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ABSTRACT


Many nationwide reform efforts in Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) have revolved around the development of the National Standards for PETE, which outline essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions required of successful physical educators (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000a). With the inclusion of Standard Six in the 3rd edition of the Initial PETE Standards (National Association of Sport & Physical Education [NASPE], 2008), programs have been challenged to integrate, teach, monitor, and assess teacher candidates’ (TCs’) dispositions in systematic ways. According to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), programs seeking to achieve or maintain accreditation have the freedom to determine how dispositions, which contribute to candidates’ overall professionalism, are assessed within their programs. Therefore, the way dispositions are addressed and evaluated often vary from program to program (Borko, Liston, & Witcomb, 2007).

To date, sporadic research exists describing the actual teaching and assessment practices of PETE programs pertaining specifically to dispositions that contribute to TCs’ overall professionalism. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the ways in which three nationally accredited PETE programs taught and assessed Standard Six of the NASPE (2008) Initial PETE Standards, which focuses on professionalism. Using occupational socialization (Lawson, 1986) as the conceptual framework, a descriptive
A multi-case study approach was utilized to explore the following research questions: (Q1) “In what ways do the selected PETE programs prepare TCs to meet each individual element of NASPE Initial PETE Standard Six?” and (Q2) “In what ways do the selected PETE programs assess TCs across each individual element of Standard Six?”

A multi-level purposeful sampling strategy was utilized to identify and recruit three PETE programs (cases) for the study. Data collection consisted of questionnaire responses, semi-structured phone interviews with two knowledgeable participants from each case, and document analysis. Using inductive and comparative analytic strategies (Merriam, 2009), cross-case analysis demonstrated patterns in the strategies programs used to address aspects of professionalism, which included discussion, modeling, and offering opportunities for engagement. Data analysis also revealed programs utilized multiple assessment techniques (e.g. systematic checklists, rubrics, standardized evaluations) to assess TCs’ professionalism during coursework and student teaching. Two programs had assessments in place to track and monitor TCs’ dispositions at various points in the program.

Findings serve as a guide for PETE teacher educators to discern and reflect on ways to effectively prepare TCs for achieving Standard Six, in order to ensure program completers possess the professional dispositions expected of prospective teachers. Additionally, results from this study provide insight into the manner in which TCs are socialized to adopt to goals and beliefs presented throughout their training. With the release 2017 National Initial PETE Standard, more research in necessary to examine how PETE programs face the challenge of modifying curriculum and assessment plans to adequately teach and assess TCs’ professionalism.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, there has been a continuous series of criticism by researchers, clinicians, parents, legislators, and the media concerning the objectives, methodologies, and content of teacher education programs across the United States of America (Collier, 2006; Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000b). Specifically, since the early 1980’s, there has been a nationwide movement to increase accountability of teacher candidates (TCs) learning through the implementation of comprehensive standards for teacher education programs, across all content areas (Hetland & Strand, 2010). In higher education, these standards, which address the professional expertise needed by educators to work with K-12 students, have been implemented to improve, guide, and uphold the effectiveness of instructional practices (Arminio, 2009). Concurrently, teacher education programs have received increased attention and criticism from national professional organizations and accrediting bodies for educator preparation.

In July 2013, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) merged with a second accreditation agency, the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), to form a single accreditation body, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Thus, CAEP has become one central agency responsible for accrediting teacher preparation programs in the US. Under the CAEP umbrella are a number of Specialized Program Associations, commonly referred
to as SPAs, which are responsible for defining content-area standards for discipline specific programs. The Society of Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE) America is recognized as the CAEP SPA for physical education, and as such, SHAPE America is the organization responsible for developing guidelines for physical education teacher education (PETE). In order to receive national recognition, programs must adhere to the guidelines set forth by the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) and SHAPE America, in collaboration with CAEP. Currently, to receive SHAPE/CAEP accreditation, programs must meet the 2008 or newly introduced 2017 Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2009; SHAPE, 2017).

**National Standards for Beginning Physical Education Teachers**

Much of the nationwide reform efforts in PETE have revolved around the development of the National Standards for Initial Physical Education Teacher Education (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000a). After initial guidelines were developed in 1985, the National Standards for Beginning Physical Education Teachers were first published by NASPE in 1995 (Appendix A), with revisions in 2003 (Appendix B), and again in 2008 (Appendix C). The 2008 standards serve to outline the essential knowledge, skills and dispositions required of successful physical educators (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000a). These standards, or performance indicators, provide a framework by which teacher educators can make decisions concerning curriculum and program content so as to best prepare TCs to teach K-12 physical education in the public school system.

Since its initial publication in 1995, the 2008 iteration of the National Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2008) has resulted in a more concentrated set of performance expectations for TCs. Among some of the more significant changes appearing in the 2008
NASPE standards was the introduction of Standard Six which addresses professionalism, specifically regarding TCs’ ability to demonstrate dispositions essential to becoming effective physical educators. The inclusion of Standard Six, which outlined four facets of professionalism, signified the first time dispositions were explicitly linked to specific performance indicators associated with individual elements, in the NASPE standards. The 1995 NASPE Standards described dispositions as “fundamental attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions about teaching and learning in physical education, which underlie the professional and ethical basis for practice” (p. 7). Similarly, NCATE (2008) described dispositions as “the attitudes, values, and beliefs that educators demonstrate through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities” (p. 6).

Standard Six requires teacher educators to reflect on the ways their programs recruit, prepare, and socialize TCs seeking to enter the field of physical education (Richards, Templin, & Graber, 2014). Such focused attention on professionalism is necessary, as Wasicsko (2004) suggested most educators who fail to be successful do so because they do not possess appropriate dispositions. Standard Six (NASPE, 2008, p. 3) focuses on the behaviors that constitute professionalism for TCs, featuring four specific elements:

- Element 6.1: TCs behaviors reflect the belief that all students are capable of becoming physically educated individuals
- Element 6.2: TCs engage in collaborative endeavors and activities that lead to professional growth and development
- Element 6.3: TCs exhibit professionally ethical behavior
- Element 6.4: TCs communication demonstrate respect and sensitivity
As illustrated in the four elements, Standard Six can be separated into two distinct, yet overlapping components of professionalism: professional growth and collaboration (6.2) and professional dispositions (6.1, 6.3, 6.4). Elements 6.1 and 6.3 were new to the 2008 standards, while element 6.2 was similar to Outcome 10.2, and Element 6.4 was similar to Outcome 5.3 of the 2003 standards. The inclusion of Standard Six in the 2008 Initial PETE standards did, however, signify a significant shift toward more accountability for the ways in which accredited PETE programs address and evaluate the professional growth and collaboration practices and professional dispositions of TCs. Not only has the addition of this standard prompted programs to develop new assessment tools, but it has also required them to determine specific ways in which TCs engage in collaborative activities that promote growth and development, as well as identify dispositions expected of effective educators (Lund, Wayda, Woodard, & Buck, 2007).

**Addressing Candidates’ Professional Growth and Collaboration**

Engagement in professional activities, such as professional development and continuing education, is an important component of professional practice, as teachers are expected to engage in activities that not only improve such practice, but also have a positive impact on their students’ learning (Keay, 2006). A critical element for achieving a successful culture of professional growth and development in teaching is to what extent experiences offered through the PETE program encourage teacher candidates to pursue lifelong learning (Loughran, 2006). With the inclusion of Standard 6.2 (NASPE, 2009), PETE programs have both an obligation and a responsibility to promote, encourage, and support TC professional growth and development. These collaborative activities, such as
workshops, conferences and participation in communities of practice (CoP), could all fall under the general umbrella of professional development (PD). Through an explicit system of accountability, TCs’ professional development progress can be guided and monitored by PETE faculty as candidates progress through the program. As TCs are introduced to the importance of PD engagement early in the program, teacher educators can reinforce the importance of such experiences, which may result in positive socialization effects for TCs into the culture of K-12 educational settings.

By providing opportunities for growth and collaboration through PD activities, PETE programs also have the potential to cultivate TCs’ appreciation for, and commitment to exploring experiences that will contribute to life-long learning (Loughran, 2006). Armour (2010) argued PETE programs should model the learning approach in-service teachers are encouraged to participate in throughout their careers. Similarly, Gallo, Sheehy, Bohler and Richardson (2015) asserted, “Early, ongoing, meaningful student involvement [in PD experiences] can serve as a powerful conduit for continued participation beyond the preservice years” (p. 33). Thus, by offering these types of experiences, PETE programs may become stronger socializing agents for TCs’ professional growth and collaboration. For CAEP accredited programs, the question becomes, “In ways can programs promote TC achievement in Standard 6.2 of the Initial PETE standards?”

Due to increased emphasis on accountability in recent years, teacher education programs are now expected to support TCs as they respond to the challenges of becoming self-reliant learners, and position themselves within the context of a professional learning approach (MacPhail, 2011). Hence, it is imperative teacher education programs strive to
promote cultures dedicated to long-term professional learning. Teacher educators must be resilient in upholding the expectation that completion of a teacher preparation program does not equate to the end of professional learning (Loughran, 2006). By the time a TC takes his or her place as a professional in the field, they are expected to have a strong understanding of what PD entails and how it provides valuable resources in their continual progress towards the goal of becoming effective, practicing teachers.

**Challenges in Promoting Professional Growth and Collaboration**

If participation in activities designed to promote professional growth and collaboration are essential requirements for all members of the teaching profession, one would anticipate this obligation would instill an attitude of progress towards the persistent advancement of teacher effectiveness, in both pre-service and in-service teachers. The challenge for teacher educators comes in demonstrating to TCs how PD is an essential component of career development for reasons that extend beyond the mandated requirements, for which teachers are held accountable (MacPhail, 2011). While it is true licensure requirements necessitate educators to produce recurrent evidence of PD in order to retain authorized teaching credentials, it should not be the sole motivation for teachers to participate in such endeavors. PETE programs are responsible for instilling in TCs an understanding and appreciation of the value of PD, beyond mere obligations for continued licensure. While every program seeking to achieve or maintain CAEP SPA accreditation must provide sufficient evidence of how elements within each standard are being met, there is little research describing how programs are achieving Standard 6.2 of the 2008 NASPE Standards. In addition to promoting TC involvement in activities that promote professional growth and collaboration, PETE programs are also
expected to regularly monitor and assess professional dispositions of candidates, which are outlined in the other three elements of Standard Six.

**Assessing Dispositions of Teacher Candidates**

With the inclusion of Standard Six in the 3rd edition of the Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2008), PETE programs have been challenged to integrate, teach, monitor, and assess TCs’ dispositions in systematic ways. Traditionally, the teaching and assessing of dispositions had been more informal than formal, not institutionalized, and rarely assessed (Lund et al., 2007; Shiveley & Misco, 2010; Wayda & Lund, 2005). PETE programs continue to strive to provide TCs with the important knowledge and skills delineated in the NASPE standards through a rigorous combination of class sequences focused on skill acquisition, foundational sciences, instructional methodologies, and field based experiences. However, no specific courses offered are explicitly designed to address TCs’ dispositions (Napper-Owen, Marston, Volkinburg, Afeman, & Brewer, 2008).

Historically, the assessment of TCs’ knowledge and skills has been comparatively straightforward, as descriptions of corresponding outcomes have been more concrete, observable, and documentable, in relation to the more nebulous construct of “dispositions” (Duplass & Cruz, 2010). Knowledge is assessed almost exclusively through participation in coursework, work sample projects, and Praxis exams which measure TCs’ academic skills and subject-specific content knowledge. However, different states require different standardized assessments to affirm TCs’ content knowledge. Performance components (skills) are determined through demonstrated proficiency of observable measures during course and practicum assignments.
(Kinderwater, 2013). Dispositions, however, are more complex, making them difficult to monitor and document, as these subjective constructs are exemplified through the behaviors and attitudes displayed by TCs’ professional conduct and interactions with others.

**Challenges in Assessing Dispositions**

Aspects of Standard Six have consistently proven more challenging to identify and monitor than components found in other standards, especially for purposes of evaluation and accountability (Shiveley & Misco, 2010). Difficulty in identifying and monitoring TC dispositions may be a result of the lack of consistency across teacher education programs’ in establishing norms by which to assess such constructs (Creasy, 2015; Ginsberg & Whaley, 2003; Lund et al., 2007; Shiveley & Misco, 2010; Wayda & Lund, 2005). According to CAEP, programs have the freedom to determine how TCs’ professional dispositions are assessed within their programs. Therefore, the way dispositions are defined, monitored, and assessed may vary from program to program (Borko, Liston, & Witcomb, 2007). Similarly, Jung and Rhodes (2008) revealed most of the descriptive terms used in the assessment of dispositions have several meanings and are used for multiple purposes within and across teacher education programs, thus making it difficult to determine exactly what aspects of professionalism are being addressed. In regard to assessing dispositions, Creasy (2015) acknowledged, “Without a universally accepted definition that is accompanied by the characteristics or qualities valued as indicators of a professional, labeling or stating that our teacher candidates have attained this status is questionable” (p.23).
Importance of Addressing Dispositions

One of the primary functions of a PETE program is to aid in the development of the beliefs, values, knowledge and skills necessary for TCs to succeed in the profession of teaching in K-12 physical education (Stroot & Ko, 2006). A critical phase of socialization occurs during formal teacher preparation, which consists of a sequential series of content and pedagogy courses, coupled with a variety of progressive field experiences. Due to the role programs play in the socialization process, it becomes imperative for PETE faculty to find effective ways to address the professionalism of TCs.

First, with the inception of the 2003 standards, NASPE/NCATE required programs to provide evidence demonstrating how TCs display the appropriate dispositions necessary for prospective educators. The focus on outcomes demonstrated a shift from curriculum-oriented standards found in the original version to performance-oriented standards introduced in the 2003 edition (Wise, 1999). With the introduction of the 2008 Standards, PETE programs must submit a conclusive set of artifacts demonstrating ways in which NASPE’s Standard Six is successfully being addressed within their program in order to attain national accreditation.

Secondly, dispositions are a critical component school district administrators consider when recruiting and hiring new teachers (Atkins, 1999; Lund et al., 2007; Napper-Owen et al., 2008; Shivley & Misco, 2010; Sleap & Reed, 2006; Wayda & Lund, 2005). Wasicsko (2004) suggests new teachers’ failure is due not to lack of content knowledge or inadequate teaching skills (apart from classroom management), but because they do not possess the appropriate dispositions to be successful. Therefore, programs have an obligation to address TC dispositions in order to prepare qualified
graduates to be competitive as they enter the job market as beginning professionals. Moreover, as teacher educators are called upon to complete reference forms for TCs with accuracy and confidence, it becomes imperative for programs to have a system of accountability in place to determine whether candidates demonstrate preferred dispositions, and then document this data for school districts (Lund et al., 2007; Shiveley & Misco, 2010).

Lastly, due to the role teacher education programs serve, as gatekeepers for the physical education profession, therein also comes the responsibility for assessing all aspects of TCs’ abilities and attitudes (Goodwin & Oyler, 2008; Lund et al., 2007; Wayda & Lund, 2005; Rike & Sharp, 2008). Teacher educators are charged with implementing both formative and summative instruments designed to monitor and assess various elements of candidates’ professionalism throughout the program. It would be a grand disservice for the programs in charge of preparing candidates for teacher certification to graduate learners with disposition problems who were deemed “unfit” for the teaching profession (Duplass & Cruz, 2010).

**Statement of the Problem**

Though the standards offer opportunities for assessment and appraisal within PETE programs, to date there is little existing evidence to determine whether or not teacher educators are exemplifying the most recent guidelines outlined by NASPE (2009), specifically in regard to Standard Six. As such, it is also unclear whether or not institutions are effectively promoting professional growth and development, while also preparing TCs with the essential dispositions to become the next generation of highly qualified physical educators (Chen, 2003). After attempting to identify essential
dispositions necessary for the success of upcoming teachers, Lund et al. (2007) determined further research was necessary to explore how PETE programs are addressing the assessment of dispositions for accreditation purposes. Lund and colleagues (2007) also asserted that continued investigation was necessary not only to examine the evaluation practices of TCs’ professionalism solely for accreditation purposes, but to discern if “[institutions] are taking this as a real challenge to improve the quality of TCs or merely giving the matter lip service to avoid sanctions from [NCATE/CAEP]” (p. 45). Similarly, Diez (2007) contended the evaluation of TCs’ dispositions must move “beyond a response to an external mandate, whether state requirements or [NCATE/CAEP] standards” in order to “take on the responsibility to both conceptualize the abilities required for effective teaching and to model those for [our] candidates” (p. 394).

**Purpose of the Study**

Therefore, the purpose of this multi-case study was to describe how Standard Six of the NASPE Initial PETE Standards was addressed and assessed in selected CAEP accredited PETE programs. Specific questions explored were:

Q1 In what ways do the selected PETE programs prepare TCs to meet each individual element of NASPE Initial PETE Standard Six?

Q2 In what ways do the selected PETE programs assess TCs across each individual element of Standard Six (e.g., when, who, how, and what aspects of professionalism are assessed)?

**Significance of the Study**

To date, limited research studies have attempted to examine the ways in which PETE programs address the NASPE Initial PETE Standards. Despite the awareness stemming from the national accreditation process of developing teacher preparation programs which provide opportunities for TCs to meet the Initial PETE Standards, the
ways programs address the standards, including Standard Six, remain a relatively
underexplored area by researchers in PETE. Moreover, the majority of the research
studies devoted to this topic were conducted prior to the introduction of the 2008
Standards (Ayers & Housner, 2008; Banville, 2006; Bolton, 2008; Chen, 2003; Lund et
al., 2007; Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000a; McCullick, Metzler, Cicek, Jackson, & Vickers,
2008). Additionally, there have been limited studies examining the general practices and
instructional strategies employed by PETE programs to specifically address the 2008
Initial PETE Standards (Hetland & Strand, 2010; Nelson, 2012). Thus, very little data
describing the actual assessment practices of PETE programs related to the most recent
version of the Standards exists in the current literature (NASPE, 2009), and even less
research pertaining specifically to the assessment of TCs’ professionalism. Lund et. al
(2007) recommended further research on this topic, emphasizing that because
“[NCATE/CAEP] believes dispositions are an issue that teacher preparation programs
need to address, then information is warranted on what PETE programs are currently
doing regarding dispositions” (p. 45).

Therefore, this study helped to determine the ways in which CAEP accredited
Findings may serve as a guide for PETE teacher educators to discern and reflect on ways
to effectively prepare TCs for achieving Standard Six, in order to ensure program
completers possess not only the knowledge and skills to become successful educators, but
also the professional dispositions expected of prospective teachers. Additionally, by
examining the extent to which Standard Six is addressed within PETE programs,
individuals can better understand the value of such teacher education programs and the
manner in which TCs are socialized to adopt to goals and beliefs presented throughout their training.

**Definition of Terms**

The following are operational definitions, including synonyms, of terms are provided to ensure understanding and cohesion of these terms throughout the study. The researcher provided all definitions not accompanied by a citation:

**AAHPERD:** American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; a professional organization for related fields of study, a related specialty professional association. Changed its name to the Society for Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE) America in April 2014.

**CAEP:** Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation; in 2013 CAEP became the sole accrediting body for educator preparation providers with the merging of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).

**Central District:** One of six regions determined by the Society for Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE) comprised of the following states: Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

**CUPEC:** College and University Physical Education Council, the group which coordinated efforts with NASPE to develop a task force to developing the 1985 and 1995 initial PETE guidelines (NASPE, 1998).

**Dispositions:** The attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and
communities. These professional dispositions support student learning and development (NCATE, 2008).

**Initial Standards:** The National Association of Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) worked in conjunction with Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) to develop the Initial Standards which represent a comprehensive vision of what a teacher of physical education should know and be able to do upon initial teacher licensure. The NASPE Initial standards are utilized by Physical Education Teacher Education programs to merit SHAPE/CAEP accreditation.

**NASPE:** National Association for Sport and Physical Education; an Association that has created, from years of research, standards for best practices and effective teaching. These standards are used to measure PETE curriculum programs at colleges and universities that are seeking national recognition through the SHAPE/CAEP process (Butler, 2006).

**NCATE:** National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education; founded in 1954 as a non-profit, non-governmental accrediting body. In July 2013, NCATE merged with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) to form CAEP, the sole accrediting body for educator preparation providers.

**PETE:** Physical Education Teacher Education; undergraduate program of study focused on training students to become physical education teachers.

**PETE Faculty:** Those who teach Physical Education Teacher Education professional preparation courses and are deemed knowledgeable by each specific college or university coordinator.
**PETE Program:** Specialized subject discipline instruction in physical education (and health education) at colleges and universities for preparation for teacher candidates to become physical education teachers. For the purpose of this paper the term PETE programs will include only activities and experiences that are designed and implemented to facilitate the NASPE standards (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000a, 2000b).

**School:** Kindergarten through 12th grade (K-12) schools of education; recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

**SHAPE America:** The Society for Health and Physical Educators of America; a professional organization for related fields of study, a related specialty professional association. Formerly known as AAHPERD (American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance).

**Students:** Children and youths attending K-12 schools, as distinguished from teacher candidates. (NASPE, 2009). SYN: learners.

**SPA:** Specialized Professional Association; CAEP has 19 Specialized Professional Associations; these SPAs cover subject disciplines and specialties. The Society for Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE) is a SPA with an emphasis on physical education.

**TEAC:** Teacher Education Accreditation Council; Founded in 1997, accreditation agency dedicating to improving academic degree programs for profession educators, those who teach and lead in schools pre-K-12th grade. In July 2013, TEAC merged with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
(NCATE) to form CAEP, the sole accrediting body for educator preparation providers.

**Teacher Candidates:** Individuals at colleges and universities that have been admitted to, or enrolled in, Physical Education Teacher Education programs; a student in a teacher preparation program. A student teacher is a teacher candidate in a student teaching placement. “Teacher candidate”, “candidate”, or (TC) is used throughout this paper to distinguish from students K-12 schools. (NASPE, 2009). SYN: pre-service teacher.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, a comprehensive review of relevant literature examining the National Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 1995, 2003, 2008; SHAPE, 2017) and their influence on the assessment of TCs’ professionalism in PETE programs is separated into 5 sections: (1) the conceptual framework of occupational socialization; (2) PETE program structures and the CAEP accreditation process; (3) historical overview of Initial PETE Standards; (4) previous research on Initial PETE Standards; and (5) research related to dispositions in PETE. Structured in this fashion, research on PETE programs originating out of various lines of inquiry, can be summarized and synthesized to provide a better understanding of how accredited programs navigate the instruction and assessment of professionalism and dispositions in TCs, as outlined in the four elements comprising Standard Six of the National Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2009).

Occupational Socialization

When considering which conceptual framework may be applied to offer guidance in the evaluation of TCs’ professionalism in teacher education, it was beneficial to look through the lens of occupational socialization (Lawson, 1983). Lawson (1986) defined occupational socialization as “all of the kinds of socialization that initially influence persons to enter the field of physical education and that later are responsible for their perceptions and actions as teacher educators and teachers” (p. 107). Simply stated, such

The acculturation phase begins at birth, and encompasses all of the childhood and adolescent observations and involvement an individual has throughout their compulsory school experience. During the accumulation of an estimated 13,000 hours of contact time with teachers during their K-12 schooling, students tend to develop strong, enduring perceptions of what teaching is supposed to look like, and how teachers are supposed to conduct themselves (Lortie, 1975). These extensive experiences leave prospective teachers with a conceptualized set of images and beliefs regarding the responsibilities and expectations attached to a teaching role. What students learn about teaching, and the teaching profession, appears instinctive and impressionistic rather than explicit and methodical (Graber, 1989). The perceptions students acquire about teaching then, as Lortie (1975) pointed out, “is based on individual personalities rather than pedagogical principles” (p. 62).

Correspondingly, Lortie (1975) also asserted that “conditions of transfer do not favor informed criticism, attention to specifics, or explicit rules of assessment” (p. 63). Considering the far-reaching implications potential effects witnessed during the acculturation stage has on future educators’ teaching practices, much insight can be garnered when attempting to understand how TCs perceive professionalism and the significance of modeling appropriate professional dispositions. According to Lortie
(1975) and Schempp (1989), acculturation is believed to be the most powerful form of socialization. Essentially, teachers will teach how they have been taught (Capel & Blair, 2013). Hence, Lawson’s (1983) theory of occupational socialization in physical education could be used to argue teachers who demonstrate inappropriate attitudes and behaviors may have been socialized into the acceptance of poor dispositions based on the teachers they observed and interacted with during the acculturation phase.

The second stage of socialization, professional socialization, (Lawson, 1983), focuses on an individual’s experiences within a teacher education program whereby they, as TCs, develop the beliefs, values, knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in the profession of teaching K-12 physical education (Stroot & Ko, 2006). It is during this stage that TCs engage in various field experiences, which culminate with a student teaching practicum where candidates emulate the role and daily responsibilities of an in-service physical educator. Due to the significant amount of time spent in placement schools working under mentor teachers, these placement teaching experiences are identified as the most significant and impactful for TCs in their development of knowledge, beliefs, and practices associated with teaching (Velija, Capel, Katene, & Hayes, 2009).

In fact, Gower and Capel (2004), and Behets and Vergauwen (2006) both found that mentor teachers are very influential in TCs’ development as teachers. This creates a particularly challenging situation for TCs to navigate if the attitude and behaviors of the cooperating teacher contradict dispositional expectations consistently affirmed throughout the teacher education program (Marks, 2007; Weinstein, 1989). Thus, research would suggest if TCs are placed under mentor teachers who do not exhibit
appropriate dispositions, they may be “socialized” into the acceptance and approval of this type of conduct (O'Sullivan & Tsangaridou, 1992). While research findings have demonstrated the significant impact personal experiences within the acculturation stage have on TCs’ beliefs about teaching (Stroot & Ko, 2006), having mentor teachers who reinforce how professionalism is monitored and addressed in the university program could potentially equalize or even outweigh any negative socialization TCs may have had within in their own K-12 experience (Richards & Templin, 2011).

In the third stage of socialization, organizational socialization, a new teacher is made aware of the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions that are esteemed and rewarded by those in authority at the particular school or district level (Lawson, 1983). During this time, if the specific school does not reinforce established expectations concerning dispositions and professional growth and development, it might not take long for new teachers to experience “wash out”, which occurs when the effect of the teacher education program diminishes (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). Nonetheless, it can be predicted TCs currently graduating from accredited PETE programs in the United States have demonstrated desirable dispositions and professional growth and development practices deemed important, and necessary, for physical education teachers, and most likely documented/demonstrated evidence of growth and progress throughout the program. If this is accurate, then it could be argued that teachers with poor dispositions who graduated from NCATE/CAEP accredited institutions since 2008, when the 3rd edition of the standards was released, did at one point demonstrate achievement across all four elements of the professionalism standard, but have since abandoned (or become socialized away from) such attitudes and behaviors.
Program Structures and National Accreditation

Physical Education Teacher Education Program Structures

The goal of PETE programs in the United States is to prepare highly qualified, 21st century physical educators with the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to successfully assume teaching positions in a global educational market (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000a). NASPE (2007) stated:

Physical Education Teacher Education programs should provide preservice teachers with substantial pedagogical and content knowledge bases; afford many opportunities for preservice teachers to participate in an array of field experiences where they can interact with veteran teachers and diverse students at all grade levels while seeing the application of classroom principles; and develop, nurture and reinforce specific professional behaviors that facilitate student learning. (p.1)

Wiegand, Bulger, and Mohr (2004) offered a framework to generically describe the PETE curricular process. This framework operates within the assumption that:

all PETE curricula are designed with the intention of enabling PETE students to fully understand the subject matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge involved in the delivery of a school based physical education program. (Wiegand et al., 2004, p. 47)

Four areas of professional preparation are included in the framework, which include (1) foundational sub-disciplinary coursework (i.e. anatomy, physiology, motor learning, biomechanics, etc.), (2) curriculum and instruction coursework (i.e. teaching methods, task design and presentation, content analysis and development, learning environment management, etc.), (3) pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) coursework (teaching elementary PE: educational gymnastics, teaching motor skills rhythms, pre-sport combinations, etc.; middle school PE: soccer, softball, volleyball, hockey, etc.; and secondary PE: golf, tennis, weight training, walking/jogging, swimming, etc.), and (4)
field placement experiences (instructional modeling and observation, teaching simulations, teaching labs, clinical field placements, and student teaching). While all PETE programs include coursework addressing these four areas, the amount of curricular space devoted to each category varies across institutions (Ayers & Housner, 2008; Bahneman, 1996; Hetland & Strand, 2010; Kim, Lee, Ward, & Li, 2015). Wiegand and colleagues (2004) argued the level of instructional effectiveness of PETE programs is not only characterized by a well-designed curriculum with coursework in these four categories, but that attention must also be given to the importance of curriculum articulation. It was suggested coursework and learning experiences be organized and prescribed in a well-organized, coordinated, and progressive manner (Wiegand et al., 2004).

Bahneman (1996) was the first to conduct a descriptive analysis of undergraduate PETE programs in the United States. Among institutions which offered PETE doctoral degrees, the researcher attempted to answer the question, “What are our peer institutions doing?” in terms of PETE course requirements, credit hours and program purpose (Bahneman, 1996, p. 198). The researcher examined similarities and differences of critical curricular components from 29 PETE programs. Findings demonstrated many similarities in course offerings and learning experiences across institutions (Bahneman, 1996).

For example, philosophy, secondary methods and curriculum courses were offered at every institution, as were the following content courses: basketball, volleyball, track and field, and rhythmic activities. Results also indicated peer teaching and student teaching were included as program requirements for all institutions (Bahneman, 1996).
However, data also revealed many inconsistencies among program offerings. For instance, less than half of surveyed institutions offered courses in officiating (28%), archery (28%), bowling (21%) and speedball (21%). Surprisingly, 33% of the institutions did not provide practicum teaching experiences in K-12 settings prior to student teaching (Bahneman, 1996). While this study provided insight into the programmatic structures of PETE programs, the researchers did not explore how curricular components may have been reflective of, or influenced by the NASPE (1995) Beginning Teacher Standards.

In 2008, Ayers and Housner published a study similar to Bahneman’s (1996), in which the researchers sought to identify curricular trends and practices among NCATE accredited PETE programs. Researchers were primarily interested in identifying course allocations and curricular areas receiving inadequate attention, as well as field experiences and other potential learning opportunities. Unlike Bahneman’s (1996) study, Ayers and Housner (2008) only surveyed NCATE accredited programs. Accordingly, researchers administered a questionnaire which, in part, focused on PETE program practices based on NASPE/NCATE accreditation standards. Data collected from 116 institutions with undergraduate PETE programs revealed sub-disciplinary coursework (e.g., exercise physiology, biomechanics, anatomy, and physiology) maintained twice as much curricular space than activity- and performance-based coursework. These findings were congruent with Kim et al. (2015) findings which indicated movement content classes, on average, accounted for only 10% of the curricula.

In contrast to Bahneman’s (1996) study in which only one-third of the undergraduate PETE programs surveyed offered K-12 field experiences prior to student teaching, 98% of the institutions in Ayers and Housner’s (2008) study reported providing
TCs with pre–student teaching field experiences. However, data did not reveal detailed information about what these field experiences entailed. Dodds (1989) recommended field experiences be sequential, progressive, increasingly complex, and well-coordinated, as he believed simply placing the student within a K-12 environment was insufficient to maximally impact the effectiveness and learning of TCs.

In a more recent descriptive analysis, Hetland and Strand (2010) attempted to gather information regarding programmatic features and practices of undergraduate PETE programs in Central District. This district, comprised of the following states: Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, is one of six regions determined by SHAPE America (Inside Districts, n.d.). Of the 44 institutions who responded to the survey, 39 (89%) were accredited by NASPE/NCATE. Data regarding curricular content showed five areas that were incorporated in PETE curricula by all institutions: adapted, activities and materials, assessment, behavior management, and curriculum design/methods. Similar to Ayers and Housner (2008), who reported 98% of institutions surveyed provided TCs opportunities to engage in K-12 pre-student teaching field experiences, Hetland and Strand (2010) found 97% of the institutions surveyed in Central District offered sequential, course-linked practicums prior to student teaching experiences.

In summary, very few studies have attempted to describe and analyze curricular trends and programmatic practices of PETE programs in the United States. Available research does suggest all PETE programs incorporate course content in each of areas outlined within the framework presented by Wiegand et al. (2004). However, the amount of curricular space devoted to each area varied across institutions (Ayers & Housner,
Concerning field experience opportunities, research demonstrates an increase over the last 20 years in the number of institutions which provide TCs practicum experiences within PETE curricula, which Hetland and Strand (2010) affirmed is necessary to authentically prepare candidates for full-time teaching positions in K-12 settings.

**Perceptions of Program Structures**

Collier and Herbert (2004) surveyed 359 K-12 physical educators from Wisconsin, Idaho, and the Pacific Northwest to determine practitioner perceptions of the value and importance of PETE curriculum components in preparing them to teach physical education. Survey respondents were relatively experienced, with 67% reporting at ten years or more of teaching experience. Researchers utilized a 6-point Likert scale questionnaire with twenty-four quantitative questions, and ended the survey with a section for open-ended comments and suggestions. Respondents perceived the following areas as the most important areas of a PETE curriculum: exercise and health-related fitness, fundamental movement skills, classroom management, exercise physiology, and special needs populations. In contrast, survey data revealed physical educators perceived adventure education, sports and games, and dance and rhythms as the least important areas of a curriculum.

Around the same time as Collier and Herbert’s (2004) study, Hill and Brodin (2004) surveyed physical education department heads in Washington state to determine the frequency specific components were included in respondents’ undergraduate PETE programs, and the perceived value of these components in preparing them to teach. Of the 132 physical education teachers who returned the survey, slightly less than half (49.2%)
reported holding a master’s degree. In general, respondents indicated most PETE programs consisted of similar components, which seem to reflect state certification and endorsement requirements. More than 90% of respondents reported their PETE coursework included the following components: student teaching, lesson planning, knowledge of physiology, knowledge of methods, knowledge of anatomy, sports skills/knowledge, fitness concepts, and motor development. Interestingly, more than one fifth of the practitioners who completed the survey reported concepts of fitness testing or assessment of learning were not addressed in their PETE curriculum (Hill & Brodin, 2004). However, because respondents had an average of 15 years of teaching experience, the data collected may not have been reflective of current PETE program practices.

Similar to Collier and Herbert (2004), Hill and Brodin’s (2004) study also highlighted PETE program areas perceived by respondents to be the most valuable to teaching physical education. Over 85% of respondents regarded the following areas as beneficial components in a teacher preparation program: management, sports skills/knowledge, teaching methods, organization, and lesson planning. Conversely, respondents perceived sports law, grading practices, integration of movement, and the historical perspective of physical education as having little or no value in a PETE curriculum. The researchers suggested findings may provide assistance and insight for PETE faculty faced with determining future curricular decisions.

**National Accreditation of Physical Education Teacher Education Programs**

Educator accreditation is a lengthy, involved, and voluntary review process teacher preparation programs undergo in order to establish credibility and demonstrate
quality assurance through external peer evaluation. Attaining national professional accreditation is particularly important for educator preparation programs, as it is currently the only consistent means of evaluating such programs (Bolton, 2008). With the consolidation of NCATE and TEAC in 2013, CAEP became the sole professional accrediting agency, authorized by the U.S. Department of Education, responsible for reviewing schools, colleges and departments which house educator preparation programs.

Two types of accreditation are offered through CAEP: institutional and programmatic (also referred to as professional). For a specialized program such as a PETE program to earn CAEP accreditation, it must provide evidence demonstrating that it meets a set of standards developed by the governing body for that discipline. Presently, SHAPE America (formerly NASPE) is the SPA for physical education. Thus, programs seeking national recognition through SHAPE/CAEP utilize the National Initial PETE standards (NASPE, 2008). The intensive review process required to attain accreditation, which is conducted every 7-10 years, provides teacher education programs a framework that encourages focused reflection and rigorous analysis of overall program effectiveness (Wise & Leibbrand, 1993).

A PETE program seeking accreditation must engage in the arduous task of compiling, analyzing and assessing appropriate sources of evidence to make a case that their program meets each of the 28 distinct elements contained in the 2008 edition of the Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2008). A significant amount of time, energy and resources go into preparing and submitting the program report, as it is the sole document utilized to determine whether a PETE program gains national SHAPE/CAEP accreditation (Senne, 2006). Assessment instruments, such as those used to evaluate
student teaching, professional dispositions, or employer and graduate satisfaction, may be utilized as sources of evidence in the application ("CAEP Accreditation Cycle", n.d.).

In order to earn national recognition from SHAPE/CAEP, programs must provide evidence of meeting each of the elements using no more than eight assessment instruments (Dyson, 2006). Due to the limited number of assessments permitted in the application, deliberate attention must be given to the selection of assessments submitted, as these assessments are intended to showcase comprehensive evidence of TC mastery across all six standards (Hacker, 2006). In addition to providing a description of the assessment, programs must also identify the rubric criteria utilized in the evaluation of TC performance on each assessment, along with TC performance data derived using the assessment rubrics (Senne, 2006).

Once programs feel confident they have sufficient evidence of meeting each element of the standards, a program review application is submitted and preparations for accreditation review begin. The compilation of evidence and supporting narrative, which form the basis of the accreditation review, is the first data source considered by the CAEP Visitor Team. This team, made up of trained peer reviewers, initially conducts a formative offsite review during which they examine the quality and overall scope of evidence provided by the educator preparation program. Program reviewers are charged with the task of evaluating program rigor, complexity, and extensiveness based on the evidence provided in the program review document (Hacker, 2006; Lund, 2006). The formative review also provides valuable insight into program strengths and deficiencies; information which will, in turn, aid the team in determining specific areas and aspects of the program to concentrate on during the on-site visit ("CAEP Program Review", n.d.).
After the formative review, the CAEP Visitor team conducts an on-site visit. This two- to three-day campus visit allows the team to explore evidence, verify submitted data and information, and review pedagogical artifacts such as lesson plans and TC work samples. During this time, team members conduct interviews with various individuals affiliated with the educator preparation program, including provider leaders, faculty, mentor teachers, students, and K-12 administrators. Upon completion of the visit, a written report is issued to the program, as well as the Accreditation Council. The information and materials obtained during the visit are summarized in the report, ultimately providing supporting evidence of the extent to which each standard has been met (“CAEP Accreditation Cycle”, n.d.). The Visitor Team report, along with evidence submitted by the program, forms the basis for the final accreditation decision.

Following this lengthy and tedious process, programs receive a Recognition Report with a decision of “Nationally Recognized”, “Recognized with Conditions”, or “Further Development Required/Recognized with Probation/Not Nationally Recognized” (“CAEP Program Review”, n.d.). To achieve the status of “Nationally Recognized”, all six SHAPE/CAEP standards must be substantially met, although some areas for improvement may be indicated (Martin & Judd, 2006). “Nationally Recognized with Conditions” indicates a program generally demonstrates TC mastery across all six standards; however, one or more conditions must be sufficiently addressed and revised within 18 months. If the specified conditions are satisfied within that time period, the national recognition status is extended for the full five- to seven-year accreditation period.
While programs seeking to achieve or maintain CAEP accreditation are required to provide evidence demonstrating how each element of the 2008 Initial PETE Standards is sufficiently assessed within the curriculum, CAEP does not mandate specific types of assessment data that must be submitted (Hacker, 2006). In regard to TCs’ professionalism, NASPE (2009) suggested faculty consider the extent to which TCs demonstrate the dispositions described in Standard Six through “internship assessment, case study, the use of portfolios, participation logs and candidate disposition assessment data” (p. 28). However, it is left to the discretion of each individual program how it chooses to define and assess TCs’ professionalism (NASPE, 2009).

**Historical Overview of Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards**

The original set of guidelines for initial teacher certification in physical education was first developed in 1985 by a task force formed by NASPE, through the College and University Physical Education Council (CUPEC), which was comprised of numerous experts in the field (NAPSE, 1998). After considering the input and perspectives of various professionals and stakeholders, the taskforce achieved unanimity for their conceptualization of the essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions required of physical educators to be successful deliverers of standards-based physical education (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000a). According to Ayers and Housner (2008), the 23 guidelines focused on the knowledge and skills needed to plan, implement, and evaluate physical education programs and were clustered into three categories: (1) physical education teaching specialty—content knowledge and knowledge derived from sub-disciplines, (2) physical education as a profession—societal and philosophic underpinnings of physical education, and (3) pedagogical physical education—planning, teaching and evaluation. (p. 52)
In 1995, the CUPEC again formed a taskforce to revisit the guidelines for initial physical education (NASPE, 1998). After widespread input and suggestions were considered, NASPE utilized the previous guidelines to delineate a set of nine categories intended to serve as the knowledge base for beginning physical education teachers:

- Standard 1: Content Knowledge – understanding of physical education content and tools of inquiry necessary to develop physically educated individuals

- Standard 2: Growth and Development – strong understanding of how individuals grow and learn, and how to plan lessons that will best meet students' needs and support various aspects of development

- Standard 3: Diverse Learners – the ability to utilize a variety of teaching strategies to effectively account for individual differences and diverse learners

- Standard 4: Management and Motivation – the ability to utilize motivational strategies to promote a positive and engaging learning environment

- Standard 5: Communication – an understanding of how to apply multiple forms of communication to encourage positive connections and interactions within a physical activity setting

- Standard 6: Planning and Instruction – the ability to effectively employ a variety of instructional methodologies to plan and implement developmentally appropriate lessons

- Standard 7: Learner Assessment – the ability to develop and administer formative and summative assessments designed to foster students' development across all three learning domains

- Standard 8: Reflection – the ability to reflect and evaluate one's own teaching, and pursue opportunities for professional growth

- Standard 9: Collaboration – the ability to cultivate positive relationships with colleagues, parents, and community organizations (NASPE, 1995, p. 1)

Thus, it was the 1995 NASPE Beginning Teacher Standards which stood as a seminal document representing the first nationally recognized set of standards designed to serve
as a framework to provide targeted goals and objectives for preparing prospective 
physical educators (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000a).

Eight years after the original publication, NASPE released the first revision of the 
National Standards for Beginning Physical Education Teachers (NASPE, 2003). The 
previous nine standards were reviewed, appraised, and expanded to generate ten 
standards, most of which strongly echoed the original components found in those 
formerly outlined. Several NCATE themes were integrated into the standards, including 
conceptual frameworks, performance assessment, intellectuality, professional 
community, diversity, technology, and evaluation (Butler, 2006).

The most evident revision included the addition of standard nine, which addressed 
the use of technology to enhance learning and increase organizational efficiency 
(NASPE, 2003). Besides the addition of this technology-based standard, the former 
standards sustained marginal changes, resulting in an updated framework that closely 
mirrored the original publication (Bolton, 2008). With 10 standards and 44 outcomes, the 
2nd edition reflected literature addressing existing best practices in teaching and 
pedagogical research (Butler, 2006). However, emulating changes in NCATE’s notion of 
program accreditation, the revised version shifted from criteria-based to a more 
progressive focus on performance-based outcomes (Ayers & Housner, 2008).

The 3rd edition of the Standards debuted in 2008 (Appendix C), with much more 
substantial modifications than the previous revision. Numerous changes ensued after 
NASPE’s Initial PETE task force reconvened to consider what essential content 
knowledge, skills and professional dispositions should serve as the basis for teacher 
certification and program development concerning the preparation of physical education
teachers, in accordance with current research-based best practices from the field of physical education and related disciplines (Zieff, Lumpkin, Guedes, & Eguaoje, 2009). A summarized version of the 2008 Initial PETE Standards are as follows (Appendix C depicts the standards in their entirety):

- **Standard 1: Scientific and Theoretical Knowledge** – TCs know and apply discipline-specific scientific and theoretical concepts critical to the development of physically educated individuals

- **Standard 2: Skill and Fitness Based Competence** – TCs are physically educated individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary to demonstrate competent movement performance and health enhancing fitness as delineated in the NASPE K-12 Standards

- **Standard 3: Planning and Implementation** – TCs plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state, and national standards to address the diverse needs of all students

- **Standard 4: Instructional Delivery and Management** – TCs use effective communication and pedagogical skills and strategies to enhance student engagement and learning

- **Standard 5: Impact on Student Learning** – TCs utilize assessment and reflection to foster student learning and inform instructional decisions

- **Standard 6: Professionalism** – TCs demonstrate dispositions essential to becoming effective professionals (NASPE, 2009, p. 6-8)

Although the general appearance and organizational format of the standards had been altered and consolidated, all the existing content from the previous standards remained. For example, in the 2003 version, assessment and reflection were categorized separately, while the revised standards combined these concepts into a single standard (NASPE, 2009). Likewise, communication, management and instruction were all merged into one standard, instead of having a standard devoted to each concept individually. The method of revision and consolidation reduced the number of overall standards from 10 to
6, comprised of 28 distinct elements (or sub-components), down from the previous 44 (NASPE, 2009).

New standards prompted new expectations for PETE programs to start addressing TCs’ physical skills, performance concepts and health-related fitness (NASPE, 2009). Additionally, a more direct focus on professionalism, seen in Standard Six, also appeared in the 3rd edition of the NASPE Initial PETE Standards (2008). While the standards were directed toward newly licensed physical education teachers, they served primarily as a guide for PETE curriculum development efforts (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000a).

During the research phase of this study, SHAPE America introduced the 4th edition of the National Initial PETE Standards (Appendix D), which are as follows:

- Standard 1: Content and Foundational Knowledge
- Standard 2: Skillfulness and Health-Related Fitness
- Standard 3: Planning and Implementation
- Standard 4: Instructional Delivery and Management
- Standard 5: Assessment of Student Learning

Research on Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards

Due to the increased attention given to the rigor and quality of educator preparation programs, accreditation now plays a significant role in the accountability and program approval for such programs (Ayers & Housner, 2008). In many states, accreditation has been embraced as one form, and in some cases the only form, of program endorsement (Popham, 2015). By achieving national accreditation, programs may recommend their TCs to the state for certification and licensure, which is one of the
main objectives of educator preparation programs (Bolton, 2008). NASPE (2007) affirmed that “PETE programs are designed to facilitate preservice teachers’ progress toward being deemed ‘highly qualified’ upon entrance into the profession” (p. 1), with highly qualified distinction typically being determined by passage rates on subject matter licensure exams (Berry, Hoke, & Hirsch, 2004). Thus, national accrediting agencies have had a major influence on the way such programs prepare future teachers (Ayers & Housner, 2008).

In order to earn national recognition, accredited programs must demonstrate alignment between curriculum content, TC performance outcomes, and the Initial PETE Standards (Butler, 2006). Therefore, a program’s values and responses to the NASPE (2008) National Standards and guidelines for PETE, as well as CAEP accreditation standards are commonly reflected throughout the curriculum (“CAEP Accreditation Standards”, 2015). Twenty-first century PETE programs in the United States are typically comprised of a combination of performance courses, foundational content, pedagogy, and field experience opportunities (Collier, 2006). However, even among accredited programs, the credit hours, expectations and course requirements, and types of field experiences provided vary greatly from program to program (Napper-Owen et al., 2008).

For a PETE program to achieve SHAPE/CAEP accreditation, it must submit a compelling set of evidence demonstrating how it satisfactorily meets each of the 28 distinct elements included in the six NASPE (2008) Initial PETE Standards (“CAEP Program Review”, n.d.). However, CAEP offers little guidance as to how programs should go about determining which evidence to include in the accreditation application, leaving this decision largely to each participating institution (Hacker, 2006). Therefore,
each program is left to determine the distribution of credit hours, sequence of courses, and experiences necessary to achieve accreditation and prepare TCs for successful careers in teaching physical education, in accordance with university-mandated credit requirements.

Over the last three decades, there have been significant developments in the standards used to assess pre-service physical education teachers. Metzler and Tjeerdsma (2000b) contend there are probable differences in how PETE programs address standards, especially given all the revisions that have been made over the last several years. However, very little is known concerning adaptations in the structure of programs as a result of the Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 1995, 2003, 2008; SHAPE, 2017) standards.

Metzler and Tjeerdsma (2000a) were the first to document the journey of a PETE faculty as they attempted to conduct comprehensive, longitudinal research focused on evaluating their program’s achievement of the Beginning Teacher Standards (NASPE, 1995). In 1994, Georgia State University (GSU) launched the Physical Education Teacher Education Assessment project (PETEAP), a multi-year endeavor intended to evaluate the impact of NCATE accreditation-inspired programmatic revisions on overall program effectiveness. The primary purpose of the project was to inform and facilitate program assessment and improvement. Soon after the initial publication of the Beginning Teacher Standards (NASPE, 1995), GSU’s PETE program adopted the outcomes and knowledge bases outlined in the nine new standards. As a result, researchers altered the project’s original goal, which was to compare the “new” program to “old” program. Researchers instead, shifted their focus toward assessing the complete range of TCs’
proficiency in the essential knowledge, skills and dispositions defined by the corresponding NASPE (1995) standards.

After five years of collecting and analyzing data for the assessment project, Metzler and Tjeerdsma (2000a) published a monograph detailing the evaluation process utilized by GSU PETE faculty, to be used as a guide and resource for other PETE faculties attempting to navigate similar program assessment endeavors. Researchers created the Development, Research, and Improvement (DRI) model, which acted as a “Master Plan” for the assessment project (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 1998). The DRI model consists of three interactive stages: development, research, and decision making for improvement. Each stage of the model was comprised of a series of guiding questions to be considered by PETE faculty throughout the assessment process, making this systematic framework more directive than prescriptive in nature.

The primary function of the development stage was to provide program faculty with a comprehensive description of the contextual factors influencing TCs’ ability to achieve the NASPE (1995) standards. Metzler and Tjeerdsma (1998, 2000b) presented three central questions which summarized the development phase: “What is the context in which our program exists?”, “What are we attempting to do in our program?” and “Why do we do those things?” (p.18). Answers to the three questions provided PETE faculty with the contextual grounding to move forward into the next two stages of model.

In the research stage, PETE faculty gathered valid and reliable performance data, from which assessment decisions were to be made. The crucial question to be answered during the research stage centered around how effective the program was in fostering TCs’ achievement of the Beginning Teacher Standards (NASPE, 1995), which formed
the basis of the core knowledge and outcomes addressed within the curriculum. Data sources and data collection techniques were established in this phase, as PETE faculty identified where each standard was addressed within the program and which types of evidence best demonstrated TCs’ achievement of each standard. Depending on the type of program assessment that was conducted, a combination of formative, summative, and/or follow-up data collection was necessary.

Once the effectiveness of the PETE program had been determined, regarding how well TCs were prepared to achieve the national standards, then PETE faculty decided if change was necessary in one or more program components. Assessment evidence was linked to various program components and specific areas of change were identified. Changes were dependent upon how the components corresponded with particular standards to encourage greater achievement across each individual standard. The assessment process was designed to be cyclical and iterative. As data collection, review and revision became an ongoing endeavor, the key questions included in each stage were revisited and reconsidered regularly.

Overall, the DRI model provided a detailed framework for PETE faculty seeking to embark on the arduous task of planning and implementing a comprehensive program assessment. However, the national standards have undergone three rounds of revisions since Metzler and Tjeerdsma’s (1998, 2000b) research was published. Therefore, while the overall structure of the DRI model is still relevant and applicable, PETE faculty interested in utilizing the model must revisit the questions outlined in each stage of the framework in order to address the most updated version of the NASPE (2008) standards.
Like Metzler and Tjeerdsma (2000a, 2000b), Chen (2003) also explored how PETE programs addressed the NASPE (1995) standards. After developing and validating the instrument, Achieving the NASPE Standards Inventory (ANSI), Chen (2003) examined how PETE programs prepared TCs for acquiring the foundation of core teaching skills, knowledge, and dispositions addressed in the 1995 NASPE Beginning Teacher Standards. Through self-assessment, 173 TCs from 10 PETE programs completed the 45-item inventory. ANSI items corresponded to three sub-sets, which assessed distinct but interrelated theoretical constructs (disposition, knowledge, and performance) reflected in the NASPE Beginning Teacher Standards. Each item, which participants rated on a five-point rating scale ranging from 1 (not true at all) to 5 (absolutely true), was designed to collectively measure TCs’ perceptions of competency in achieving the National Standards for Beginning Physical Education Teachers (NASPE, 1995).

Overall competency, as perceived by TCs, was determined by total scores on 43 items of the ANSI, which were then quantified and classified into one of four levels (competent, acceptable, developing, unacceptable) based on quasi-distribution. Overall mean scores and percentage quantification from each group (PETE program) revealed seven groups reached the Competent Level, while the remaining three groups reached the Acceptable Level. These results would suggest TCs felt prepared to achieve the national standards, based on self-assessments (Chen, 2003).

While the researcher did not analyze data according to which NASPE (1995) standard or standards each item corresponded with, group differences on each of the three ANSI sub-scales were examined. The subscales not only exemplified critical areas
addressed in the standards, but also reflected the essential constructs of the standards. The first subscale, named “Dispositions of Pedagogy”, included items concentrated on assessing a TC’s values and beliefs in areas such as accommodations, assessment, planning, and reflection. On the continuum from unacceptable to competent, data analysis showed nine of the ten groups reached the Competent Level for this sub-scale, while the remaining group reached the Acceptable Level. Results suggested PETE programs can positively influence TCs’ beliefs about teaching (Chen, 2003).

The second sub-scale, “Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills”, was composed of items focused on measuring a TC’s pedagogical skills and knowledge in various areas, including growth and development, diversity, management and motivation, communication, technology, and collaboration. Based on percentage cutoffs for each level, four groups rated themselves at the Competent Level, while the other six groups reached the Acceptable level. From the results of the data, Chen (2003) concluded TCs possessed the essential skills needed to implement their knowledge of pedagogy into future career endeavors, noting the Competent Level rating by four of the ten groups may have been attributed to PETE programs’ focus on pedagogical preparation, specifically related to progressive field experiences (Chen, 2003).

The final sub-scale, named “Knowledge, Abilities, and Dispositions of Subject Matter”, consisted of items designed to “assess a TC’s understanding of subject matter, ability to use knowledge of the subject matter in teaching, and values and beliefs about the importance of subject matter knowledge and abilities when teaching” (Chen, 2003, p. 337). Data indicated six groups rated themselves at the Competent Level, while the remaining four groups reached the Acceptable Level. Results suggested over half of TCs
surveyed were enrolled in exemplary programs which provided comprehensive, progressive coursework concentrated on a combination of content and content specific pedagogy designed to equip TCs with sufficient knowledge of and perceived competence in the subject matter.

In all, TCs in two groups reached the Competent Level on all three sub-scales. In contrast, one group self-assessed their competence at the Acceptable Level across the all sub-scales, whereas the other seven groups reached the Competent Level on two of the three sub-scales. Interestingly, while six groups reached the Competent Level in their perceived overall achievement of the standards, only two groups rated themselves at the Competent Level in all three sub-scales, demonstrating inconsistency between overall achievement and perceived competence in each of the sub-scales. As with any self-assessment, prospective discrepancies between a candidate’s perceptions of achieving the standards and the actual observed and documented performance levels of a TC throughout their time in a PETE program may have occurred (Chen, 2003). Therefore, the researcher pointed out the necessity of combining the ANSI with observational instruments and artifacts such as work samples, portfolios and other evidence intended to document TCs’ proficiency and competence in achieving the Beginning Teacher Standards (NASPE, 1995).

Yi (2005) investigated program directors’ perceptions concerning the extent to which national standards influenced curriculum changes in PETE programs, and whether curriculum changes were related to the Beginning Teacher Standards (NASPE, 2003), individual or institutional variables. Surveys completed by 63 randomly selected program directors indicated an average of three course changes during the ten-year period
following the enactment of the standards. Findings suggested curriculum changes and school-university collaboration within PETE programs were influenced by Beginning Teacher Standards (NASPE, 2003), with a Pearson correlation indicating Standard Six (planning and instruction) was significantly correlated with course changes (P<0.05). The researcher concluded the influence of the Beginning Teacher Standards (NASPE, 2003) was related to individual and institutional factors, which were predictive of implementation of the standards. Moreover, specific standards related to technology, planning and instruction, and assessment were perceived by program directors as yielding a significant impact on changes in PETE coursework. Additionally, program directors identified faculty awareness and knowledge of national standards as important factors which influenced the implementation of standards (Yi, 2005).

Banville (2006) utilized the NASPE (1998) guidelines as a framework to analyze exchanges between cooperating teachers and TCs in elementary internship settings. Data collected from daily logs and transcriptions of recorded conversations between six pairs of cooperating teachers and TCs was categorized using the nine standards. Results revealed over two-thirds (68%) of all exchanges between cooperating teachers and TCs focused on management (Standard 4) and instructional planning (Standard 6), while diverse learners (Standard 3), content knowledge (Standard 1) and collaboration (Standard 9) comprised just 4.1% of these conversations. However, it was acknowledged findings only reflected interactions recorded during data collection, so the frequency in which topics were actually discussed throughout the entirety of placement could not be determined. However, the small amount of attention given to discussions related to diverse learners, content knowledge and collaboration led the researcher to question the
feasibility of PETE programs to effectively address every standard during a seven-week internship placement (Banville, 2006).

Following the second publication of the NASPE standards in 2003, Bolton (2008) conducted a study comparing the extent to which NCATE accredited PETE programs and non-accredited programs addressed the revised national standards (NASPE, 2003). Adhering to the Teacher Socialization Theory, the researcher utilized a descriptive case study approach to examine four PETE programs in the Midwest (two which sought NCATE accreditation, and two that chose not to participate in NCATE). Formal and informal interview data, along with materials such as departmental curricula, mission statements, student portfolios, course syllabi and class assignments were analyzed using both inductive and deductive analysis to determine the manner in which the NASPE (2003) standards were adhered to within each PETE program.

Consistent with findings presented by Ayers and Housner (2008), results indicated all four institutions encompassed comparable program components (Bolton, 2008). Data also showed program components appeared to encourage achievement across most, if not all, ten national standards to varying degrees. Of all the standards, the ways in which programs addressed diversity, assessment and technology showed the greatest variation. It was noted how programs solely seeking state approval were subjected to state standards, which appear similar to the national standards, while NCATE utilized the NASPE (2003) Initial PETE Standards for accreditation purposes.

The purpose of Bolton’s (2008) study was to examine the extent to which PETE programs addressed the standards, not necessarily to assess each program’s level of achievement across the national standards. Therefore, even though curricula appeared
similar in terms of the strategies and methods used to address the standards within each program, institutions receiving national recognition through NCATE provided compelling evidence of actual achievement across each standard, which is an included requirement in the accreditation review process. Compared to the state approval process, the required performance data and documentation detailing TC achievement across all standards suggested a higher degree of rigor and accountability for accredited programs.

Similar to Chen’s (2003) findings, TCs in Bolton’s (2008) study reported feelings of confidence in their ability to achieve each of the standards as a result of training received (Bolton, 2008). Students who were interviewed also indicated plans to utilize this preparation in future teaching practices. However, due to the small sample size (two students per university), and the awareness TCs’ had that the researcher contacted them through a professor’s referral, interviewed TCs may have answered questions and displayed beliefs that aligned with program objectives in an attempt to be perceived more favorably by faculty.

As other research focused on faculty and candidate perspectives of PETE program assessment using the national standards as a guideline, McCullick and colleagues (2008) explored public school students’ ability to provide valuable feedback on TCs’ competency of the NASPE (2003) standards. Analysis of data from group interviews with 2nd-12th grader revealed students were, in fact, able to offer meaningful and substantive insight into TC performance, with elementary students providing the richest data. Findings indicated students were able to provide informed feedback on TCs’ competence in seven of the ten standards (Content Knowledge, Diverse Learners, Communication, Management and Motivation, Planning and Instruction, Student Assessment and
Reflection). For the three remaining standards (Growth and Development, Technology, and Collaboration) students’ had difficulty assessing TC performance (McCullick et al., 2008).

McCullick and colleagues (2008) also found both elementary and secondary students were rarely able to gauge TCs’ dispositions, though researchers acknowledged interview questions were more focused on gleaning information on TCs’ knowledge and skills; not necessarily on what they believed or valued. In the end, researchers considered interviewing students regarding TC performance to be a worthwhile endeavor that could lead to program improvement. However, exploring student perspectives was believed to be most valuable when used to compliment a thorough program assessment, as the method of research did not offer a complete view of TCs’ competency across all ten standards (McCullick et al., 2008).

Attempting to expand on the seminal work of Metzler and Tjeerdsma (2000a), Connolly (2012) applied the most recent edition of the National Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2009) as a research-based framework to examine the process undergraduate PETE programs utilized to prepare TCs for successful careers in physical education. Data collection included interviews with six beginning physical education teachers, along with observations and artifact analysis. The qualitative study was guided by six research questions, which corresponded to the six standards. Findings revealed 2-4 themes per standard, for a total of 18 themes. Relative to each research question, the researcher offered the following recommendations for undergraduate PETE experiences: increase context-specific application examples in exercise physiology courses, develop deeper knowledge of health-related fitness concepts, enhance diversity education, include more
practicum teaching experiences, examine how assessment techniques and reflective practices are addressed within the curriculum, and explicitly address professional behaviors and dispositions throughout the program.

Nelson (2012) examined the perspectives of PETE program coordinators in Central District to determine the importance and effectiveness of programs in achieving the National Standards for Initial PETE (NASPE, 2009), and the barriers to achieving NASPE/NCATE accreditation. Fifteen (65.2%) of the 24 program coordinators who completed the survey indicated their PETE programs were accredited through NCATE. While not all participants’ programs were accredited, the majority of the program coordinators who responded (87.5%) perceived accreditation as important.

When asked to rate their perceptions of the importance of each NASPE standard using a five-point Likert scale (1=Very Unimportant; 5=Very Important), program coordinators identified Standard Four (Instructional delivery and management), Standard Six (Professionalism), and Standard Three (Planning and implementation) as most important to TC preparation (Nelson, 2012). Concerning respondents’ perceptions of the effectiveness of their program in meeting the National Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2009), every program coordinator who completed the survey identified each of their programs as effective in meeting all six of the NASPE standards.

Data from Nelson’s (2012) study revealed Standards Six (Professionalism), Three (Planning and implementation), and Four (Instructional delivery and management) as the standards most effectively met by participating PETE programs. Hence, the three standards which program coordinators identified as most important were also perceived to be the standards PETE programs were most effective in preparing TCs to achieve.
Finally, program coordinators perceived financial resources as the greatest barrier for PETE programs to meeting the National Standards for Initial PETE (NASPE, 2009). In terms of future research, authors suggested the use of qualitative studies to explore what specific artifacts are utilized by PETE programs to demonstrate achievement across each of the standards in order to satisfy NASPE/NCATE accreditation requirements (Nelson, 2012).

**Standard Six: Professionalism**

As the CAEP standards now mandate the assessment of professional dispositions in educator preparation programs, the 2008 edition of the National Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2009) also included a standard concentrated on the assessment of professionalism and dispositions in TCs. Standard six states TCs must “demonstrate dispositions essential to becoming effective professionals” (NASPE, 2009, p.8). With professionalism serving as the primary focus of the standard, programs seeking national accreditation must demonstrate achievement across each of the standard’s four elements, or subcomponents, which are as follows:

- Element 6.1: Demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the belief that all students can become physically educated individuals.

- Element 6.2: Participate in activities that enhance collaboration and lead to professional growth and development.

- Element 6.3: Demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the professional ethics of highly qualified teachers.

- Element 6.4: Communicate in ways that convey respect and sensitivity. (NASPE, 2008, p. 3)

Prior to the 2008 Initial PETE Standards, former editions articulated three interrelated components (knowledge, skills, and dispositions) encompassed within each
standard, as all three embody essential elements that contribute to effective teaching (Darling-Hammond & Ball, 2004; Shulman, 1987). Accordingly, distinct dispositions, which characterized the ideal “attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors” were delineated for each standard (NCATE, 2008, as found in NASPE, 2008, p.24). Therefore, in the 1995 and 2003 editions of the NASPE standards, the concept of dispositions and assessing professional dispositions was considered and evaluated across all aspects of each individual standard.

With the 2008 publication, the Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2008) included a standard solely devoted to professionalism and professional dispositions. Similar to the NCATE Standards, dispositions outlined in Standard Six of the Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2008) were defined in a vague manner that concurrently promotes their importance yet provided little guidance as to their implementation (Wasicsko, Callahan, & Wirtz, 2004). One advantage of such vagueness, as highlighted by Wasicsko and colleagues (2004), was that it allowed programs a significant amount of freedom in how they define, monitor, and assess TC dispositions in order to demonstrate achievement of the standards.

According to Stuhr and Ortiz-Stuhr (2015), “professionalism is a fluid construct requiring complex forms of intra- and inter-personal behaviors that are modified and transferred in a variety of situations” (p.1). While professionalism was not the primary focus of any given standard in previous versions of the National Beginning Teacher Standards (NASPE, 1995, 2003), parallels can be observed between Standards 3 (Diverse Learners) and 10 (Collaboration) of the 2nd edition (NASPE, 2003), and Standard 6 of the newest edition. As outlined in the 2008 edition, TCs must display several facets of
professional behavior, including, but not limited to: communicating with respect and sensitivity, advocating for the profession, engaging in the continuous cycle of reflection and revision related to teaching practices, adhering to public policies and guidelines, and participating in the wider professional community (Stuhr and Ortiz-Stuhr, 2015). In teacher education programs, oftentimes a compilation of self-evaluations, rubrics, checklists, observations, and a series of artifacts are utilized to assess TCs’ professional dispositions (Young & Youngs, 2005). Correspondingly, a more well-rounded view of TCs’ professionalism is represented when multiple assessors are considered in the evaluation process (Ignico & Gammon, 2010; Wayda & Lund, 2005).

**Research on Collaborative Practices of Teacher Candidates in Physical Education Teacher Education**

Standard Six of NASPE’s (2008) Initial PETE Standards addresses the topic of TCs’ professional dispositions. Specifically, Section 6.2 states how teacher candidates are expected to “participate in activities that enhance collaboration and lead to professional growth and development” (NASPE, 2008, p. 3). While a considerable amount of research has been published in recent years examining professional growth and development initiatives for practicing physical education teachers (Armour & Yelling, 2007), MacPhail, Patton, Parker, & Tannehill (2014) highlight how little investigation has been done concerning what constitutes operative PD opportunities for TCs within a PETE program. When considering teacher educators’ involvement in PD and dedication to promoting professional learning among TCs, MacPhail et al. (2014) states, “A physical education teacher educator’s investment in [professional learning] and PD, and the successful portrayal of that to [TCs] through innovative pedagogies, role modeling, and
mentoring, would improve [TCs] experiences in the PETE program” (p. 54). In the article, authors share ideas for how PETE faculty might promote involvement in a community of practice (CoP) as a beneficial facet in the landscape of PD in education (MacPhail et al., 2014).

Despite having a broader focus of inquiry, other research findings have inadvertently addressed the professional growth and development practices of TCs. In their descriptive analysis of undergraduate PETE programs in Central District, Hetland & Strand (2010) found 27.3% (n= 12) of programs surveyed required TCs to join a professional organization. Findings from this study also indicated within the two years prior to completing the survey, 79.5% (n=35) of PETE programs gave TCs the opportunity to attend a conference or convention. While the Beginning Teacher Standards (NASPE, 2003) was one of many documents reviewed during the development phase of the survey, researchers did not utilize the standards as a point of reference during data analysis. Had the most recent edition of the standards already been published, it would appear findings concerning TCs’ involvement in professional organizations relate specifically to Standard 6.2 of the NASPE (2008) Standards.

Therefore, Hetland and Strand (2010) reported nearly 80% of PETE programs included in the survey indicated TC achievement in this particular element of the 2008 NASPE standards. It should be noted, however, 89% (n=39) of PETE programs included in the survey held NCATE accreditation. This would suggest, when the newest edition of the NASPE (2008) Initial PETE Standards was released, at least four of the accredited programs included in this study sought to develop ways to assess TC collaboration and
participation in activities, or risked losing their accreditation status due to insufficient evidence of achievement in this particular element.

**Research on Dispositions in Physical Education Teacher Education**

Utilizing disposition statements found in the 1995 NASPE Beginning Teacher Standards, Tjeerdsma, Metzler, Walker, and Mozen (2000) attempted to measure TCs’ attitudes and beliefs delineated within the standards. Data from several sources were collected and multiple evaluation instruments were employed to evaluate the undergraduate experiences of 23 TCs from Georgia State University throughout their time in the PETE program. Researchers collected assessment information about TC dispositions across all standards (NASPE, 1995), minus standard seven (learner assessment). However, only one piece of somewhat weak evidence was collected for three of the standards.

Data revealed TCs appeared to believe in the importance of physical education, yet did not seem to believe physical activity could encourage self-expression (Tjeerdsma et al., 2000). In regard to value orientations, there appeared to be very little variation in TCs’ values about curriculum goals in physical education throughout their time in the program. The finding is congruent with other research which has suggested TCs’ beliefs are resistant to change (Bryan, 2003; Doolittle, Dodds, & Placek, 1993; Kagan, 1992; Leavy, McSorley, & Boté, 2007; Raths, 2001; Richardson, 2003). Concerning personal qualities and characteristics, TCs’ seemed to think attributes, such as patience and creativity, were part of good teaching. Results suggested TCs’ believed their personal characteristics became stronger as they progressed throughout their student teaching experience. Similarly, cooperating teachers reported at least 90% of TCs as “More than
Satisfactory” on final evaluations related to collaboration dispositions. Overall, TCs seemed to be positive in their dispositions related to the Beginning Teacher Standards (NASPE, 1995).

Chen (2003) created the instrument, ANSI, to explore how PETE programs prepared TCs to achieve the Beginning Teacher Standards (NASPE, 1995), including aspects related to dispositions. Teacher candidates in nine of the ten PETE programs surveyed perceived themselves to be well prepared with positive dispositions of pedagogy, a finding which supports previous research suggesting dispositions of pedagogy can be molded and enhanced by educator preparation programs (Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002). Six of the ten groups rated themselves as “Competent” on the Knowledge, Ability, and Dispositions of Subject Matter subscale. Participants from these six programs identified physical education as playing an important role in individuals’ overall health and well-being. Likewise, TCs from these groups also reported efforts to stay current with, and expand their physical education content knowledge (Chen, 2003).

Lund and colleagues (2007) used survey questionnaires to identify dispositions PETE faculty deemed important for TCs to be successful in the teaching field. In addition, the researchers sought to determine the frequency to which dispositions were being addressed, and also evaluated within PETE curriculum. The 25-item survey, based off reviews of employability research, PETE disposition rubrics and recommendations from multiple school districts, was completed by 47 PETE faculty. One hundred percent of survey completers identified 10 of the 25 dispositions listed on the questionnaire as essential skills for beginning professionals. These dispositions included aspects of
dependability, cooperation, communication, problem solving, enthusiasm, trustworthiness, preparedness, sensitivity to differences, ability to work without supervision, and taking initiative.

Researchers determined PETE programs were addressing many of the dispositions listed on the survey, according to participants (Lund et al., 2007). However, “regular attendance at class meetings” was the only disposition addressed by all programs. Ten other dispositions (working without supervision, enthusiasm, taking initiative, communication, sensitivity to differences, cooperation, trustworthiness, preparedness, problem solving, and dependability) were identified as being taught by the majority of participants. Essentially, most of the dispositions listed on the survey were not being assessed by PETE programs, which demonstrated a discrepancy between participants’ identification of the items’ importance and whether they were actually assessed within the curriculum. Researchers concluded the assessment of dispositions appeared to be a challenge for PETE programs, as 90% of the survey completers identified only 5 of the 25 dispositions (preparedness, following directions, regular attendance, participation in PD, active participation) as items for which TCs were held accountable (Lund et al., 2007).

Unsurprising, the dispositions which were reported to be assessed most often within programs seem to be both outwardly apparent and fairly easy to define. Other items (e.g. trustworthiness, being a role model, dedication, etc.), which prove to be more difficult to observe and define, were assessed 50% of the time or less, even though they were identified as important by 90% of survey completers. Because the assessment of TCs’ dispositions stands as both a necessity and an obligation (and now a requirement for
accreditation), programs must find meaningful and effective ways to evaluate these items within PETE curriculum. Researchers suggested the use of case study teaching, program matrices, and assessment rubrics to evaluate TCs’ dispositions throughout their time in the program (Lund et al., 2007).

McCullick and colleagues (2008) found that while K-12 students were quite capable of providing valuable insight into TCs’ skills and knowledge, they were rarely able to gauge TCs’ dispositions. Therefore, the methodology utilized in the study did not provide a comprehensive technique for assessing PETE programs’ ability to promote TCs’ achievement across all of the Beginning Teacher Standards (NASPE, 2003). The researcher did, however, call attention to how little consideration was given to exploring TCs’ beliefs and values during the development of the investigation protocol. Thus, it was suggested student feedback may actually be a useful data source to triangulate with other methods of garnering information for the purpose of assessing TCs’ dispositions (McCullick et al., 2008).

Connolly (2012) utilized the most recent version of the National Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2008) to explore the perceptions of beginning physical educators concerning the impact of their undergraduate PETE experience on current teaching practice. The research question corresponding to Standard Six stated, “What professional behaviors and dispositions acquired in their undergraduate program do beginning teachers apply in their practice as public school physical educators?” (Connolly, 2012, p. 12). Participants described the various aspects of professionalism and professional expectations related to teaching physical education which were addressed in their PETE program, including attire, fitness, knowledge and punctuality. The researcher found
beginning teachers in the study not only learned about various aspects of professional dispositions during their experiences in a PETE program, but also had many opportunities to utilize and apply what they had learned in real-world settings as practicing physical educators.

While Connolly (2012) utilized the Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2008) as a research framework, it does not appear the researcher considered the extent to which participants’ responses reflected actual achievement of individual elements, as outlined in the standards. For example, participants defined and described professionalism (Standard Six), in part, as maintaining a high level of physical fitness. According to the standards, it appears these particular responses more appropriately align with Standard 2 which addresses skill- and fitness-based competence. Specifically, participant responses about maintaining a high level of fitness correspond with element 2 of Standard 2, which states, “TCs will achieve and maintain a health-enhancing level of fitness throughout the program” (NASPE, 2008, p. 1).

Similarly, none of the participants’ responses appear to address Standard 6.1, which describes how TCs must “demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the belief that all students can become physically educated individuals” (NASPE, 2008, p.3). It seems the researcher only considered the general description given for each standard when attempting to assess the transference of knowledge, skills, and dispositions as embodied by the Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2009) to the practice of teaching physical education in a public school setting (Connolly, 2012). Thus, while the beginning teachers who participated in the study recalled how professionalism was addressed within their PETE program and the ways in which they felt they were adhering to those concepts
as in-service physical educators, their stated definitions did not fully reflect how professional dispositions were delineated within the four elements that make up Standard Six.

In a survey of 24 program coordinators, Nelson (2012) found Standard Six (NASPE, 2009) was listed as one the standards most effectively met by undergraduate PETE programs, and was also perceived to be one of the most important among the six national standards. In the study, 65% of the participating programs were identified as being nationally accredited through NCATE. Nelson’s (2012) study provided valuable insight into program coordinators’ perspectives concerning the importance of each standard and their perceived effectiveness in meeting the standards. However, similar to concerns highlighted with Chen’s (2003) research findings, when examining individuals’ perspectives, perception does not automatically correlate to reality. Thus, discrepancies between PETE coordinators’ perceptions of their programs’ effectiveness in achieving the standards and actual documented evidence of program effectiveness may have occurred (Nelson, 2012).

**Development and implementation of Dispositions Rubrics**

Educator preparation programs are recurrently faced with developing assessment instruments that sufficiently address the context of professional dispositions within their program. As assessment tools are developed and implemented, institutions must determine the reliability and validity of the instruments they choose to employ (Brindle, 2012). Wayda and Lund (2005) reported on the process they undertook in creating, validating, and implementing a rubric intended for faculty use in the assessment of TCs dispositions as they progressed throughout a PETE program. From an initial compilation
of 30 attributes made by ten PETE faculty members, a list of 10 descriptors was created: attendance, in-class performance, class preparation, relationship with others, group work, professional development, respect for school policies, emotional control, role model, and communication. The descriptors ultimately agreed upon appeared to align with characteristics and qualities identified as desirable in prospective teachers, as delineated in employability literature. Using these descriptors, a qualitative rubric was then created, which included four distinct performance levels: unsatisfactory, basic, proficient and distinguished.

Throughout the review process, Wayda and Lund (2005) piloted the rubrics in several classes by having instructors complete the assessment and TCs complete the abbreviated self-assessment. Similarities between performance level descriptions were addressed and revised. Concerning issues of validity and reliability, content experts reviewed the rubric several times, and inter-rater reliability scores ranged from .7 to .8, which were deemed acceptable for this type of assessment. Researchers discussed potential barriers and issues PETE faculty may encounter during implementation of the assessment tool, along with possible resolutions. Interestingly, even though the National Beginning Teacher Standards (NASPE, 2003) at this time did not yet have a standard devoted solely to the assessment of professional dispositions, it appears this instrument created by Wayda and Lund (2005) may be used to sufficiently evaluate TC achievement across all four elements of Standard Six of the National Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2008). However, the language and wording of the rubric addresses dispositions of TCs in their role as students, not dispositions associated with teachers. Since its creation, two
other longitudinal studies have utilized the rubric to assess the impact of PETE programs on TCs disposition development.

First, Ignico and Gammon (2010) utilized the assessment tool created by Wayda and Lund (2005) in a study which examined changes in the professional dispositions of TCs in PETE programs over time, along with differences between TC and professor ratings. In the PETE program, all participants were enrolled in, the evaluation tool was completed seven times (in seven PETE classes) over the course of the four-year program. Researchers examined data collected in three sequential methods courses over a two-year period, as 65 TCs completed a self-assessment and the professor completed the dispositions rubric for each TC during the final week of the semester.

Disposition data was analyzed using a 2x3 ANOVA. Results revealed significant differences in TC and professor ratings on the rubrics completed during the first two courses, but alignment between the rubrics completed during the third course (Ignico & Gammon, 2010). Researchers determined TCs’ inflation of self-assessment scores during the first two courses might be what led to the differences between TC and professor ratings in the first two courses. Interestingly, findings also demonstrated a decrease in disposition self-ratings and professor-ratings over time, which was attributed to increased expectations and self-awareness, as opposed to a decline in professional behavior.

Researchers considered the assessment instrument created by Wayda and Lund (2005) to be a valid and reliable method to assess the professional dispositions of PETE TCs (Ignico & Gammon, 2010).

Four years later, Lee, Hagood, Kingsley, and Hare (2014) conducted a similar study, exploring changes in TCs’ dispositions during the course of a PETE program, and
correlations between TC and professor ratings on the assessment tool. In this study, researchers examined data collected from 48 TCs during three courses which marked the entry, midpoint and culminating student teaching experiences in their 5-year undergraduate curricula. Similar to Ignico and Gammon (2010), researchers found higher correlations between TC and professor ratings during the last course compared with ratings from the first two courses. However, contrary to the findings of Ignico and Gammon (2010), data analysis from this study revealed TCs’ and professors’ ratings significantly improved over the course of the program. Researchers concluded similarities between TC and professor ratings resulted from TC maturity and assimilation throughout the program.

**Conclusion**

Since the debut of the National Beginning Teacher Standards in 1995, only a small amount research has been devoted to investigating the ways in which PETE programs address the standards. More so in recent years, educator preparation programs seeking to receive or maintain national accreditation have faced increased pressure from accrediting agencies to provide compelling evidence of TC achievement across the standards. Nonetheless, the assessment practices of PETE programs in relation to the standards, including Standard Six, remain relatively underexplored. Likewise, very few studies have focused on the most recent version of the NASPE (2008) standards.

Researchers have specifically addressed various methods of PETE program assessment (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000a, 2000b) and descriptive analyses of PETE programs (Chen, 2003; Hetland & Strand, 2010). Regarding research related to the Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 1995, 2003, 2008), studies have focused on perceptions of
TCs (Bolton, 2008; Tjeerdsma et al., 2000), PETE faculty (Bolton, 2008), cooperating teachers (Banville, 2006), program coordinators (Bolton, 2008; Nelson, 2012, Yi, 2006), K-12 students (McCullick et al., 2008), and PETE program graduates (Connolly, 2012) using both quantitative and qualitative research methods. While investigation into perceptions of the various stakeholders is interesting and valuable, few studies have attempted to describe what programs are actually doing, in terms of teaching to, and assessing the standards. Additionally, while previous research has investigated how PETE programs address the Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2008) as a whole, no research to date has explored how programs address Standard Six specifically, or how they assess the professionalism of TCs. In addition, most studies have focused on previous editions of the NASPE (1995, 2003) standards, which did not include a standard dedicated specifically to professionalism.

As accredited PETE programs throughout the nation are exploring ways to accurately and meaningfully assess TCs’ dispositions, research has focused primarily on the development and implementation of assessment tools (Ignico & Gammon, 2010; Lee et al., 2014; Lund et al., 2007; Wayda & Lund, 2005). Throughout the literature, several common characteristics can be observed regarding the development and implementation of dispositional assessment tools. Such characteristics include progressive monitoring of professionalism (Ignico & Gammon, 2010; Lee et al., 2014; Wayda & Lund, 2005), monitoring/assessment of TCs’ professionalism by different individuals (Ignico & Gammon, 2010; Lee et al., 2014; Wayda & Lund, 2005), utilization of a system of accountability (Lund et al., 2007), opportunities for TC self-evaluations of dispositions (Ignico & Gammon, 2010; Lee et al., 2014; Wayda & Lund, 2005), implementation of
intervention processes (Rike & Sharp, 2008), and the utilization of rubrics (Ignico & Gammon, 2010; Lee et al., 2014; Wayda & Lund, 2005).

This overview of relevant literature regarding comprehensive program evaluation has illustrated various perceptions concerning the impact, value, and importance of standards within PETE programs. This review also highlights what little research has been done concerning how TCs engage in collaborative activities that promote growth and development, and the ways in which programs define, identify, monitor and assess professional dispositions expected of prospective physical educators.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Problem, Purpose, and Research Questions

Over the last 30 years, there have been substantial developments in the standards used to assess TCs in teacher education programs. As CAEP now mandates educator preparation programs to assess professional dispositions in TCs, the 2008 edition of the Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2009) also includes a standard focused on the assessment of professionalism and dispositions in TCs. Not only did the inclusion of this standard encourage the development of new assessment tools within PETE programs, but it also signified a shift toward more accountability in the ways teacher educators address and evaluate the professional dispositions and PD practices of candidates.

Currently, there is an absence of a universally accepted blueprint or framework to define and measure professionalism in PETE programs, which leaves individual teacher education programs somewhat on their own to wrestle with how to define, identify, monitor, and assess the professional growth and dispositions of TCs. Therefore, the purpose of this multi-case study was to describe how Standard Six of the NASPE Initial PETE Standards was addressed and assessed in selected CAEP accredited PETE programs. The intent of the study was to gain a clearer understanding of how faculty from selected accredited PETE programs identify, interpret, and evaluate professionalism as
delineated in the four elements of the Initial PETE Standards (2008). In order to do so, the following research questions guided this study:

Q1 In what ways do the selected PETE programs prepare TCs to meet each individual element of NASPE Initial PETE Standard Six?

Q2 In what ways do the selected PETE programs assess TCs across each individual element of Standard Six (e.g., when, who, how, and what aspects of professionalism are assessed)?

Because of the vital role teacher education plays in the socialization process of TCs, it is important to understand the ways in which PETE programs are developing and promoting the beliefs and values necessary to succeed in the profession of teaching K-12 physical education (Stroot & Ko, 2006). Thus, the research questions focused on the exploration of various aspects of the ways in which Standard Six is addressed and assessed within PETE programs, using the conceptual framework of occupational socialization (Lawson, 1983). Based on these stated purposes, a qualitative approach was deemed most appropriate, as it offered the greatest potential for answering the research questions. In addition, a qualitative research approach contributes a rich and detailed depiction of the ways in which accredited PETE programs embody elements of professionalism, and provide evidence of alignment with NASPE (2009) Standard Six, as experienced by PETE faculty.

Research Design

According to Corbin and Strauss (2014), qualitative methods can be used to explore areas not yet thoroughly researched, or to gain new insight on phenomenon about which much is already known. Thus, the utilization of qualitative methods was deemed appropriate, as few studies have focused on the ways in which PETE programs assess
dispositions and professional growth in TCs. Merriam (2009), highlighted four main characteristics of qualitative research:

1. The focus is on process, understanding, and meaning
2. The researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis
3. The process is inductive
4. The product is richly descriptive (p. 14)

Individuals who engage in social research bring to the investigation their own worldviews, paradigms, and sets of beliefs which serve to inform the problem to study, the research questions, the data collection and analysis, and the interpretation (Creswell, 2013). Crotty (1998) outlined four basic elements of any research process which help to warrant the soundness of the research and make determined conclusions plausible. These elements, which inform one another, include: epistemology, theoretical perspective, methodology, and methods.

**Epistemology**

According to Hamlyn (1995), “epistemology deals with the nature of knowledge, its possibility, scope and general basis” (p. 242). Constructivism served as the epistemology for this study. Creswell (2013) explained:

> In this worldview, individuals seek understanding of the world in which they live and work. They develop subjective meanings of their experiences.... These meanings are varied and multiple, leading the researcher to look for the complexity of views… Often these subjective meanings are negotiated socially and historically. (pp. 24-25)

Thus, individuals who utilize constructivism believe that knowledge is not something to be “found”, but is socially constructed, with meaning being based on prior knowledge and experiences (Merriam, 2009). Constructivism was deemed most appropriate for this
study, as the process of teaching and assessing professionalism as it is delineated in the standards needs to be examined, as well as how that process has developed and is experienced by the PETE faculty.

The current protocol used to document and assess the professionalism of TCs may differ between faculty members within and across PETE programs. According to Hatch (2002), while members of a group may share comparable experiences and insights, each individual holds a unique perspective which is molded by personal experiences. Therefore, each faculty member constructs his or her own meaning and understanding of the phenomenon within his or her own program, making these experiences distinct and subsequently unique. As such, the current study looked to describe potential phenomenon that exist within and across selected PETE programs regarding the ways in which faculty promote and assess TC achievement of the four elements outlined in NASPE (2008) Initial PETE Standard Six.

**Theoretical Perspective**

Crotty (1998) described a theoretical perspective as a way of viewing at the world and coming to understand it. Under the guidance of constructivism, the theoretical perspective for this study was interpretivism. Researchers who adhere to this perspective attempt to understand and explain human and social reality through the lived-experiences of individuals (Crotty, 1998). Further, Creswell (2013) posited, “interpretive methodology is directed at understanding phenomenon from an individual’s perspective, investigating interaction among individuals as well as the historical and cultural contexts which people inhabit” (p. 8). In keeping alignment with this perspective, instead of beginning with a theory, the researcher sought to identify accordant concepts throughout
the research process that may lead to the development of a theory (Creswell, 2013). Thus, interpretivism framed this study as the researcher sought to describe patterns that emerged from the data concerning the ways in which dispositions and professional growth and development are taught and assessed in PETE programs, as experienced by faculty members.

**Methodology**

Among the various types of qualitative methodologies available, a descriptive, multi-case study was chosen for this study. Case study research has been described as an approach “in which the researcher explores a real-life, contemporary bounded system or multiple bounded systems over time, through investigator detailed, in-depth data collection involving *multiple sources of information*, and reports a *case description* and *case themes*” (Creswell, 2013, p. 97, emphasis in original). According to Merriam (1998), case study methodology is a particularly appropriate design when a researcher is interested in process. Sanders (1981) explained, “case studies help us to understand processes of events, projects, and programs and to discover context characteristics that will shed light on an issue or object” (p. 44). Equally, Yin (2009) considered case study advantageous when answering research questions that pertain to the “how” or “why” of the phenomenon of interest.

A descriptive case study design is employed when the researcher seeks to develop a document that fully illustrates the complexities of a situation (Stake, 2006) and the real-life context in which it occurred (Baxter & Jack, 2008), whose end product is characterized by a rich, thick description of the phenomenon under study (Merriam, 2009). Lijphart (1971) labeled descriptive case studies “atheoretical”. He explained how
these types of studies are “entirely descriptive and move in a theoretical vacuum: they are neither guided by established or hypothesized generalizations nor motivated by a desire to formulate general hypotheses” (Lijphart, 1971, p. 691). Descriptive studies are valuable, however, in offering rudimentary information about underexplored areas of education, with a common focus of such studies concentrated around innovative educational programs and practices (Merriam, 1998). While purely descriptive studies lack direct theoretical benefit, they do offer great utility toward the development of databases, which can then be utilized for future comparison and theory building (Lijphart, 1971). Merriam (1998) asserted, “Whatever the area of inquiry, basic description of the subject being studied comes before hypothesizing or theory testing” (p. 38).

Multi-case study, also known as collective case study, is used when the researcher focuses on a single issue, but selects multiple bounded systems to exemplify that issue (Creswell, 2013), with the intention of exploring similarities within and between bounded systems (Baxter & Jack, 2008). As Stake (2006) expounded,

In multi-case study research, the single case is of interest because it belongs to a particular collection of cases. The individual cases share a common characteristic or condition. The cases in the collection are somehow categorically bound together. They may be members of a group or examples of a phenomenon. (p. 5-6)

While multi-case studies can be time consuming and difficult to manage, the evidence is considered more compelling, and therefore regarded as more robust than a single case study (Merriam, 2009). Since the intent of this study was to describe the ways in which selected PETE programs address and assess Standard Six within their programs, applying a descriptive, multi-case design was deemed most appropriate and therefore utilized.
Methods

Case Identification, Selection, and Recruitment

Overview. The first objective of a case study is to identify the unit or units of analysis to be explored (Stake, 2006). Based on the research questions (Yin, 2009), the units of analysis, or “cases” for this study are the processes selected CAEP accredited PETE programs utilize to address and assess dispositions in TCs, as outlined in Standard Six of the NASPE (2008) Initial PETE Standards. When defining the cases, consideration must also be given to how the research plans to “bind” the case. Merriam (2009) believed the hallmark of case study research lies in the delineation of boundaries around the unit or units of analysis to be studied. For this study, the cases were bound by time and activity (Stake, 2006). The cases were bound by the time period since the 2008 Initial PETE standards were introduced and by the teaching and assessment practices utilized during the most recent NCATE/CAEP accreditation review period, as this review occurs every seven years, it was the time period since the 2008 Initial PETE standards were introduced.

When considering sample size for a multi-case study, Creswell (2013) recommended including enough cases to provide sufficient opportunity to detect prominent themes of the cases as well as conduct cross-case theme analysis. Yin (1996) asserted, since the multi–case study approach does not rely on the type of representative sampling logic used in survey research, “the typical criteria regarding sample size are irrelevant” (p. 50). The cases selected for a multi-case study should be selected intentionally to encompass occurrences in which the phenomena under investigation are likely to be found (Merriam, 2009). To get the most depth possible from each case,
Creswell (2013) recommended no more than four or five cases for inclusion in a multiple case study. Therefore, in consideration of Creswell’s (2013) recommendations, and the manageability of utilizing a multi-case study method for dissertation research, this study sought to describe the dispositional teaching and assessment processes utilized by three selected PETE programs.

Based on the review of literature, it was determined a multi-level sampling and data collection approach (for case identification, selection and recruitment) was necessary to identify eligible cases and recruit potential participants. The following sections detail the selection criterion, method, and rationale for case identification, selection, and recruitment. IRB approval was secured before data collection was conducted (Appendix E).

**Case identification: Level one.** Using an initial set of criteria to identify eligible programs, PETE programs were purposely sampled by sending out a preliminary questionnaire. Purposeful sampling techniques were appropriate for this study because the aim was to “intentionally select individuals and sites to learn or understand the central phenomenon” (Creswell, 2013, p. 156). By selecting information-rich cases, there is the potential to acquire a great deal of data regarding the ways in which PETE programs promote and document evidence of achievement for NASPE (2008) Standard Six (Patton, 1990). Criterion sampling included all cases that exhibited certain pre-determined criterion characteristics (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The primary site/participant criteria for selection of PETE programs to receive the initial questionnaire were as follows:

- Nationally recognized SPA through CAEP
- Initial teacher preparation program leading to licensure in physical education
- In the United States

- PETE coordinator/Knowledgeable Teacher Educator in PETE

Only programs who had attained accreditation as a SPA through CAEP were eligible for this study, as such programs have been required to demonstrate compelling evidence regarding how TCs have successfully met each element included in the Initial PETE standards. Teacher educators, as identified by CAEP, are individuals employed by an institution and teach at least one course in education, provide services to TCs, supervise field experiences, or deliver some part of the teacher education program (NCATE, 2008). Therefore, those teacher educators who held the position of PETE coordinator and/or other knowledgeable PETE faculty members were selected because they were likely to have the most insight in the topics of interest. All programs considered “initial teacher preparation programs” that led to licensure in physical education were considered because they usually concluded with a student teaching practicum. The student teaching experience was of interest in this study, as previous research focused on the assessment of dispositions during this culminating experience (Banville, 2006; McCullick et al., 2008). Initial teacher preparation programs eligible to receive nationally accredited status through CAEP are offered at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, thus both baccalaureate and master’s level programs were considered for participation in this study. Additionally, since CAEP accredits both public and private institutions, all programs receiving nationally accredited status through CAEP were eligible for this study. Lastly, only programs in the United States were considered for this study, as the research questions revolved around achievement of one of the national standards, which are guidelines applicable to programs in the United States. Based on the
criterion, 156 PETE programs in the United States were eligible for inclusion in the initial participant gathering phase of the study. The number of eligible programs was determined by cross-referencing the most updated list of nationally accredited PETE programs listed on the CAEP website.

**Case identification: Level two.** For the participant gathering pool, email addresses of PETE program coordinators were obtained through institution/program websites (predetermined by CAEP Accreditation list). Acting as a participant gathering technique, the initial questionnaire allowed the researcher to: (a) collect basic information about the program, including the ways in which they taught and assessed Standard Six; (b) determine the willingness of potential participants to continue their involvement in the study via a phone interview and document collection; and (c) determine if the potential participants could identify one other knowledgeable faculty member to participate in a phone interview. Thus, snowball sampling (Creswell, 2013) was employed as PETE program coordinators from each of the selected programs were asked to identify one faculty member who would also be willing to participate in an in-depth interview related to the phenomenon of interest. Snowball sampling occurs when participants who meet the criteria for the study are located and then used to refer researchers on to other individuals who could potentially participate in or contribute to the study (Merriam, 2009). Snowball sampling is especially advantageous when the goal of a study is primarily qualitative, exploratory, and descriptive (Hendricks, Blanken & Adriaans, 1992).

The questionnaire was distributed electronically via email to 135 PETE program coordinators. Online data collection techniques for the case identification phase of the study was advantageous, as efficiency of resources was improved due to the reduction in
time and cost of mail correspondence and researcher travel (Creswell, 2013). Similarly, online data collection allowed participants flexibility in completing the questionnaire. This questionnaire was sent to all identified PETE program coordinators with a four-week response deadline. Each individually addressed email (Appendix F) contained a link to an initial electronic informed consent (Appendix G) and the questionnaire (Appendix H) created using the Qualtrics survey tool through the University of Northern Colorado. The informed consent was provided for the participants to read electronically and sign prior to beginning the questionnaire. If an individual chose to consent, they clicked the “I accept” button to proceed to the questionnaire. If an individual did not consent, they were taken to the end of the questionnaire and asked to close their browser.

After the questionnaire had been active for 14 days, a reminder email was sent. If recipients failed to respond after 21 days, a final follow-up email was sent. After the questionnaire had been active for 28 days and had been distributed to PETE coordinators three times, response data were exported from the Qualtrics website and compiled on an Excel spreadsheet. Data collected in this preliminary phase aimed to determine: CAEP accredited PETE programs’ processes for assessing TCs’ professional growth and disposition, method(s) and procedures for evaluating dispositions, type(s) of intervention utilized, willingness to participate in future phone interviews, and ability to identify one other knowledgeable faculty member who would participate in an interview. Data were then organized in a matrix and analyzed to identify similarities and differences in dispositional instruction and assessment procedures. For each questionnaire item, descriptive statistics such percentages, and frequencies were calculated.
**Initial questionnaire results.** The findings from the initial questionnaire descriptive in nature. Results are reported to give context as to how selected cases were ultimately chosen for the study. Initial questionnaire results are presented in Table Six.

**Case selection.** There were 31 individuals who completed some portion of the initial questionnaire. In order to be considered for the study, respondents first needed meet the following qualifiers: respondents indicated their willingness to participate in a phone interview, and also their ability to identify one other knowledgeable faculty member who would also be willing to participate in an interview. Respondents who did not complete the questionnaire were not considered as potential participants to continue further with the study. Of the 16 individuals who completed the entire questionnaire, five of those respondents met the two identified qualifiers.

Data from the questionnaire for those five potential programs were filtered and transferred to a separate Excel sheet, creating a new pool for the case selection and recruitment phase of the research. A matrix depicting data collected in the questionnaire was then compiled for sorting purposes. While the proposed method of selecting participants included analyzing data from a list of designators, the low inclusion rate limited the variability exhibited between potential participants. With consideration of the participant responses, two groups of two programs exhibited similar demographic characteristics. Thus, to maximize variability, one program was randomly selected from each of the two groups. The two selected programs, along with the one other program that was unique in comparison to the others, were identified for recruitment in this study (Table 1). Each case was represented by two individuals, the PETE program coordinator
who completed the initial questionnaire and the other PETE faculty member they
identified.

Table 1
*Case Profile Summaries*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profiles</th>
<th>Rocky Creek College</th>
<th>Shady Valley University</th>
<th>Ridgeview Heights University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Northeastern US</td>
<td>Midwestern US</td>
<td>Southeastern US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Enrollment</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Enrollment</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Study</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree(s) Awarded</td>
<td>M.A.T.</td>
<td>B.S. (PE &amp; HPE)</td>
<td>M. Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidates</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>25 PE, 25 HPE, 5 M. Ed.</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrolled in PETE Program(s)</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Assessment in PE course- 100 hours of observation</td>
<td>Content/Methods courses coupled together</td>
<td>Cohort Model, 1yr Student Teaching Practicum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: M.A.T. = Master of Art in Teaching; PE = Physical Education; HPE = Health & Physical Education; M. Ed. = Master of Education.*

The selected PETE programs were located in different parts of the United States, had diverse programmatic characteristics, differed in terms of enrollment size and number of faculty, and were organized in different ways within their respective
institutions. In addition, the types of licensure programs offered and types of degrees awarded through each initial teacher preparation program differed across institutions. While the programs differed in term of demographics and geographic location, all three programs achieved national recognition as a CAEP-accredited program, which establishes they each demonstrated achievement across all six elements of the NASPE Initial PETE Standards (2008). Ultimately, differences among the cases did not impact the purpose of the study: to describe the ways in which CAEP accredited programs taught and assessed professionalism in TCs, as outlined by Standard Six of the Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2008).

**Case recruitment.** An analysis of responses collected from the initial case identification questionnaire was used to determine the characteristics identified and utilized for case recruitment. Final determination was made after data from the questionnaire was collected and examined, and discussed with expert and peer reviewers/debriefers. Selecting three programs (2 participants per program) allowed for the exploration of ways in which TCs learn about professionalism and are held accountable for demonstrating achievement across all four elements of Standard Six in selected CAEP accredited PETE programs. The goal was to gain perspective of the ways in which CAEP accredited PETE programs teach and assess professionalism in TCs, as outlined in the Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2009).

Participants from the three selected cases were then contacted via email (Appendix I) to determine an interview date at time. In this email, participants were also asked to provide the name and contact information of the other knowledgeable faculty member who would be willing to participate in a phone interview. The identified
individuals were typically other faculty members who played an integral role in the development and/or implementation of dispositional assessments within program. Once a faculty member had been identified, contact was initiated with him or her to extend an invitation to participate in this study. Participants from all three selected programs responded to the email with a signed copy of the consent form, and interview dates and times were scheduled. The same process was followed to schedule interview dates and times for the additional participant from each case as well. Thus, two PETE faculty members from three separate cases (six participants total) participated in the study.

Five to seven days prior to each scheduled interview, a follow-up email was sent to each participant to achieve the following: (a) confirm the interview date and time; (b) provide the phone interview informed consent (Appendix J) in advance; and (d) offer to email the semi-structured interview guide (Appendix K) in advance. The purpose of sending the informed consent was to provide participants with a brief rationale and purpose of the study, while the interview guide was offered to each participant prior to their interview to provide them with ample time to reflect on their knowledge and experiences related to how professionalism was addressed and assessed within their program.

The semi-structured, in-depth phone interviews focused on the central topics of:

- Process for addressing each element of Standard Six
- Method(s) used to monitor and assess TC dispositions
- When TC dispositions are assessed
- Who monitors and assesses TC dispositions
- Method(s) used to monitor and assess TC professional growth and development
- How expectations are communicated with TCs
- Ways in which TCs are held accountable for professionalism
- Type(s) of intervention utilized

There was an option for supplementary follow-up interviews for subsequent questions that arose or if the participant had additional information to share. All interviews, which lasted between 75-135 minutes, were recorded and later transcribed. In order to promote and maintain confidentiality, each of the programs and participants included in the study were assigned pseudonyms.

Data Collection Instruments

Case identification questionnaire. The instrument utilized (Appendix G) to identify a pool of potential cases in this study was an adaptation of questionnaires originally created by Ellis (2007) and Zost et al. (2014). Ellis (2007) conducted a study investigating the identification, assessment, and use of teacher dispositions in NCATE accredited teacher education programs in the United States. Zost and colleagues (2014) examined the processes employed by NCATE accredited teacher education programs in the United States when evaluating the dispositions of TCs. Adaptations included the elimination of questions not pertinent to the stated research questions, as well as the addition of questions specifically related to the ways programs address and assess the four elements included in Initial PETE Standard Six (NASPE, 2008). All items ultimately chosen for the questionnaire reflected operative characteristics related to the instructional
and assessment practices of professionalism within PETE programs, as consistently identified in the literature:

- Progressive monitoring of professionalism: dispositions and professional growth and development practices assessed and documented at various points throughout the program (Ignico & Gammon, 2010; Lee et al., 2014; Wayda & Lund, 2005)

- System of accountability utilized (Lund et al., 2007)

- Implementation of intervention processes (Rike & Sharp, 2008)

- Monitoring/assessment of TCs’ professionalism by different individuals (Ignico & Gammon, 2010; Lee et al., 2014; Wayda & Lund, 2005)

- Opportunities for TC self-evaluations of dispositions (Ignico & Gammon, 2010; Lee et al., 2014; Wayda & Lund, 2005)

- Utilization of Rubrics (Ignico & Gammon, 2010; Lee et al., 2014; Wayda & Lund, 2005)

Program demographics (e.g. CAEP accreditation status information, number of graduating TCs, etc.) and questionnaire responses were collected (Appendix L) through the online tool Qualtrics. The questionnaire contained 23 main questions, with 11 potential follow-up questions. Due to the use of question logic, respondents did not necessarily see follow-up questions. The instrument was designed in such a way that responses to particular items caused the responses to be directed to supplementary follow-up questions pertaining to their specific situation. Thus, all respondents did not complete the same number of items. For example, after answering the basic demographic questions, respondents indicated whether or not they are CAEP accredited. If the respondent answered no to this item, it signaled the end of the questionnaire for this individual, as the sample being investigated in this study was limited to CAEP accredited programs only. Several questions were formatted in such a way as to allow the recipient
to indicate “all that apply”. Multiple questions allowed the respondent to select “other” and add more information.

The questionnaire included a place for individuals to indicate whether they would be willing to participate in semi-structured phone interview. Data collected in this preliminary phase aimed to determine CAEP accredited PETE programs’ processes for assessing disposition, method(s) of evaluating dispositions, when dispositions are assessed, and type(s) of intervention utilized. Data collected in the initial questionnaire was ultimately utilized to identify three willing participants from accredited programs to recruit for participation in the study.

Questionnaire responses were used to compliment and corroborate findings from subsequent interviews and document analysis. Descriptive statistics have been included in the methods section to aid in the explanation and justification of how the programs were selected for the multi-case study (Appendix L). However, since this questionnaire acted primarily as a participant gathering technique, information obtained from other programs during this phase were not analyzed or included in the discussion aspects of this study.

The initial form of the questionnaire (Appendix H) was sent for review to 5 experts in the field to provide evidence of face validity. The experts were faculty members at universities in the United States who have experience with the topic of interest. Experts were asked to critique the readability, clarity, conciseness, and layout of each section of the questionnaire, which contributed to content validity evidence (DeVellis, 1991). Based on feedback from the experts, items, definitions, and formatting were revised and changes were made to the questionnaire as appropriate.
**Interviews.** In-depth, semi-structured phone interviews were the central method utilized to gather a rich data set directly aligned with the two primary research questions. According to Merriam (2009), interviews are one of the most common forms of data collection methods utilized in qualitative research. In case study research, specifically, interviews are considered to be one of the most significant sources of data (Yin, 2009). Throughout the interview, participants were encouraged to respond to the interview questions with concrete explanations and examples based on their knowledge and understanding of instructional and assessment practices related to professionalism utilized within the department. Thus, in-depth interviews provided contextual insights into the perspectives of participants through their own interpretations and words. A semi-structured interview format was implemented, as it was desirable so issues and topics were explored at appropriate levels (Merriam, 2009). The interview questions and topics included in the interview guide (Appendix K) were developed and refined through piloting with one member of a PETE faculty not involved in the study. As a result of pilot testing, some questions were reworded and refined in order to increase clarity (Creswell, 2013).

**Documents.** Documents related to the dispositional teaching and assessment practices of the selected PETE programs were gathered to help further explore how programs meet Standard Six of the Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2008). According to Merriam, documents are useful because “they can contain clues, even startling insights, into the phenomenon under study” (Merriam, 2009, p. 149). In case study research, documents are used most often to supplement and substantiate evidence from other sources (Yin, 2009). Documents collected included dispositions assessments (checklists,
observation forms, rubrics, rubric scoring guides), letters of concern, and contracts for remediation. Documents were provided by program coordinators when completing the questionnaire and following phone interviews. These documents were used to support interview data and provided important contextual information for each case. Thus, these documents, in conjunction with the interview data, enabled triangulation of the data during analysis to determine the validity of the findings, thus strengthening the results of this study (Merriam, 2009). Information from the programs’ website were reviewed also (course catalogues, dispositions statements, etc.).

Data Analysis

After identifying various data analysis methods, the researcher elected to utilize inductive and comparative analytic strategies outlined by Merriam (2009), who defined data analysis in qualitative research as “the process of making sense out of the data …. that involves consolidating, reducing, and interpreting what people have said and what the researcher has seen and read” (Merriam, 2009, pp. 177-178). The extensive amount of data collected was managed and organized using QRS NVivo, a data management software program. This program also provided a convenient way to store qualitative data (Creswell, 2013).

In order to find answers to the stated research questions, which Merriam (2009) identifies as the practical goal of data analysis, examination of relevant data was conducted concurrently with data collection. Thus, as each interview was transcribed and each document was collected, these units of data were also analyzed. The initial analysis of data was used to guide and inform subsequent rounds of data collection (Merriam, 2009). During this simultaneous process, common themes were initially constructed
based upon similar patterns identified in various units of data. These units included meaningful statements and quotes garnered from the interviews or documents (Merriam, 2009). Codes derived from the research questions, key concepts, and important themes were used to help organize, cluster, and later retrieve information (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

Data were first sorted to identify emergent themes, and then reviewed in light of the conceptual framework of occupational socialization outlined by Lawson (1983). Questionnaire data, along with information obtained from any collected documents, including program websites, were analyzed using document analysis techniques to identify the extent to which collected data substantiated interview data. The recursive and dynamic process originated from the emergent design many qualitative researchers encourage and apply (Merriam, 2009).

Due to the multi-case design of this study, data analysis took place in two distinct stages. Within-case analysis occurred first, as data collected from each program was examined independently. Treating each case as a comprehensive set of data in and of itself allowed the researcher to learn about contextual variables influencing each case (Merriam, 2009). After an individual analysis of each case was completed, then cross-case analysis ensued to determine common themes among interviews and documents from each case to further validate the findings of the study. Ultimately, generalizations were made regarding consistent patterns and relationships between and among programs to draw cross-case conclusions (Yin, 2009).
Trustworthiness and Dependability

Trustworthiness of the data was established utilizing six techniques. First, triangulation within and across data from questionnaires, interviews and documents was used to strengthen the credibility and dependability of the study (Creswell, 2013). Specifically, data from the participants’ interview responses were triangulated with data collected in the initial questionnaires and relevant documents collected (Merriam, 2009). Secondly, a researcher journal was kept in order to enhance the researcher’s ability to identify any potential bias I may have had as I conducted the study, as consistent and intentional reflection allowed for the exploration of participant perspectives to the fullest extent possible (Creswell, 2013). Keeping a journal also allowed the researcher to keep an audit trail in order to document pertinent aspects of the research process as it occurred. Third, a member check (Appendix M) was used by returning all interview transcripts to participants for their review, as Lincoln and Guba (1985) consider this to be “the most critical technique for establishing credibility” (p. 314). Fourth, the researcher stance has been explained to identify any bias within the study (Merriam, 2009). In addition, a thick, rich description (Creswell, 2013) was used to report on the teaching and assessment practices of the selected accredited PETE programs, as it relates to professional dispositions addressed in the sixth national standard (NAPSE, 2008). Finally, the findings were explained in great detail and supported with evidence such as quotes from interviews and documents in order to describe the ways in which programs taught and assessed professionalism of TCs.
Researcher Stance

As an undergraduate, I myself spent five years working towards a Bachelor’s degree in physical education in a PETE program in Texas. Thinking back on my time as a TC, I don’t recall the professors in my department ever having an intentional focus on professional dispositions, in any capacity. That’s not to say they did not, but I do not have any recollection of lectures, power-point presentations or discussions concerning the attitudes, values, and beliefs necessary to becoming an effective physical education teacher. I completed my undergraduate degree two years before the NAPSE (2008) Standards were published, which suggests even if the PETE program I attended was attempting to adhere to the Standards, there was not a standard devoted specifically to professionalism yet.

After obtaining a Master’s degree in Sport Pedagogy, I was employed as a physical educator and coach for six years. As a professional working in the field, I all too often observed poor dispositions from fellow teachers and administrators alike. It was not until I began my doctoral program that I started questioning where educators learned about appropriate dispositions and the importance of exhibiting such attitudes and behaviors. After becoming familiar with occupational socialization theory (Lawson, 1983), I speculated whether these individuals had always displayed such poor professionalism, or if they been socialized away from demonstrating proper dispositions during their time as in-service teachers.

As a CAEP accredited initial teacher preparation program, the undergraduate PETE program at the university I attend is required to provide evidence of achievement across each element of all six Initial PETE Standards (2009). As such, professionalism is
an observable theme weaved throughout the PETE curriculum, as student dispositions are consistently discussed, monitored, and assessed at specified checkpoints within the program. Throughout my time in my doctoral program, I have taught several courses in which disposition assessment rubrics and interviews were used to monitor TCs’ progress related to Standard Six (NAPSE, 2008).

As I have worked closely with TCs in the PETE program at UNC over the past three years, I have interacted with at least a few TCs who undoubtedly possessed the adequate knowledge and skills required of those entering the field of education, yet severely lacked the maturity or sensitivity, or whatever “hard to measure” and “hard to describe” attributes one would think should be considered prerequisites for working with children. I have seen these TCs perform skills with proficiency and pass the written exams, but truth be told, I would never want them working with my (future) children. After some lengthy conversation with faculty and other graduate students, I concluded, “Surely we were not the only PETE program to have students who exhibit less than ideal dispositions.” Thus, this query has led me to explore the ways in which other programs are teaching and assessing the professionalism of TCs.

Along with my interest in the dispositional instruction and assessment practices of PETE programs, I have also focused a significant amount of time throughout my doctoral program exploring how the University of Northern Colorado (UNC) can better encourage participation in activities that promote professional growth and development among TCs. This curiosity aligns seamlessly with the current research study, as Element 6.2 addresses TCs participation in “activities that enhance collaboration and lead to professional growth and development” (NASPE, 2008, p. 3). As I have continued to engage in discussions
centered on ways to increase accountability for TCs’ professional growth and
development, and professional dispositions, I decided it was a worthwhile research
endeavor to explore how other CAEP accredited PETE programs addressed and assessed
professionalism in TCs, using the four elements of the Initial PETE Standards as a guide.
I believe a necessary launching point for research in this area would be to conduct a
descriptive multi-case study to investigate the ways in which the selected accredited
programs are the promoting achievement of this particular standard within their
programs.

My past experience, as well as my involvement in the CAEP accreditation process
at UNC and dispositional assessments of TCs in our program could have potentially led
to some personal bias that could distort the data collection and interpretation processes
(Creswell, 2013). I recognized that keeping a researcher journal was necessary to identify
my own personal experiences and preconceptions. Also, in order to counteract my
potential biases, special caution was used when interviewing participants to remain open
to the findings as they emerged by not letting preconceptions influence the process.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this multi-case study was to describe the ways in which selected nationally accredited PETE programs teach and assess Standard Six of the NASPE (2008) Initial PETE Standards. Participants in this study included PETE program coordinators and knowledgeable faculty members from CAEP accredited physical education teacher education programs at three separate colleges or universities in the United States. Specific research questions were:

Q1 In what ways do the selected PETE programs prepare TCs to meet each individual element of NASPE Initial PETE Standard Six?

Q2 In what ways do the selected PETE programs assess TCs across each individual element of Standard Six (e.g., when, who, how, and what aspects of professionalism are assessed)?

The chapter presents analyzed data to identify and describe the dispositional teaching approaches and assessment practices of initial physical education teacher preparation programs at three institutions: Rocky Creek College, Shady Valley University, and Ridgeview Heights University. In this chapter, an analysis of the data obtained from multiple sources within each case, including questionnaire data, interviews and collected documents, is presented. The multiple data sources were utilized to create a comprehensive understanding of each program’s instructional practices and evaluation tools concerning TCs’ professionalism. An overall description of each program is
provided. Each of the programs and participants in the study were assigned pseudonyms. Wherever quotes are included, the pseudonym for each participant are reported.

Rocky Creek College

Case Description

Institutional profile. Founded in the late 1800s, Rocky Creek College is a small, private, not-for-profit college located in the Northeastern part of the United States. With 1,800 undergraduate students and 1,100 graduate students, the college resides in a hilly village just outside a large metropolitan area. Rocky Creek offered undergraduate and graduate degrees in over 90 areas of study, including arts and sciences, business and education. The institution employed approximately 104 full-time and 208 part-time faculty and had been accredited by the National Council for Accreditation in Teacher Education since 2005. The accreditation covered all initial teacher preparation programs and/or advanced educator preparation programs leading to initial and/or advanced state educator certification.

Participant profiles. As a former K-12 physical education teacher and administrator, Rachel spent 15 years working in public school systems across three states before transitioning to higher education. With a background in curriculum and movement education, Rachel was commissioned by Rocky Creek College in 2005 to start a graduate level physical education licensure program. Before that, Rachel spent 17 years at a different university where she served as Program Director of another large graduate PETE program. When she first accepted the position at Rocky Creek College, several of Rachel’s colleagues from her previous university accompanied her in the transition. In her time at the college, Rachel had taught a variety of pedagogy, methods, and content
courses, including socio-cultural and multi-cultural education. An accomplished researcher and tenured professor, Rachel has authored 11 books in the areas of movement, play and game activities; and published over 50 articles concerning the need for physical play in youth and adolescents. Since the program’s inception, Rachel had served as the Program Coordinator for the Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy graduate program at Rocky Creek College.

Kelli, a former K-4 health and physical education teacher, had taught physical education and health courses at Rocky Creek College for the past 12 years. Kelli was one of Rachel’s colleagues at a different university who elected to join her at Rocky Creek when the program was first launched in 2005. With a Master’s degrees in both physical education and motor learning, and an Ed.D. in Health Education, Kelli had taught a broad range of health and physical education courses in higher education. Her range of coursework taught over the past 12 years included exercise physiology, kinesiology, anatomy, advanced biophysical concepts, and a variety of health-based courses. In addition to teaching Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy courses, Kelli was also serving as Director of the Health and Wellness Certification and was in the process of building a Master’s of Health Education program at the college.

**Program profile.** The Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy program was a graduate-level initial teacher certification program in physical education which led to a Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.). Established in 2005, the M.A.T. was one of the largest physical education teacher preparation programs in the state with enrollment numbers around 175. Rocky Creek College’s physical education licensure program received national accreditation through NASPE/NCATE for the first time in 2009 under
the direction of Rachel, the current Program Coordinator. When asked about the absence
of undergraduate PETE program that leads to licensure, Rachel explained,

I did not want to create an undergraduate program…. I didn’t want to compete
with myself. I knew we have down the road, about 20 minutes away is [another
PETE program]…. That was one of the first things I said, if you’re going to pull
me in I’m not going to compete with another undergraduate program, I’d rather
have a graduate only.

While the institution offered an undergraduate degree in Sport Studies, the program itself
did not lead to teacher certification. According to the institution’s website, the Bachelor
of Arts in Sport Studies had a strong theoretical basis, making it more applicable to
careers in sport management.

The PETE program was housed in the School of Education, with two full-time,
two part-time, and nine adjunct faculty members teaching courses in the Physical
Education and Sport Pedagogy program. However, the program director hesitated to label
these instructors as adjunct:

They have been here since the beginning. They have offices here; they are highly
experienced, and they are practicing teachers, so it’s like they have a second job
here at [Rocky Creek]. So, while they are still only adjuncts, they are still very
instrumental in decision making. These folks have been with me from the get go.
(Rachel)

**Teacher candidate profile.** Students enrolling in the M.A.T. in Physical
Education and Sport Pedagogy program were typically individuals seeking to enter the
physical education teaching profession as a second career. In fact, the program’s website
stated the greatest percentage of students who enrolled in the program had undergraduate
degrees in Elementary and Secondary Education, Business and Marketing, Journalism
and Communication, Sociology and Psychology, Criminal Justice, Exercise and Athletic
Training, and the Health and Medical fields. However, there were some TCs who had not
joined the job market yet, but came straight from an undergraduate program. Rachel explained, “[W]e do recruit some of the best and top candidates when they’re graduating from undergrad. I go right after them and offer them what I can, scholarship wise.”

Typically, scholarships came in the form of a book award.

**Admissions requirements.** To be admitted to the M.A.T. program, applicants were required to take the GRE, complete a program application, submit two letters of recommendation and write an essay discussing their personal teaching philosophy and interest in applying to the program. Additionally, a 3.0 grade point average (GPA) was also required, and applicants had to participate in an interview with the program coordinator. Upon completion of 30 credits of multi-disciplinary liberal arts and 18 hours of pre-requisite courses, students were able to formally apply to the 39-hour initial teacher preparation program. The program accepted and graduated about 35 TCs on average per semester. While the department did not keep specific records regarding the job placements of their graduates, the program director’s belief was that the percentage was relatively high.

**Program overview.** The initial teacher preparation program at Rocky Creek College prepared TCs for certification in physical education at the K-12 level. On average, it took TCs two years, although students had up to five years to complete the program. The length of time it took a TC to finish depended on the number of co-requisite courses needed, in addition to the 39-credit program, and how many courses a TC completed per semester. Classes were offered in the Fall, Spring, and Summer semesters, and TCs could take up to four courses a semester. With the exception of three field experience courses (including student teaching), all graduate classes were offered on
Monday and Tuesday evenings. According to the curriculum description on the website, the program format included thought-provoking classroom discussions followed by dynamic peer-teaching demonstrations.

**Curriculum overview.** The curriculum included a variety of instructional methods courses at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels, along with content specific courses in rhythm and gymnastics, individual sports, and team sports. The program was also comprised of courses focused on sport law, assessment and evaluation, and adapted physical education. Prerequisites included general education classes, a nutrition course, and two science-based courses in Anatomy, Physiology or Kinesiology. Prior to student teaching/supervised teaching, teacher candidates completed 100 hours of observation within a single course, which focused on the analysis and assessment of teaching practices in a K-12 physical education setting. According to the Program Coordinator, this format was not typical:

> We’re probably one of the few programs that have all of our observation hours in one course, almost everyone in the country has to have 100 hours of observation. When I came here I said I’m not going to do what I did at [previous institution] …. [M]ost colleges scatter, 10 hours in this class, 15 hours in that class. We said forget that. We put all 100 hours into [one class]. And that is huge…. [T]hey’re doing 100 hours, so they’re observing a lot of what they’re talking about. (Rachel)

During the final semester of the M.A.T. program, TCs completed a comprehensive exam in order to demonstrate a thorough knowledge and clear understanding of the essential content and pedagogical practices pertaining to physical education and sport. Rachel explained how the faculty opted to require a comprehensive exam instead of a thesis for a capstone experience, stating, “It’s pretty intense, but I think it does help prepare them for the content specialty test, and they need to be a good writer [to be] in our profession. You have to be a good communicator.” Regarding the content test, Rachel was proud to share
her students had a 100% pass rate on the content test over the past two years, with no re-
takes, which she believed helped her program establish credibility with potential students.
Rachel affirmed, “That tells people, you get in this program, you do what we tell you to
do, and you’ll get out.” In addition to all the other program requirements, TCs were also
required to successfully complete the edTPA, a summative, portfolio-centered,
performance-based assessment designed to evaluate TCs' subject-specific readiness for
licensure (SCALE, 2015).

Overview of Professionalism
Assessments

Within the PETE program, three main assessments were used to evaluate aspects
of NASPE Initial PETE Standard Six: the RCC Competencies Checklist, the Candidate
Dispositions Assessment, and the Student Teaching Assessment. Data from each
document were used as artifacts in the program’s most recent CAEP accreditation review.
The remainder of this section describes each of the identified documents, as they will be
referenced throughout the chapter.

Rocky Creek College Competencies Checklist. At the end of each 8-week
placement, the field supervisor was required to complete the RCC Competencies
Checklist (Appendix N), an assessment document which mirrored the 2008 NASPE
Initial PETE Standards. Aggregated data from the Competencies Checklist were utilized
in the program’s re-accreditation CAEP report. As Rachel described, “[O]ur
[Competencies Checklist] is assessing a TC’s professionalism, and it coincides with
Standard Six exactly.”

Rachel acknowledged the purposeful intention of such alignment when she
described the process followed for preparing the program’s initial CAEP (then NCATE)
accreditation report, which occurred just four years after the program was launched. As she explained, “We started in 2005, and became accredited four years later, in 2009. That was as soon as we could and then we got it the second time, too. So, we’ve gone through the process twice. We’ll have [another] onsite visitation in 2018” (Rachel). When asked how it was determined which data would be collected for the accreditation report, Rachel replied,

I followed the [NASPE] Initial [PETE Standards] rubric as closely as I could, and the first time we went through the process we made our own rubrics. That was the whole goal, you know, can we make our own that coincide extremely close with our national standards. And I like it, I was very proud, because it required the professors to come in and say ok, and so you knew your rubric cold. You’d created it, it worked and then the second go around we had an outside person come in, a consultant, not from SHAPE, and they said you really should be making your rubrics to the standards of your national organization. So, that’s what we did.

Since the program was established with accreditation in mind, all the rubrics created and selected for the NCATE report were built into courses as they were being developed. The intentional alignment was especially apparent with the Competency Checklist.

As revised editions of the Initial PETE Standards were introduced, the RCC PETE program underwent revisions as well. For example, when NASPE introduced the 2008 Initial PETE standards, rubrics utilized throughout RCC’s programs were modified accordingly. As Rachel noted, “We’ve gone through two sets of standards, and we know the new standards are coming out,” suggesting her program would undoubtedly undergo a re-evaluation to ensure the data collected aligned with the most recent set of standards.

Rachel attributed the program’s initial success in achieving nationally accredited status from NASPE/NCATE to the diligent attention given to the creation and implementation of rubrics based off the national standards, and the guidance she sought
from NASPE when developing each assessment document. She recalled, “I contacted them in the planning process asking for any help or anything that I should be buying or looking into…. I thought, ‘I didn’t want my program to fail!’” (Rachel). After the PETE program at RCC attained nationally accredited status for the second time in 2016, representatives from SHAPE (formerly NASPE) called to acknowledge their accomplishment, “They said, ‘Congratulations, we know you were starting from scratch’” (Rachel). Thus, the PETE faculty at Rocky Creek College had been recognized and commended for the ways in which they have successfully integrated assessments utilized within the program with the corresponding Initial PETE Standards.

**Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment.** Toward the completion of a TC’s semester-long field experience, the RCC field supervisor completed The Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment (Appendix O), with input from the cooperating teachers. The rubric, which aligned with the Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P), assessed 20 different dispositions selected and adapted from the Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers, developed by INTASC. Both rubrics included the same items, with the language changed from “I” on the self-assessment to “The TC” on the form completed by the field supervisor.

**Candidate Dispositions Assessment.** The Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P), which focused on a variety of professional dispositions, was not specific to PETE, but was required across all teacher education programs at the institution. Rachel recalled, “As a School of Education, some of us didn’t go along with just using the national standards, so we have something called our RCC, School of Ed, Candidate Dispositions Assessment.” The evaluation document was a self-assessment completed by
the TC. The corresponding assessment form, completed by the College’s field supervisor, was called the Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment (Appendix O).

For the self-evaluation, a TC was required to not only identify the extent to which they agreed with each of the 20 statements listed on the rubric as it pertained to their student teaching experience, but they also had to provide evidence for how they met each item. As Rachel explained,

Now this [rubric] is filled out by the TC right before they student teach, and they write down, usually in each of those categories is five different criteria, and you write down, I strongly agree, I agree, I disagree, I strongly disagree…. You would write down one of those four choices. And so, then you have to say, “How do I demonstrate this disposition?” which is really tough.

Rachel believed her program’s use of the self-assessment document heightened the level of accountability for TCs in regard to actually demonstrating professional dispositions. She expressed, “[I]t’s pretty intense, but that’s why I said I like this. I think it’s a step beyond the average college or university” (Rachel). One additional question in each section required TCs to identify how they could further develop the dispositions listed in each category. As Rachel described,

It’s hard because [TCs] could just say, “Oh yeah, sounds good, I agree” but then you have to say how you demonstrate. It gets handed back if they don’t do it. Or if [they] don’t, it’s “How can I develop this disposition?”. That’s probably the keener part…. how do [TCs] actually demonstrate [dispositions listed on the rubric] since dispositions are so belief oriented and socially discussed. You got to have things you can actually demonstrate.

The self-assessment was then submitted with supporting documentation to a faculty member who used a corresponding rubric (Appendix Q) to evaluate the extent to which the disposition assessment had been completed by the TC. Thus, if a student completed the checkboxes (level of agreement with each item) but did not answer the justification questions or failed to provide documentation, the student would receive an F on the
rubric, which would ultimately result in a failing grade for student teaching. Rachel confirmed, “In other words, you fail that, you fail student teaching whether you are a fabulous teacher or not.” Ultimately, data from the dispositions self-assessment were given to the Associate Dean of Graduate Advising. She recalled, “[He] scores the whole school to see how we’re doing, and then he compares it with the supervisors, how well they think we’re doing” (Rachel).

Addressing and Assessing Teacher Candidates’ Professionalism

**Addressing Standard 6.1.** Aspects of element one were addressed by instructors utilizing a variety of strategies across several courses (Table 2). Element 6.1 pertains to TCs’ providing equal amounts of feedback to students during physical education classes, regardless of students’ ability levels. Giving all students feedback equally was a consistent theme in the individual and team sports content courses, according to Rachel. She recalled, “[TCs] have to have x amount of teaching cues and the differences between [types of] feedback, so those discussions take place the most in those two particular classes…. The two sport classes are really hitting on the feedback element,” (Rachel). In regard to addressing the idea of providing equal feedback, Kelli pointed toward the same content courses, but also mentioned methods classes:

It’s also discussed, the idea of feedback, in our [elementary methods] course. And, one more, [Analysis and Assessment] in PE; that class obviously hits a lot of this, the analyzing and assessing. This is where we do our 100 hours. You’re observing, you’re watching, you’re analyzing.

Another facet of Standard 6.1 describes how TCs are to provide equitable opportunities for students to participate and also adapt lessons for underperforming students. Kelli gave specific examples of techniques modeled and taught to TCs to
promote equitable participation in physical activity experiences. Examples included “teaching by invitation” and “challenge by choice”; teaching strategies which were discussed in a variety of classes throughout the curriculum, including sub disciplinary courses such as biomechanics, which Kelli taught. She explained how she might emphasize the use of such strategies in discussions of biomechanics and what happens to the body physiologically when a person is playing basketball. Kelli would tell TCs, “[I]f you are providing maximal opportunities for all students [to participate], you may have a basket at different heights, poly spots or dots at different distances so each child has a choice as to where they’re going to be successful” (Kelli). She went on to elaborate, describing how she often emphasized the ways in which TCs could differentiate instruction across various scenarios in order to maximize learning for all students:

You also I might have a point system. And with challenge by choice, it’s the same kind of concepts, that you are challenging the students with a variety of challenges and they choose where they go, which could be an obstacle course. You have harder obstacles, easier obstacles in your elementary physical education. You have different kinds of obstacles and then you give them the choice, and they can choose where they want to go; where they’re comfortable. (Kelli)

Table 2
Rocky Creek college- Ways Standard 6.1 was Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Sports (Content)</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Sports (Content)</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary methods</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis &amp; Assessment of PE</td>
<td>Teach by invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomechanics</td>
<td>Challenge by choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessing Standard 6.1. Predictably, several of the courses identified as areas in the curriculum which addressed features of Standard 6.1 also included assessment
components related to the element (Table 3). Within the individual and team sports classes, evaluations of element one of Standard Six were present:

[You are assessed when you’re teaching, how many times you reinforce something. Equitable [participation] as well, making sure all students are encouraged to participate…These are stressed over and over in these two classes. So, we have a rubric that assesses that…. In that class, I think there are 8 elements and it is certain sports that they’re assessed in their teaching, and that is indicated. So, when that score comes up, [Standard 6.1] definitely goes into that one. (Rachel)

Besides the content courses, the student teaching practicum another area of the curriculum where aspects of Standard 6.1 were assessed. Assessments were completed by the field supervisor, TC, and cooperating teachers.

Table 3

Rocky Creek College- Ways Standard 6.1 was Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Individual Sports (Content)</td>
<td>- Feedback rubrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Team Sports (Content)</td>
<td>- Candidate Dispositions Assessment (self-assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Competencies Checklist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RCC Competencies Checklist (Appendix N) was an exact replication of the National Initial PETE Standards Rubric. Thus, TCs were rated according to the rubric descriptions by the field supervisor toward the end of the student teaching practicum. While the checklist included a section devoted solely to the assessment of TCs’ professionalism, it was not the only dispositions assessment utilized by the program.

In addition to the checklist, which was specific to PETE, the program also utilized a set of corresponding assessments developed and instituted by the College of Education. The Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P) was completed by the TC, while
the field supervisor completed the Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment (Appendix O) toward the end of the student teaching practicum. Four items from the assessments which best applied to characteristics outlined in Initial PETE Standard 6.1 included:

- (1.) The teacher respects students’ differing strengths and needs and is committed to furthering each student’s overall development.

- (2.) The teacher is committed to work toward each student’s mastery of disciplinary content and skills.

- (6.) The teacher believes that plans must always be open to adjustment and revision based on student needs and changing circumstances.

- (15.) The teacher is committed to providing timely and constructive feedback to students on their progress.

In addition to rating themselves on each of the 20 items, TCs were also required to comment on two open-response sections in each category, explaining how they have demonstrated each disposition, and how they could further develop said dispositions. For more information on the assessments can be found in the “Overview of Professionalism Assessments” section of the Case Description.

**Addressing 6.2.** National Initial PETE Standard 6.2 states “TC participates in activities that enhance collaboration and lead to professional growth and development” (NASPE, 2008, p. 21). TC engagement in professional development opportunities beyond program requirements is one of the components included in the descriptor for a target rating of the element. Engagement may come in the form of: attending or presenting at professional conventions; being in leadership in a student group, or planning an activity. Additionally, the Target rating descriptor states, “TC documents collaboration with faculty, parents, supervising teachers and/or service projects beyond program
requirements” (NASPE, 2008, p. 21). The standard was addressed in a variety of ways across the curriculum, with PD expectations in a few specific courses (Table 4).

Table 4
Rocky Creek College- Ways Standard 6.2 was Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary methods</td>
<td>Consistent encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted PE</td>
<td>Hosting PD on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>Modeling by PETE/School of Ed faculty (Collaboration and PD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses taught by Kelli</td>
<td>Inviting TCs to PD sessions presented by faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stated expectations (Student Teaching syllabus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Socialization</td>
<td>Modeling from Liberal Arts faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No active PE Club</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding professional growth and collaboration, and participation in PD events was modeled by faculty throughout the department. Kelli explained, “[W]e try to encourage and support as much as we can, all of our students [to attend PD activities]. We’re also a part of these organizations, and [we] attend conferences.” Kelli went on to discuss the faculty’s involvement in state, regional and national conventions hosted by SHAPE. When the national convention was held at a location within a reasonable driving distance of Rocky Creek College, she insisted, “We try to heavily encourage… all of our [TCs] to go to SHAPE [national convention]” (Kelli). Many faculty members, including Kelli herself, regularly presented sessions at the conferences they attended.

Additionally, both faculty members discussed how the College hosted a number of education-related PD events every year. Rachel acknowledged, “Every semester we have a major conference, a major workshop, two or three, and they’re big. Right now, we
[are hosting] a state conference coming in April.” Kelli described the conference as health-centric, with several cross-over presentations designed to integrate both health and physical education concepts. The shared effort and teamwork Kelli and her colleagues exhibited as they worked to organize the conference was cited as a tangible example of how collaboration was modeled collaboration among faculty.

While some courses included PD attendance requirements, Kelli believed persistent encouragement, and modeling by faculty were important ways professional growth and collaboration were addressed throughout the program. For example, PD attendance had not been a requirement in the classes Kelli taught, although it was highly encouraged:

So, here’s the thing, when I say I strongly encourage you, I can’t require you, but if I were in your spot I would be attending, and I am attending in my position. [I] just explain to them the benefits, and the networking with the people, and seeing new ideas. And also, being able to take examples of curriculum back to your school or just adapting it to your own, but getting a general idea and taking that and adapting it for what works for you, and your space, and your resources, and your population, and your age, and your school culture, and your learning culture, whatever it may be. Every school is different.

Kelli believed she did a good job of modeling and promoting PD activity for her TCs:

“Besides just me giving them the information, explaining the benefits of why it’s good to go to all these conferences or seminars or workshops, whatever you want to call it, I also present a lot”. In addition to being one of the primary organizers for the health conference that was hosted by Rocky Creek College, she was also planning to present at the conference. Kelli recalled, “I [would] say, ‘Hey, you should really come to the state conference. I’m presenting and I’d love to see you guys. Come on down to my session!’”
Rachel also perceived herself and the rest of the PETE faculty to be positive role models for TCs when it came to promoting professional growth and collaboration. However, she was quick to acknowledge such role-modeling was not necessarily occurring in PETE programs at other institutions, or even with the Liberal Arts faculty at Rocky Creek College:

One reason [PD attendance for TCs] doesn’t go over better in departments of physical education is because you have faculty who don’t want to go. And you know, I don’t have that problem because I’m so small, and the adjuncts have to go anyway because they are already teaching so they get professional development credit. But my previous job (there was 16 of us), and you’re trying to get the students to go and you couldn’t get half the faculty to go. It was very bothersome, very troublesome…. We have a giant retreat here, and there’s been a mass of emails between faculty members of who ‘has’ to go, and I’m thinking, the School of Ed is going, we know, but the Liberal Arts faculty, forget it. Not happening. (Rachel)

In regard to the aspect of Standard 6.2 that addresses collaboration, an entire section in the student teaching syllabus was devoted to the mutually-beneficial interaction between TCs, field supervisors and cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience. Found on page four and five of the 27-page syllabus, the section on professionalism outlined expected outcomes pertaining to each of the four elements of Standard Six. For Standard 6.2 specifically, a list of eight expectations was provided. Most of the expectations centered on interactions between the TC and the cooperating teacher in terms of the planning, implementation and feedback aspects of student teaching. In relation to the PD requirements, the online version of the student teaching syllabus provided a link to a list of sample conferences TC may attend. Moreover, the requirement concerning attendance at a PD activity was reiterated in four different places throughout the syllabus.
Assessing 6.2. According to the Program Director, several courses within the curriculum had PD attendance requirements (Table 5). Rachel explained her perspective of the mandatory conference attendance policy for TCs:

See, we can say required. Some other places…they’re always afraid to say, “You’re required to go to something.” This is a day you’re going to know about well in advance. Unless there’s a death in the family or your wife is having a child, bottom line is you have to be at those events.

Courses with such requirements included secondary methods, Adapted PE and Sport Law. For example, TCs enrolled in the Sport Law course were required to attend at least one type of workshop or clinic addressing some aspect of safety,

It is a requirement that they take some kind of safety [PD]. It could be a workshop, it could be an online thing…. They have to show they’ve done something more than in-house. It could be… anything from pool safety to aquatics. Right now, during the winter they’re doing weight training safety practices, those kinds of things. They’ve got to show that they’ve gone to PD opportunities. (Rachel)

Concerning the conference Kelli and colleagues were planning and organizing, Rachel asserted, “So, that’s coming and all [TCs] are required [to attend].” However, how TCs were to be held accountable for the stated expectation was not identified.

Table 5
*Rocky Creek College- Ways Standard 6.2 was Assessed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Secondary methods</td>
<td>- Individual course requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Professional Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sport Law</td>
<td>- Candidate Dispositions Assessment (self-assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Competencies Checklist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond expectations tied to specific courses, Rachel recalled at least 5 PD workshops TCs were required to attend during student teaching. She stated, “They have
the bullying; they have to go to the safe schools; they have to go to [PD for] child abuse. And they’re long, they’re half day or full day [workshops]” (Rachel). Other workshops included adventure education and violence prevention.

In an effort to increase accountability among TCs, attendance was recorded at all PD events. Rachel explained, “[W]e do take attendance at all our functions to make sure, and it just got easier…. If they know they’re going to sign in they’re more likely to go, I don’t care what anyone says.” PD attendance records were also used as a form of documentation when considering a TC for dismissal from the program due to unfulfilled expectations concerning PD requirements:

We always used to say, “We just want to see how many numbers are there so sign in, that’d be great.” But [attendance records] are used in a couple different ways. It’s being able to say to a person we might let go, “You haven’t been to these last three activities. Where were you?” So, that is a situation. (Rachel)

During student teaching, field supervisors completed the Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P), which included two items aligned with Standard 6.2:

- (3.) The teacher sees him/herself as a student continuously attempting to broaden, deepen, and integrate his/her own content knowledge.

- (20.) The teacher takes the initiative to grow and develop with colleagues through interactions that enhance practice and support learning.

In addition, TCs had to evaluate themselves using the Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P), as described in the “Assessing 6.1” section of this case description. The assessment, which was mandated by the Rocky Creek School of Education, required TCs to provide evidence documenting the extent to which they had achieved each disposition listed. After TCs indicated the extent to which they agreed with how well they fulfilled each item, they answered two supplemental questions:
“How do you demonstrate this disposition [is the first question]?”. You could say... “I have attended these following functions. I have presented. I have been an assistant at this conference. I was a co-presenter. I did two workshops at my local school, whatever it is.” Then, “How can I further develop these dispositions?” [is the second question]. That’s when the student struggles, because they go, “I don’t know how to do this one.” And I say, “Well is there anything going on at your school? Go back to the school where you’re student teaching. Is there anything that they’re doing that you can say you will be attending so you can further develop the idea of going with colleagues? It might be a workshop, there’s always something.” These public schools have to do a million things. So, they go, “Oh yeah, yeah, yeah, [but] they told me it was a day off.” And I go, “Probably not. You probably want to go to that so you can say [you attended],” because at the end they have to fill it all in. (Rachel)

Thus, TCs were held accountable to the stated expectation of attending a PD event, as they were required to provide documentation of their attendance. Not only that, but they had to be able to identify and articulate how they could continue to develop each disposition.

Mandatory PD participation was also one of the components included in the Professional Portfolio, an assignment all TCs had to complete as part of the student teaching experience. The hard-copy Portfolio consisted of 14 distinct components, of which number eight pertained to “Evidence of Memberships in Professional Organizations/Conferences”. In the student teaching syllabus, a note within the description of component eight stated, “Required of all student teachers- attendance at least one conference workshop during student teaching.”

As previously mentioned, field supervisors also completed a Competencies Checklist (Appendix N) which mirrored the 2008 Initial PETE Standards rubric. Data collected from the checklist was subsequently used for accreditation purposes. One of the ways listed in the target rating for TCs to participate in professional opportunities outside of program requirements was to demonstrate leadership in student group. The example of
demonstrated membership and participation in a student group proved to be challenging for TCs at Rocky Creek College, as the program did not offer a PETE major’s club.

**Addressing 6.3.** Initial PETE Standard 6.3 states, “TCs demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the professional ethics of a highly-qualified teacher” (NASPE, 2008, p. 3). Aspects related to professional ethics include exceeding expectations concerning appropriate teaching attire, as well as maintaining confidentiality and professional relationships. Additionally, promoting respect and equitable treatment among students is outlined in element three of Standard Six. Interviewees identified multiple strategies utilized within the PETE program at RCC to address professional ethics (Table 6).

### Table 6

*Rocky Creek College- Ways Standard 6.3 was Addressed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Courses taught by Kelli</td>
<td>-Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Biophysical Foundations</td>
<td>-Course expectations (TC Professionalism Guidelines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Student Teaching</td>
<td>-Modeling by faculty (PETE Program, School of Ed, entire College)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-All courses offered at RCC (i.e. academic integrity, equitability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative Socialization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Modeling by cooperating teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning professional ethics as a general concept, Kelli described how she had consistently modeled and addressed the characteristics outlined in Standard 6.3 with TCs in her classes. She affirmed, “I take the teachable moments from my experience in my education to make sure I relate that to my grad students, the ones who are in the Masters in PE” (Kelli). The emphasis on professional ethics was not just a sentiment discussed by faculty, it was actually upheld. Kelli went on to explain, “Well, I told them point blank, if
you want to get a job and you want to be happy in your job, and this is your chosen field, there are characteristics you should really understand, execute, and develop. Point blank.”

Similarly, Rachel outlined how professional dispositions were a consistent theme woven throughout essentially every aspect of the program:

Their professional conduct is always under the microscope. And I tell them why. I tell them when people graduate that’s one thing, we can’t control that, but while you’re in the program there’s a reputation we want to maintain, and they have to exercise sound judgement and ethical behavior in our classes, that means assisting professors, that means being on time. We’re sticklers.

As Rachel shared aspects of the program related to professional ethics, she highlighted the expectation of courtesy:

The other thing that we talk to them about right away is about being very courteous. I explain, during our initial student teaching meetings, there are no second chances, not one. And I’ve reinforced this thought through demonstration. I take a book and drop it and say, “About 7 years ago, a student got very upset in seminar about all the workload, and took a book and slammed it to the floor, not terribly hard.” And then I ask the group, “Ask me how long it took for that student to come back to finish the program.” It took two years for the student to finish the program. Two years. We required a year of anger management, personal counseling, and this requirement was on their own bill. After you hear that story the students know we are serious.

Outside of the example regarding courtesy, she also discussed the necessity of addressing TCs’ competitiveness early in the program when teaching games and activities:

I love my guys dearly and they’re very responsible and they are lovely to work with, but if you light a little fire, the gentleman can go crazy when they’re in the gym, and during these games and things. I’m like, “Gentleman, let’s just sit down for a minute. You’re supposed to be playing like the kid. You’re learning how to do this activity so you can teach it someday.” You have to pull the reigns early…. We have to because, let’s face it, if you get a class of 35 in the gym, and they’re doing some games they can nail each other if they’re not careful. (Rachel)

As Program Coordinator, Rachel encouraged PETE faculty to be strict with TCs concerning the behaviors that were permitted in class, especially content classes. She
asserted, “I do think that is part of a professor’s role with dispositions, to differentiate to [TCs] the role of being a student scholar and being a teacher on the outside.”

In addition to courtesy and emotional control, a variety of other dispositions were also addressed throughout the curriculum. Kelli described how she reinforced different aspects of professional ethics with TCs:

[I tell them] this is what goes into being a professional: This is how you model being a professional, and this is how you educate students in this specific topic area of PE, and this is how you conduct yourself, meaning you are positive, you are encouraging, you are honest…

The expectation for TCs to consistently display appropriate professional dispositions was not a unique feature of the PETE program, but was reinforced throughout the School of Education, and across the college. Kelli described the cohesiveness of the School saying, “I feel like we’re on a very similar trajectory. Maybe if you went over to [a different school], it would be very different, or if you went to the graduate school. We are gelled in the School of Education.”

In the same way, Rachel elaborated on several aspects of professionalism which were valued and promoted in programs across the entire campus. Targeted professional dispositions explicitly focused on maintaining professional relationships, confidentiality, and equitability among students:

Our Associate Dean stresses training in this area because they want to model every person, everyone is a model of personal and academic integrity. I don’t think the average student really understands that term at the beginning, but by the end they certainly do. That “character building” is huge. The other element that is stressed in our elective courses, “social justice and treating students equitably”, so that falls under the fairness disposition. The college really reinforces social justice, treating students equitably and academic integrity, so that falls under the fairness disposition. (Rachel)
Similarly, Kelli insisted such dispositions related to professional ethics were modeled and upheld by the college, and were not limited to expectations solely reinforced by the PETE faculty or professors in the School of Education. She maintained, “[T]he College is very, very strong on academic integrity. They are so tough on this one. Teachers have to be very forthright in their interactions with others, standards of trust, and character, academic integrity” (Kelli). She went on to discuss how equitable treatment of students by faculty was also an explicit expectation indorsed across the entire institution.

Prior to engaging in coursework with practicum components, TCs received a document entitled, “Assessing a Teacher Candidates’ Professionalism Guideline”. The 2-page document outlined how professionalism was addressed during upcoming field experiences. Referencing the PETE program’s intentional alignment with the NASPE (2008) Initial PETE Standards, expectations pertinent to each of the four elements listed in Standard Six were described. The section devoted to element three was divided into six segments: (a) promptness; (b) appearance and dress; (c) oral expression; (d) demonstrating a strong work ethic; (e) maintaining confidentiality; and (f) maintaining professional relationships. Each section described specific expectations pertaining to that aspect of professionalism, outlined in Standard 6.3. For example, the description for section (b) stated, “appearance and dress in keeping with the generally accepted standards of the school community (i.e. collared shirt, Rocky Creek College PE and Athletic warm-ups purchased in the bookstore, Appropriate Sport Shoes).” Hence, the guidelines addressed program expectations related to each element of Standard Six, including element 6.3.
In terms of professional dress, Rachel believed the faculty did an upstanding job of modeling appropriate attire in ways that exceeded program expectations. She proudly stated, “We are one sharp looking faculty. You see the Phys Ed people go to a meeting, they’re all in ties, they look like your athletic team. They’re all dressed very appropriately.” When discussing how the expectation of professional dress started, she expounded, “Most of my guys are in ties and most of the ladies are in full suits” (Rachel). The instructor of Biophysical Foundations had especially high expectations for professional attire, as Rachel described him as “a stickler of all the appropriate dress for your gyms and facilities.”

For teaching in a gym-type setting, TCs were not required to mimic faculty members’ professional dress of suits and ties. Rachel explained, “We do not require the [TCs] to have uniforms of any nature, we only require them to get a couple of college [polo] shirts, that’s it.” Kelli echoed the program’s standard of teaching attire, saying, “You should have on a polo with the college logo, or collared shirt. I tell them to think of every day like a job interview, except you’re in a gym.”

Even though expectations related to professional dress were articulated and modeled for TCs, both interviewed faculty members identified it as an aspect of professionalism TCs often struggled to uphold. Rachel affirmed,

We need to work on this one always…. We have to constantly keep on them, make sure that they’re professional. My athletic trainers who are in the program, they obviously look very good. We use them as role models. The women [in PE] wear too many things that are tight and they don’t realize it.

The same frustration was also expressed by Kelli, “I supervise student teachers, and I see a lot of issues with dress.” Rachel went on to explain some of the reasons why she thought the area of professional dress was such a challenge for TCs. While faculty
members exhibited appropriate attire, the same standard was not always modeled in school settings by cooperating teachers during TCs’ field experiences:

In some of the [urban] schools, [Cooperating Teachers] wear jeans. I’m like, “You will never wear jeans while you’re teaching PE while you’re in this program. Do you understand?” But they do. They all wear jeans, it’s very common. They have their school top on, but they wear jeans and sneakers. So, we battle it, and these are graduate students so it’s a little bit tougher because they look at me like they’ve got me over a barrel on this one. But, we’ve pulled them up and said, you just, you can’t. And they do not understand there is an image that goes along. (Rachel)

Hence, the incongruent expectations between the program and cooperating teachers out in schools were thought to be a source of confusion for TCs. However, Rachel perceived cooperating teachers who were alumni of Rocky Creek College to be exemplary role models in all facets of professionalism. She believed alumni made some of the best cooperating teachers because of their familiarity and continued adherence with program expectations. Rachel asserted, “I dance in the streets every time one of my alumni takes one of our [TCs] because I know there will be really good modeling of teaching practices and assessment techniques.” She continued, “I am always delighted when they come to me and say I would like to work with one of the alumni” (Rachel).

Generally, while TCs may have received inconsistent messages from cooperating teachers as to what appropriate attire consisted of, especially if they were not placed with one of the program’s alumni, professional dress was an aspect of professionalism consistently addressed within the program by many faculty members and field supervisors.

**Assessing 6.3.** When asked about the assessment practices utilized in the program related to element three, Rachel spoke first about the letters of recommendations applicants were required submit when initially applying to the M.A.T. program (Table 7).
She indicated how the letters of recommendation provided insight on various aspects of an individual’s professional dispositions, especially concerning aspects outlined in 6.3. For example, one of the items on the letter of recommendation form read, “Please comment on the applicant’s character, personality, maturity, stability and responsibility.” While the phrasing doesn’t include the word “dispositions”, a response to the item could offer valuable insight into a potential candidate’s professional ethics. Other items on the recommendation form centered on the applicant’s potential for success as not only a graduate student, but also as a future educator. Rachel found recommenders tended to focus on the applicant’s work ethic and ability to uphold the responsibilities required of TCs in the program. In some cases, applicants hadn’t been admitted to the program based on their letters of recommendation. Rachel explained, “Letters of recommendations came in on several and just said, I don’t think this person would be a good fit.” Reasons given for the applicant not being a good fit for the program could have included any number of reasons, but issues with professional dispositions were always a concern. Rachel even recalled a time when a person blatantly said of an applicant, “I wouldn’t hire this person”.

After discussing the letters of recommendation, Rachel then identified the secondary methods class and a Biophysical Foundations course as areas in the curriculum where TCs were held accountable for exhibiting a professional appearance. Rachel described the specific expectations enforced by the Biophysical Foundations instructor, “[Y]ou’re not in there with sneakers untied and that kind of thing. He’s really tough on that one, and he does check them off too” (Rachel).
In addition to the coursework Rachel spoke of, Kelli also acknowledged student teaching as an area of the program where aspects of element three were assessed. She explained, “We tell them before [they teach in schools], this is the expectation, this is how you’re going to look: neat and clean and professional.” Correspondingly, multiple rubrics used to assess TCs during the student teaching experience included items related to Standard 6.3. For instance, the Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P) and the Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment (Appendix O) included the following:

- (10.) The teacher values the role of students in promoting each other’s learning and recognizes the importance of peer relationships in establishing a climate of learning.

- (19.) The teacher fulfills the expectations of the profession including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, professional behavior, dress and presentation, and relevant law and policy.

Table 7
*Rocky Creek College - Ways Standard 6.3 was Assessed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Secondary methods</td>
<td>-Letters of recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Biophysical Foundations</td>
<td>-Course expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Student Teaching</td>
<td>-Candidate Dispositions Assessment (self-assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Competencies Checklist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the assessments were completed by the TC and the field supervisor, candidates had to display not only the positive dispositions outlined in Standard 6.3, but they also had to provide documentation of their achievement for each item. Rachel highlighted the “evidence” piece of the Candidate Dispositions self-assessment (Appendix P) as particularly important. She explained,
We talk about [professional ethics] in [our] classes. If they just hand [the dispositions assessment] back and it’s not complete, you’re [grade is] going to get killed by your supervisor because your supervisor takes it afterward, and they assess whether or not, or how well the person answers these questions. (Rachel)

As previously noted, the Candidate Dispositions Assessment and the Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment were rubrics implemented across the School of Education, which meant TCs in all educator preparation programs were held accountable for demonstrating achievement of appropriate dispositions outlined in the rubrics.

Also during student teaching, the Field Supervisor completed the Competencies Checklist (Appendix N), which directly corresponded to the 2008 Initial PETE Standards. Thus, candidates were evaluated explicitly on Standard 6.3 within the rubric.

Determination of TC ratings for each element were discussed and agreed upon by the cooperating teacher.

**Addressing 6.4.** The last element of Initial PETE Standard Six states “The TC will communicate in ways that convey respect and sensitivity” (NASPE, 2008, p. 3). The rubric for element four focuses on inclusive, culturally responsive teaching approaches and promoting respect for cultural differences. Additionally, the intentional absence of sarcasm and put-downs is also mentioned.

When asked how aspects of 6.4 were being addressed within the curriculum, Rachel spoke at length about the expectations concerning respect for diversity, which were modeled and discussed early and often throughout the program (Table 8). She explained,

Dispositions [related to cultural sensitivity] are introduced at the very beginning in the initial interview. It’s made very clear this is an expectation…. We have a respect for diversity. You have to be very sensitive to individual diversity, and they’re told this in their initial interview…. [T]hey learn that right away. (Rachel)
Kelli, another PETE faculty member, echoed the same sentiment regarding TCs’ attention to cultural differences. She expressed, “The expectation is set at many different spots, and also personal expectations from [the program coordinator] and other colleagues.” To elaborate, Kelli explained, “I think [cultural diversity is] addressed from a comprehensive approach, where we have a series of meetings, a series of seminars, and different classes with objectives trying to discuss those different points…” During the interviews, both faculty members cited informal and formal ways Standard 6.4 was addressed throughout the curriculum.

Table 8
Rocky Creek College- Ways Standard 6.4 was Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Historical &amp; Cultural Context in PE</td>
<td>-Faculty modeling of expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Analysis &amp; Assessment of PE</td>
<td>-Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Adapted PE</td>
<td>-Course Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Rhythms, Dance &amp; Gymnastics</td>
<td>-Cultural dance unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Student Teaching (Seminar)</td>
<td>-Workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reference to Standard 6.4, Rachel listed off several courses that focused on culturally responsive teaching practices and stressed the importance of inclusiveness. For example, a course emphasizing historical and cultural contexts in physical education was mentioned, within which 11 different international sports were taught. A course focused on analysis and assessment, as well as the Adapted PE class were also identified as courses which utilized specific instructional strategies to promote aspects of Standard 6.4. Kelli explained, “I would say those three because we have specific rubrics and criteria to check off.” She went on to elaborate how cultural competency was especially emphasized in the rhythm, dance and gymnastics class, but how many of the courses in the curriculum didn’t necessarily focus on such topics:
[The course instructor] does so many cultural dances and everything. [She] has a rubric that goes over the cultural differences, to recognize the dances that look similar and things like that and she checks off on that and actually records things. So, that’s it, I think I’m accurate, I’m pretty sure. And that still means there’s many, many classes that don’t necessarily. They’re there for other reasons, like pedagogy and things like that. (Rachel)

Besides the courses identified by the Program Coordinator, Kelli also spoke of student teaching as a critical area of the curriculum where culturally responsive teaching was addressed. She discussed a recent situation where a particular TC’s placement school consisted of “a highly heterogeneous student body”. To promote an environment of respect and sensitivity, Kelli encouraged the TC to implement a “games from around the world” unit. She recalled,

[S]o in that unit [the TC] spoke about different countries, games from different countries, activities from different countries. Flags, currency, and language from different countries. Questioning the students and different classes, “Is anyone from this country? Does anybody speak this language?” Having the students be able to share some of those languages, all of that was part of learning the physical activity, or the fitness aspect, or the sports. So, really touching on origins of where you come from, [showing] people are more similar than different. Everybody has differences but we can accept them all, and these are the similarities. (Kelli)

Due to the demographic makeup of the school, Kelli felt the unit was generally well received by students. She mentioned the concepts presented in the unit may not have been as relevant at other schools, but with that particular group of students, the unit seemed to bring everybody together more:

[Students] saw how many of the [other] kids spoke Spanish. Or, who didn’t speak Spanish and needed help with Spanish, [and] how can they help them. [Students would say], “Oh, so-and-so speaks Spanish. I didn’t know that.” It’s kind of like general acceptance and respect for other cultures. Not even just culture, but just having respect for differences. (Kelli)

In addition, Kelli reported that the college hosted a variety of university-sponsored events focused on diversity, which were offered to faculty as well as the
student body. Kelli believed the workshops, which she referred to as “learning experiences”, to be prevalent opportunities provided by RCC for both faculty and students alike. Concerning such trainings, Rachel spoke of a recent student teaching seminar where TCs discussed prevalent issues related to gender and sexuality which they experienced in their K-12 student teaching placements. Within the conversation, TCs also described the corresponding trainings they had attended on the topic:

We asked the student teachers, “How are your teaching practices changing and becoming more appropriate?” That’s just the word we used, with the gender issues that are going on, and particularly, not just gender issues, but transgender. So, I’m sitting there in the back of the room. There’s all my professors and supervisors and everything. And 9 of my 27 [TCs] have K-12 students who are transgender. This factor shocked me. I said, “How many of you?” I am dumbfounded. So, then they went on to give us a wonderful analysis of what’s going on in schools and the workshops they’ve had to attend ….They knew and had better vocabulary than any one of us in the room. They knew how to handle the gender differences, trans-fluid, all these words I didn’t even know….As far as transgender, I was dumbfounded. And they said, “Doc, I’ve got one in kindergarten, and third grade.” Elementary school, most of them were in elementary school. This was beyond me. It was totally beyond me. They said, “We’ve got one on you!” It was hilarious. And I said, “You do, you absolutely do because I did not realize all this training was going on.” (Rachel)

As the author of several books on the topic of culturally responsive teaching practices, Rachel considered herself to be somewhat of an expert in this particular area. In fact, several of the PETE faculty had written articles on the topic. However, she was shocked to hear TCs using language completely unfamiliar to her as they discussed their K-12 teaching experiences, but she was thankful TCs were receiving training on contemporary issues they encountered out in the schools.

When considering aspects of Standard 6.4, Rachel also discussed the ways in which TCs were encouraged to speak to and interact with students during their field experiences. She affirmed, “We really focus on teacher demeanor, and what that means.
It’s an old-fashioned word but we reinstituted it in this program” (Rachel). The concept of teacher demeanor encompassed how TCs were prepared throughout the program to communicate expectations, while also maintaining a positive environment. Many discussions revolved around effective ways to communicate and interact with students in extremely large class sizes, sometimes in excess of 200 students at once. Dialogue with TCs on the topic focused on navigating the balancing act of being firm, yet friendly in a teacher role. Rachel insisted, “We do spend a great deal of time talking about the difference between being sarcastic in your teaching, and being a best buddy.” She also stated, “We talk about putdowns. It’s one of the biggest lectures we have” (Rachel).

Similarly, Kelli discussed how she consistently reinforced the importance of TCs building positive rapport with students. As Kelli told TCs, “If you are likable, it allows children of all ages to be more open to what you have to say and your message and your advocacy, and to what you are trying to relate to them.” Kelli perceived the majority of TCs in student teaching to respectful and likeable. She described how she talked with TCs about the differences in interactions they may have with students based on age level, “It’s like, if you are a storyteller, it is okay because [with] fifth grade, you can make a little joke! They will think it’s funny. If [students] are in high school, you have to treat them with the independence of the high-schooler” (Kelli).

Assessing 6.4. As previously mentioned, rubrics were utilized to assess facets of element four in a variety of PETE courses (Table 9). Within the identified classes, TCs were evaluated on the ways in which they incorporated and implemented aspects of culturally responsive instructional approaches and inclusive teaching practices. Rachel
acknowledged the lack of explicit attention given to such topics in other areas of the curriculum, especially within the methods courses, due to the strong focus on pedagogy.

Table 9
Rocky Creek College- Ways Standard 6.4 was Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Historical &amp; Cultural Context in PE</td>
<td>- Assignment Rubrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analysis &amp; Assessment of PE</td>
<td>- Candidate Dispositions Assessment (self-assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rhythms, Dance &amp; Gymnastics</td>
<td>- Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td>- Competencies Checklist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the assessment practices identified for the other three elements, student teaching was again identified as an area within the program where features of Standard 6.4 were evaluated. Two items on the Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment (Appendix O) pertained to characteristics of element four:

- (7.) The teacher makes students feel valued and helps them learn to value each other.

- (8.) The teacher respects families’ beliefs, norms, and expectations and seeks to work collaboratively with students and families to establish positive and supportive learning environments.

Accordingly, as with all the other items listed on the rubric, when completing the Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P), TCs were required to provide evidence of the ways in which they demonstrated each disposition. In addition, they also needed to identify ways they could continue to grow in each area. For example, the TC Kelli spoke of who was placed in the highly diverse school could have focused on their experiences implementing the “games from around the world” unit for the item centered on students’ feeling valued and valuing each other. For documentation, the TC might have submitted lesson plans and reflections outlining how students’ countries of origin
and cultures were highlighted during activities taught within the unit, and the corresponding impact the unit content had on students. Then, the TC could have indicated upcoming diversity trainings or workshops offered through the college or local school district they planned to attend to continue to enhance their knowledge of culturally responsive teaching practices.

Lastly, as with each of the other elements included in Standard Six, field supervisors were required to complete a Competencies Checklist (Appendix N). The checklist provided a rating of TCs’ achievement across each element listed in the National Initial PETE Standards, including 6.4. Data from the checklist was compiled and aggregated, then utilized in the program’s most recent CAEP re-accreditation report.

**Shady Valley University**

**Case Description**

**Institution profile.** Located in the Midwestern United States, Shady Valley University (SVU) is a public institution with a total enrollment of 19,300 undergraduate students and 4,200 graduate students. Established in the 1900s as a teacher training school, the institution offers over 300 academic programs across ten colleges, with the largest enrollments in the areas of business, health professions, communications, and education. The institution employs over 950 full-time faculty and 800 part-time faculty. SVU was first recognized as a nationally accredited university through NCATE in 1957.

**Participant profiles.** A seasoned faculty member, Sean first joined the PETE department at SVU in the early 1990’s. At the time of the study, he was transitioning from PETE into an administrative role in the College of Education (COE). During his time in PETE, Sean spent several years at Program Coordinator. Due to the shifting of his
role at the university, his teaching load had been reduced to one methods course per semester. However, over the span of his career at Shady Valley, Sean had taught a variety of PETE courses and had strong insight of the specific ways professionalism was addressed and assessed across the PETE curriculum. In addition, Sean possessed a robust knowledge of the accreditation process, as he had served in multiple leadership positions within both SHAPE America and CAEP. Prior to pursuing a career in higher education, Sean taught K-12 physical education for six years.

Jackie had served as the Program Coordinator for two years. She first stepped into the coordinator role when Sean began to transition to COE. As a PETE faculty member at Shady Valley for nearly a decade, Jackie had taught a myriad of courses, including methods, curriculum, analysis, and inquiry. She started her teaching career as a secondary physical education content specialist before pursuing graduate studies, which ultimately led to a career in high education.

Program profile. The PETE program was believed by faculty to be one of the first teacher education programs offered by SVU. While there weren’t available records detailing when the first NASPE/NCATE accreditation took place for Shady Valley’s PETE program, both the current and former Program Coordinator attested it occurred at least 25 years ago. Thus, the program’s first accreditation took place using the original NASPE/NCATE guidelines, which became effective in 1987. At the time of the study, SVU maintained accreditation for three separate PETE programs. As Sean explained, “One is the four-year physical education only license, the second program is the combined five-year health and physical education (HPE) licensure, and then we have a Master’s degree program that leads to licensure, so we seek accreditation for that also.” It
was determined the instructional strategies and assessment practices pertaining to Standard Six (NASPE, 2008) occurred in specific coursework required across all three programs.

The PETE and HPE programs at SVU are two of three undergraduate programs offered in the department, while the Master’s licensure program is one of two graduate programs offered. In addition, the department also offers one endorsement, and one minor. During the past year, approximately 25 students were enrolled in the PE only program, 25 in the Health and PE concentration, and five students in the Master’s licensure program. These numbers represent a decrease in program enrollment, especially in the PE only program:

We’ve declined in recent years, numbers across the country have…. We declined gradually. We got down to a low point last year; we’ve come up a little bit from last year…. I don’t think it’s going to come back to where it once was but I’m hoping it will come back a little bit more (Sean, former Program Coordinator).

Of the five faculty members who teach Physical Education courses at SVU, three are tenured professors, one is tenure-track, and one is non-tenure-track. One faculty member is an adapted physical education specialist. Other instructors of record include Master’s students who have teaching assistantships. Four of the five students in the Master’s program currently have assistantships and act as instructors of record, teaching assistants, or help with research, depending on the instructional needs from semester to semester. Graduate assistants typically only step into instructor roles during times when a full-time faculty member is on sabbatical, or during times of transition (i.e. faculty members resign, retire, or move into administrative roles). Otherwise, PETE faculty generally teach across all physical education content and methods courses, and instruct student teaching seminar.
**Teacher candidate profile.** TCs enrolled in the undergraduate physical education teacher licensure programs at SVU were characterized by Sean, as mostly traditional-age college students, many of whom commute from places within a 25-mile radius from campus and hold part-time jobs in addition to being full-time students. Jackie provided a similar description, adding,

[SVU] has approximately 60% first-generation students that come to college. Most come from a working-class, middle-class family. Quite a few commute from the [surrounding] area. A very small percentage of them live on campus. So, a lot of our students are working to put themselves through school while trying to go through school, and then of course we have a few students who come from more affluent families where they don’t have to work or they work minimally…. [The TCs] are able bodied and primarily white, in regard to our students in PE anyway. Again, they come from a lower to middle class and quite a few are first-generation students.

With an increase in the number of TCs working, a shift has also been observed in recent years with regard to the amount of volunteering TCs engage in. As Jackie explained, “I used to get a lot of students who would be willing to volunteer with all these opportunities… and that has dramatically declined over the past two years and I don’t know if that’s purely out of interest or if it’s also just because they are working.”

The general academic ability of TCs in the undergraduate programs was described as relatively average, as some students struggle to meet the 2.75 GPA requirement to be admitted to the teacher education program. Jackie spoke of her empathy toward the students who struggle with grades:

We have a majority of students that are okay, they are going to be between that 2.75 and 3.0 grade point average, and then we have a good chunk that are a little bit below there in regards their academics, and so they struggle. And I get it, I struggled when I was an undergrad too initially, and so I have a lot more patience with them and give them more opportunities because I don’t always equate that just because you are strong academic student means that you are going to be an effective teacher, and the other way around. So, I want to try to give them as much opportunities as possible.
The majority of students enrolled in the Master’s program were what Sean called “career changers”. The makeup of the current group spanned from an individual with an exercise science undergraduate degree who decided they didn’t want to work in that particular field, to a former Division I basketball coach who concluded he wanted to teach rather than coach. Even with just five students, the faculty felt comfortable with the small enrollment in the Master’s program: “We keep our program small, I guess we don’t keep it small, it just is small because we don’t get that many applicants, but were okay with that. We’re not trying to flood the job market with people and then there are no jobs” (Sean).

**Admissions requirements.** Unlike some undergraduate PETE programs, students at Shady Valley could be admitted directly into the teacher education program during their freshman year if they satisfied the required grade point average. Sean asserted, If they’ve got the high school GPA, they can be admitted to our teacher education program straightaway, and regardless if they are a major or not they can still start to take our major courses. They just can’t be formally admitted until they’ve established a 2.75 GPA, and if it’s not out of high school, then it’s at [Shady Valley].

To apply for the Master’s program, applicants were not required to have an undergraduate degree in physical education. However, candidates must have satisfied 27-29 credits of prerequisite coursework before being admitted. Admission requirements included providing evidence of at least a 3.0 undergraduate grade point average, letters of reference and a written statement of career goals. In addition, candidates had to provide a comprehensive resume, transcripts, and complete an interview with a faculty member.

**Degree program overview.** There were three programs at SVU that led to licensure for physical education: two baccalaureate programs and one master’s program.
The 120-hour Physical Education Teacher Licensure program was a Bachelor of Science degree for students who wished to seek state teacher licensure in physical education only, while a combined concentration in Health/Physical Education was a 157-hour Bachelor of Science degree available to students who sought teacher licensure in both areas. In addition to these two undergraduate programs, Shady Valley also offered a non-licensure program designed to prepare students for careers similar professions, such as athletic coaching or leading other non-school physical activity programs. The physical education only licensure program was typically completed in four years, while the combined Health/Physical Education licensure program was designed to be completed in five years. The combined licensure program allowed students to utilize up to 12 credit hours of graduate courses to satisfy program requirements. Both undergraduate initial teacher preparation programs included numerous field experiences, followed by semester-long student teaching practicums.

Concerning the variety of field experience settings, Sean surmised, “I would say most of them are suburban schools. We’ve got some rural schools that we work with. We try to get into [urban] schools, but it’s very difficult due to the presence of [a nearby institution].” In the Health/Physical Education concentration, students had the opportunity to gain teaching experience in both subjects. Graduates from both baccalaureate programs were eligible to sit for the K-12 educator licensing examinations.

The Master of Education (M. Ed) in Curriculum and Instruction with a PETE concentration also leads to K-12 state licensure in physical education. The program is designed to prepare TCs with competencies that meet the National Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2008). Similar to the undergraduate licensure programs, the 43-
credit hour M.Ed. licensure program includes both elementary and secondary field experience components, and culminates with a semester-long student teaching practicum split between the two levels.

**Curriculum overview.** Upon the completion of 30 hours of university core requirements and the necessary sub-disciplinary coursework, TCs in the undergraduate physical education initial teacher preparation program at SVU then took six courses with field experience components. The six-course segment of the program began with an Intro to Teaching PE course where students completed 20-hours of observation out in schools, and an Adapted PE course, which had a 30-hour field experience component specific to adapted physical education. Following the intro and adapted courses, TCs enrolled in 2 sets of concurrent methods and content courses. The elementary methods course with the corresponding content course was first in the sequence, followed by the secondary methods/content block. The ways in which methods courses and content courses were coupled together was identified by Sean as a unique characteristic of the program:

[R]ight now, I’m teaching secondary methods with my colleague back-to-back with me teaching secondary content. So, when we go out to a field experience, we combine the two together so we have them out in the field for a complete block of time all morning on Tuesday and Thursday, which is really beneficial. Not a lot of programs have that.

During the secondary methods and content block, TCs were in middle schools two days per week from 7:30am-12:30pm for five weeks, followed by a two-week placement with the same format at the high school level, which equated to about 70 hours of field experiences between the two three-hour courses. As Sean explained, “[TCs] are not teaching, of course, the whole time, but they will all teach at least one, and quite often two lessons every day. So, they’ll get plenty of teaching experience.” The elementary
methods/content block was structured differently, but TCs spent essentially the same amount of time out in schools as the secondary methods/content block. Between the six field-experience courses, TCs spent a substantial amount of time teaching and interacting with K-12 students. As Sean observed, “They get a lot of field experience, and within that they get quite a lot of teaching experience as well. And, they are teaching whole classes; they are not teaching small groups or one-on-one or anything. They are teaching whole classes.”

Concerning the Master’s program, students completed any of the necessary 24 pre-requisite hours before taking two three-credit courses to satisfy the research and curriculum requirements. Besides the methods and content courses, the vast majority of courses which made up the Master’s program were offered in an online format. Then, according to Sean,

Once students get to the methods stage in the Master’s [initial teacher preparation] program, they will join the seniors in the undergraduate program and they will do our methods and content courses with them. So, that’s when they come together and likewise for student teaching and seminar as well.

**Overview of Professionalism Assessments**

Within the PETE program, three main assessments were used to evaluate aspects of NASPE Initial PETE Standard Six: the Secondary Methods Portfolio, the Student Teaching Assessment, and the Candidate Dispositions Assessment. Collected data were used as artifacts in the program’s most recent CAEP accreditation review. The remainder of this section describes each of the identified documents, as they will be referenced throughout the chapter.

**Secondary Methods Portfolio.** The Secondary Methods Portfolio purposely mimicked the structure and format of edTPA to give TCs an opportunity to experience a
similar assessment process before completing the actual Portfolio assignment. Thus, for the Secondary Methods Portfolio, TCs were required to provide evidence demonstrating competency across each element of the seven state teaching standards. All three of SVU’s initial teacher preparation programs in physical education utilized data from the Secondary Methods Portfolio in CAEP accreditation reports.

**Candidate Dispositions Assessment.** All teacher education programs at SVU utilized the Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R). At numerous points throughout the program, the assessment was completed by a variety of different people:

This assessment form is done across all teacher education programs so the data is used for the unit assessment for CAEP. So, what happens is there is an [education] course which is common to all [teacher education] programs, and it is sophomore year course. That course is designated as a dispositions assessment course, so it’s done once by whoever the instructor is. Then [in PETE] it’s done in the secondary methods course, so that’s me. Then it’s also done during student teaching, so there’s three different people. But, then it’s also assessed as part of the portfolio in elementary methods, and that would be the fourth person. So, there’s a combination [of assessors] between people within the program and people outside of the program. (Sean)

While the assessment document was completed during four distinct courses, all PETE instructors were able to fill out a Candidate Dispositions Assessment at any time, in any class:

We can fill a dispositions assessment out on any student at any time. It is specifically done in the three courses that I mentioned, and in the portfolio for the [elementary methods] course, but it doesn’t preclude me from going to an instructor and saying, “I got a dispositions problem here, fill out the dispositions assessment.” That gets added to their file online, and then they have to develop it professional dispositions plan, so there is that. It can be done at any time on an individual, not just for a whole class or for all students in a class. (Sean)

In addition to faculty completing the assessment, PETE TCs enrolled in elementary and secondary methods courses were shown the document and given the opportunity to fill out the assessment on themselves. The self-assessments, however,
were neither collected nor analyzed. Instead, Sean explained that they were utilized as more of a formative evaluation tool designed to give TCs “an idea of where [they] feel as though [they] stand with these professional expectations” (Sean).

If a TC received a rating of “needs improvement” on one or more of the 27 items listed on the assessment, they were required to complete a professional dispositions plan. If a plan is warranted, the TC were required to devise a detailed strategy they would utilize to address the issues identified. Sean explained, “There’s no template for it, but if it is seen they need improvement on the dispositions assessment, then that automatically triggers email to them and to the instructor that they have to complete a professional dispositions plan.” Once the TC and instructor agreed on a remediation plan, the TC had the remainder of the semester during which the assessment was completed to rectify or resolve the issues identified. As a way to reinforce accountability, Sean expounded, “TCs must have it signed off on by the faculty member that is giving it to [them]. If that doesn’t get signed off on, then it prohibits them from continuing in the program”.

**Student Teaching Assessment.** The SVU Student Teaching Assessment (Appendix S) was another evaluation tool implemented by all teacher education programs. The performance-based assessment instrument was based on the state standards, which were heavily influenced by INTASC standards, thus creating strong alignment with many of the elements found in the 2008 Initial PETE Standards. The instrument consisted of seven standards divided into 35 elements.

The assessment was implemented at both the elementary and secondary placements for TCs in physical education only programs (B.S. and M.Ed.), and with a slight variation for TCs in the Health/Physical Education dual-licensure program. As
Jackie explained, “It’s the [TCs], cooperating teacher, and the [field] supervisor. What they do is, we call them three-way meetings, and so it’s supposed to be halfway through each placement, and at the end of each placement.” Thus, TCs received a mid-term rating, as well as a summative evaluation at the end of each 8-week placement from both evaluators. However, only scores from the field supervisor were utilized in the SPA report for CAEP. Unlike some institutions, faculty members did not serve as field supervisors:

We did for quite a long time, and then, a few years ago our Dean at the time reorganized our schools within the college and at that point in time we were the only program left that were still supervising our student teachers, and they didn’t want to give faculty load anymore for supervising student teachers and that’s when we started to have to look into hiring retired teachers. They are very good, and they do go through some training that the college provides, and the people we have worked with for years as mentor teachers. (Jackie)

Even though these individuals were not formally connected to the program, Jackie believed the retired K-12 physical educators who served as field supervisors did a good job of reinforcing the program’s high expectations concerning professionalism. When asked if she thought the supervisors had a strong grasp on TCs’ dispositions as they were out teaching in the schools, Jackie replied,

Without a doubt, I absolutely feel very strongly about that. Before they go student teach, I meet with all the student teachers, even if I’m not teaching the inquiry seminar class, I invite the [field] supervisors to come as well. And dispositions are one of the things that is on the agenda and we talk about that in great detail. They are completely on board. They have been doing this now for three or four years. I absolutely believe they are completely on board, and they are good.

All of Jackie’s responses confirmed her stated belief that field supervisors were competent and readily able to assess TCs in every feature of Standard Six.
Addressing and Assessing Teacher Candidates’ Professionalism

Overview. The preceding sections provide descriptions of all three SHAPE/CAEP accredited initial teacher preparation programs. Correspondingly, the following sections provide in-depth descriptions of the ways in which TCs’ professionalism is collectively addressed and assessed through overlapping course requirements for each program. Therefore, descriptions do not pertain to specific degree programs, as no apparent differences in the instructional strategies and assessment techniques utilized to teach and evaluate TCs’ professionalism existed between the three initial physical education teacher preparation programs at SVU. As Sean explained, “[T]he assessments that they do, and the portfolio stuff, and the student teaching stuff… apply to both [undergraduate and graduate] programs. So, we don’t touch on dispositions any differently.”

Addressing Standard 6.1. According to Jackie, the fundamental idea that all students can be physically educated individuals was a consistent ideology promoted throughout the physical education curriculum:

I think that we have the attitude that all students can be successful and that you need to teach to all students regardless of their ability, disability, gender, race, etc. The main focus for us is that we want to create as much of a positive and welcoming environment for all of our students. So, I really do believe that even with their field experiences, [TCs] get students, of course, that can be challenging, but I think [TCs] really do believe that they can meet the needs of all students, and all students can have the potential to be physically educated. And so, I think that’s probably a theme that can be seen across our program…

Correspondingly, the distribution of equitable feedback is a feature of Standard 6.1. Within the physical education curriculum at SVU, the concept of providing equitable feedback to students was addressed consistently throughout the six-course
methods/content block, which featured substantial field experiences (Table 10). For example, in the secondary methods/content grouping, Sean described how the importance of the provision of feedback was discussed before TCs first engaged in field experiences. Once out in the schools, TCs collected data on their teaching episodes. Besides completing feedback analyses, Sean explained, “[W]hen they get out into the field… [TCs] do pathways analyses to show themselves where in the gymnasium they are moving, [if] they are missing particular parts of the gymnasium, perhaps missing certain students.” After each field experience, TCs gathered as a group to reflect on the teachings, where instructors typically addressed the equitably of feedback distribution observed.

Table 10
Shady Valley University- Ways Standard 6.1 was Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Intro to PE</td>
<td>- Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Pathways Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Application of simplifications, extensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>during field experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td>- Lectures on concepts and theories related to motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Debriefing after field experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another aspect of 6.1 emphasizes lesson adaptations made by TCs to ensure the success of all students in a physical education class. The concept of lesson adaptations was also addressed regularly in the field-experience-based courses. Within the six-course block, TCs frequently participated in discussions focused on creating effective lesson plan formats and the importance of maximizing opportunities for all students. Sean asserted,
We make our students put in the modifications that they would make to each task, or the simplifications, and extensions so that they are challenging all students maximally, as high as they can. Early on in my [secondary] methods class I talk about theories of motivation and talk about flow, flow theory. The idea that providing tasks at the appropriate level is maximally motivating for students, for all students.

During debriefing sessions, conversations ensued regarding the ways TCs implemented various modifications, simplifications, and extensions in their teachings. Sean acknowledged that while TCs generally would become quite skilled at including adaptations in their lesson plans, they were typically less proficient when it came to incorporating the various modifications in their actual teaching episodes.

**Assessing Standard 6.1.** The components of professionalism which embody Standard 6.1 were assessed in several ways throughout the PETE curriculum (Table 11). On the initial questionnaire, Sean indicated TCs’ professional dispositions were assessed at various times by at least four individuals. During his interview, Sean expanded on this, describing how every teacher education program at SVU utilized the Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R). In relation to the Initial PETE Standards, the Candidate Dispositions Assessment contained three items which exemplified characteristics found in element one of Standard Six:

- (1.) Demonstrates a commitment to working with children, youth, and their families in developmentally appropriate ways.
- (7.) Accepts diverse learners and their needs.
- (8.) Adapts to differences among people including differences of SES, gender, age, ability, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, etc.

Concerning the provision of feedback, TCs documented and evaluated data in a variety of ways. For example, TCs throughout both the elementary and secondary blocks, numerous systematic observations were conducted on TCs’ teachings. During the seven
weeks of field experiences each semester, TCs were required to complete multiple forms of data collection and evaluation pertinent to Standard 6.1. Jackie reported, “[TCs] do a lot of systematic observation. They use the ALT-PE, we have a variety of feedback forms, monitoring, cues, a whole variety…. [TCs] go out and teach twice a week, and we have them do two or three per week.” Observations were completed in several ways, as Sean explained,

Either [TCs] fill it out themselves, or if they have it from video, they video record every lesson that they teach. Or, if they have a peer or a cooperating teacher who can help them out, they might do that, which saves them from having to do quite such an extensive review of the videotape in-between their teaching experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Intro to PE</td>
<td>- Candidate Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Self-observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Feedback Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Pathways Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- ALT- PE 2-3/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- edTPA Portfolio Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, TCs also conducted a thorough evaluation of feedback they provided during their student teaching practicum as part of the edTPA assessment. Required by all teacher education programs at the university, edTPA is a nationally available, performance-based, discipline-specific portfolio assessment designed to evaluate teaching quality (SCALE, 2015). Specifically, TCs must record and analyze the feedback given to three select students during one of their teaching episodes.

According to the edTPA Physical Education Assessment Handbook (SCALE, 2015), the three focus students should “represent the range of psychomotor competencies
within the class” (p. 8). Additionally, “At least one student must be a low-achieving student with respect to psychomotor skills” (SCALE, 2015, p. 8). While the evidence submitted by TCs for edTPA was not utilized in the CAEP accreditation process, characteristics of TCs’ work sample projects aligned with aspects of the Initial PETE Standard Six. In this case, the concentrated focus on feedback provided to students who characterized an array of skill levels, and more specifically the attention given to underperforming students, correlated closely to the part of Standard 6.1’s rubric which states “TC provides equal amounts of feedback to students regardless of skill level” (NASPE, 2008, p. 20).

Similar to the Candidate Dispositions Assessment, the SVU Student Teaching Assessment (Appendix S) was also employed by all teacher education programs at the university. Of the 35 elements which made up seven standards on the evaluation instrument, two elements included in Standard One corresponded with Initial PETE Standard 6.1, which were as follows:

- (1.2) Candidate utilizes knowledge of students’ abilities, talents, and prior knowledge to inform instruction in Physical Education.

- (1.3) Candidate establishes and clearly communicates high expectations and believes in the abilities of all students in Physical Education

The assessment was completed by field supervisors twice during the student teaching practicum. More information concerning the implementation of the Student Teaching Assessment may be found in the “Overview of Professionalism Assessments” section of SVU’s case description.

**Addressing 6.2.** The many components that characterized Standard 6.2 were addressed throughout the PETE program in a variety of ways (Table 12). When
considering how the PETE program approached element two, Jackie spoke first on the concept of professional collaboration and how faculty across the program strove to model such behaviors. She asserted, “[W]e really try to live that ourselves, in regard to the program, to ensure we work collaboratively.” Professional collaboration among faculty members was most apparent in how the content and methods courses were grouped together. Instead of two individual three-credit courses, the classes were combined to create a six-credit block where instructors co-taught the combined curriculum and oversaw the associated field experiences together.

Table 12
Shady Valley University - Ways Standard 6.2 was Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Modeling by PETE faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Opportunities for TC collaboration across coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- Promoting PD events/activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sharing/offering volunteer opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Inviting TCs to assist in faculty presentations at state conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PETE program covers cost of TCs’ registration at state convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PD addressed in course readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Exploration of physical education websites encouraged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Negative Socialization**
- No active PE Club

Collaboration was not just modeled for TCs, as they were also provided a variety of occasions to work together on group projects and assignments throughout the program. Jackie insisted, “They do a lot of collaborative work together.” Additionally, various volunteer experiences were made available for TCs to participate in with their peers. Activities ranged from university- and community-based functions to K-12 physical
education events such as a field day or an afterschool activity program. All voluntary activities announced or offered by the PETE program were preceded by a meeting where the programs’ expectations were communicated. Rachel explained the briefing process for events hosted in K-12 schools, “[O]nce I get a pool of [volunteers] then we have a conversation about what expectations are. I make sure the actual K-12 teachers are involved. They [also] provide the expectations of what is going to happen in the school, so it’s multilayered.” While TCs were encouraged to engage in volunteer work, the program did not mandate participation in such activities. Sean explained, “When [TCs] have volunteered, they are able to document those sort of things within their portfolios but… the experiences are beyond the program requirements.”

In addition to volunteering, Sean described participation in PD activities as another way the program engaged TCs in the profession and promoted collaboration, “[W]e give them professional development opportunities so they get opportunities to interact with teachers.” While some courses required PD attendance, all TCs in the program were encouraged to attend such activities. In fact, the PETE program paid registration fees for all TCs who attended the annual state convention. Rachel viewed such occasions as increasingly important for TCs, especially when considering the heightened emphasis on technology and its impact on TCs’ interpersonal interactions:

We have [TCs] go to our state conference… to come along with us. So, I feel like when they have those types of experiences, they are getting some of those opportunities to collaborate. And let’s face it, – certainly has changed even in the [time] I have been here. The more that we have social media and kids walking around with earbuds and kids texting and doing things with their phone… it’s more challenging for them. So, this is something that’s very important, even more so now than before, of making sure that we are providing them collaborative opportunities so that they know how to work with people. (Jackie)
Faculty attendance and involvement in PD events, like the state SHAPE convention, were also seen as a positive way to model and promote aspects of Standard 6.2:

Faculty present, although I’ll confess that I haven’t for couple years, and often [TCs] will help faculty with their presentations. It’s a great way to model, and also to help build confidence for [TCs] that they not only can be teachers, but they can be contributors to the profession in a bigger way. (Sean)

Besides the state convention, the program consistently shared information about larger professional development activities and workshops, including the national SHAPE convention. While attendance was encouraged, there was not an obligation for TCs to take part in the SHAPE America convention, due to a of the lack of financial assistance available to help offset the cost of registration and travel expenses,

Really, it’s more the expense of the national convention. Whether it’s a drive or flight, registration is more, the conference last longer, so the hotel rooms cost more, and we don’t have the funds to be able to cover that. So, we’re happy for students to be able to go if they can afford it, but we are not in the position really where we feel like we can mandate it. (Sean)

In addition to participation in state and national conferences, PETE faculty also encouraged TCs to peruse SHAPE affiliated websites to identify further professional development opportunities and resources. Similarly, most textbooks or required readings utilized in the program had chapters or sections devoted to professional development, making it a consistent topic addressed throughout the curriculum.

Regarding the availability of relevant student organizations on campus, Sean referenced the slow decline and eventual discontinuation of SVU’s PE club, “We launched one a few years ago, and it was honestly like pulling teeth, just to get students to [participate]. It dwindled in the program, and it became not worth it.” Many potential
explanations for the club’s deterioration were offered, including lack of leadership among TCs, and the number of TCs who worked and/or commuted to campus:

We had one specific [TC] who wanted to take this on and organize it, but even she found it hard work to get [other TCs] there. For the most part, our students commute, or they are working in the evenings, so it was just very difficult to find time to get students together in a way that would really foster a PE club…. Rightly or wrongly, for better or for worse, we decided to pull the plug on it just because things weren’t getting done, there was a core of maybe half a dozen students and they kept saying, “Yeah, we’re going to try and organize stuff”, but things just didn’t get done. (Sean)

The vitality of the organization typically centered around one dedicated TC who volunteered to lead, but struggled in the absence of strong student leadership from year to year:

It honestly relied on whoever was president at the time, it was typically, someone would step up to be president and be gung ho about it, and it was hard work for them to get other people to these things and once you lost that one person someone else needed to step up and take it by the scruff of the neck, and it just didn’t work. (Sean)

PETE faculty members were willing to sponsor the club, but Sean explained how, as Program Coordinator, he didn’t feel comfortable making it an additional burden for another faulty member. He recalled, “The idea was that it was going to be a student club, student run, student led and if it couldn’t survive under those circumstances then maybe it was something that we didn’t need” (Pascal). Thus, the PE club had remained inactive for at least 3 years.

Assessing 6.2. At SVU, a few places in the PETE curriculum required participation in professional development opportunities, and two of the three identified assessments included items which required documentation of collaboration and/or participation in PD to achieve satisfactory rating. Thus, there were multiple ways TCs were held accountable for achievement of Standard 6.2 (Table 13). The identified
documents which assessed aspects of element two consisted of the Secondary Methods Portfolio, the Student Teaching Assessment, and Candidate Dispositions Assessment.

Attendance at the state convention was tied to course expectations for the elementary methods/content block and student teaching practicums in the Fall semester, since the annual state convention always took place during the last few months of the year. As Sean explained,

We don’t insist that they go until they are at least in the methods block. We have had some students who go earlier, and we do talk about it with freshman and sophomore and juniors, but we don’t insist that they go. In large part, it would mean them having to miss a bunch of other courses as well and might put them a little bit behind, particularly with it being the end of the semester and finals week coming up.

While the convention schedule typically included a variety of sessions offered over the course of a day and a half, the expectation was, at minimum, TCs attended one full day. The proximity and timing of the convention, along with the financial assistance provided to TCs out of a program fund to attend the convention gave faculty reason to believe the attendance expectation was fair and appropriate:

We cover their registration for the conference… It’s a Thursday and half of Friday, so we say you have to and attend on Thursday. We feel justified in doing that because they would be with us in classes for half of Thursday anyway, so they are not missing too much of our courses. So, we say you have to come on Thursday, we’ll cover your registration… (Sean)

Table 13
Shady Valley University- Ways Standard 6.2 was Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td>-Elementary methods course requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>-Secondary Methods Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>-Student Teaching Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Candidate Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was estimated 15-20 TCs attended the annual state convention each of the previous two years. Due to the mandatory attendance requirement for those enrolled in elementary methods and student teaching during the Fall semester, there had been very few instances of TCs not fulfilling the expectation. As Sean recalled, “In fact, the only one I can remember, there was one [TC] who was asking the question about whether she really had to go, and then the morning of I got an email from her saying…I think it was childcare, and that she wasn’t able to come.”

The Secondary Methods Portfolio (Appendix T) included two items which corresponded to Initial PETE Standard 6.2:

- (6a.) Teachers collaborate and communicate with students, parents, other educators, administrators and the community to support student learning.

- (7a.) Teachers assume responsibility for engaging in continuous, purposeful professional development.

The required artifact for element 6a could have been evidence of communication with parents, while documentation of involvement in professional organizations were the required artifacts for element 7a. More information concerning the implementation of the Secondary Methods Portfolio may be found in the “Overview of Professionalism Assessments” section of SVU’s case description.

Another assessment identified by faculty to include components of Standard 6.2 was the Student Teaching Assessment (Appendix S). Similar the Secondary Methods Portfolio assessment, the rubric was based on the state standards, which were also strongly influenced by the INTASC standards. The assessment rubric identified how each element corresponded with the 2008 NASPE Initial PETE Standards. Thus, the following rubric categories indicated strong alignment with Standard 6.2:
- (2.5) Candidate connects content to relevant life experiences of students and career opportunities in Physical Education

- (3.4) Candidate collaborates and communicates student progress with students, parents, and colleagues.

- (6.2) Candidate effectively communicates student learning with parents and care givers.

- (6.3) Candidate collaborates with cooperating candidates and other educators at the school/district/university.

- (6.4) Candidate collaborates effectively with the local community and community agencies, to promote a positive environment for student learning.

- (7.3) Candidate seeks opportunities to impact the quality of teaching, making school improvements, and increasing student achievement.

Similar the Secondary Methods Portfolio, the Student Teaching Assessment was also utilized as an artifact in SVU’s last PETE reaccreditation report in 2014. One other item on the Student Teaching Assessment document, element 7.2, was listed as having alignment with Initial PETE Standard 6.3. However, the element most strongly aligned with Initial PETE Standard 6.2:

- (7.2) Candidate takes responsibility or engaging in continuous purposeful professional development.

More information concerning the implementation of the Student Teaching Assessment may be found in the “Overview of Professionalism Assessments” section of SVU’s case description.

The final assessment which included aspects of 6.2 was the Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R). While four courses were designated to include the Candidate Dispositions Assessment, all PETE instructor had the ability to fill out the rubric at any point if it was deemed necessary to document a dispositional issue with a
particular TC. One of the 27 items listed on the rubric which corresponded directly with Standard 6.2:

- (23.) Works collaboratively with parents, colleagues, and professionals.

Jackie perceived collaboration to be an important disposition which could be progressively developed throughout TCs’ time in the program, especially when they started to spend more time out in field experiences:

We talk about the importance of developing relationships with these mentor teachers, but [also] these K-12 teachers and administrators, because pretty soon, sooner than they think, they are going to be looking for a job, and they want those people to remember who they are, based on their teaching on the gym floor, but also their behaviors and their attitudes.

A TC who received a “needs improvement” rating on any one of the 27 items was then required to create a disposition plan to remediate the identified issue. However, if an item did not apply to dispositions addressed in the course, an instructor may select a rating of “unknown”. Additional information concerning the Candidate Dispositions Assessment can be found in the “Overview of Professionalism Assessments” section of SVU’s case description.

Addressing 6.3. The third element of Standard Six addressed several different aspects of professional ethics, including appropriate attire, maintaining confidentiality, equitable treatment of students, fostering respectful environments, and maintaining professional relationships. The PETE faculty at SVU approached each component in a variety of ways (Table 14). As a whole, Sean believed all aspects of Standard 6.3 were consistently modeled for TCs throughout their time in the program:

I would like to think that it is modeled in the way that we teach, and again I think this is an advantage of having full-time faculty teaching…for years and years when I taught human performance course, and [another tenured faculty member] taught a fundamental movement course for quite a number of years, as did my
full-time colleagues. So, we teach those courses so I think we model things like
dress, we model things like communication and skills. We’ve modeled equitable
treatment and that type of thing, respect for each other and we would like to think we lived the curriculum.

Despite not being explicitly outlined in the rubric description for Standard 6.3, the concept of timeliness and promptness was an area of professional ethics Jackie spoke about at length. She described how her current group of TCs tended to struggle with such dispositions quite a bit, attributing it to a lack of accountability in their lives in general, and more specifically in the earlier PETE courses:

I just think that, in general, some of the students are bit laissez-faire, because they aren’t being held accountable. Certainly, we have high expectations here and we certainly hold them accountable, but for this generation of [TCs], they’ve gotten a pass a lot. Even in our first initial courses like the intro course, and our content-based courses, that if they arrived late they get docked a couple of points. But then all of a sudden, they come to methods and it’s, “You are a professional, and we are looking at professional behaviors.” So, they struggle being on time, they struggle really thinking for themselves…. It’s just about the promptness, it’s just about the timeliness, about taking responsibility for themselves. (Jackie)

Jackie also discussed instances of some TCs exhibiting a noticeable lack of regard for personal responsibility during the initial stages of the program. She concluded, “[O]nce they are licensed PE teachers, for some of them it’s a shocker. It is a shocker for them and they have to grow up rather quickly. So, I think that’s what I’m seeing right now in the last couple batches of [TCs]” (Jackie).

Although appropriate professional behavior is not specifically referenced in the Initial PETE rubric description, it was another area of professional ethics addressed by both SVU faculty members. Sean explained, “We just initiated a document about not drinking when we go to a convention because of a couple issues that came up.” The document, which Rachel described as a “positive dispositions contract” was implemented
in an attempt to curb the prevalence of alcohol-related issues among TCs at professional development events:

I am tired of being embarrassed, or getting the title of “Oh, the SVU students are the partiers.” So, this Fall… we talked to the [TCs] and we actually had them sign contracts before they went [to the state convention] to make sure that they were displaying positive dispositions and what that means: just because you are of legal [drinking] age doesn’t mean that you can go party, and the way that that looks around other professionals. So, that’s certainly something that we have addressed.

Table 14
*Shady Valley University- Ways Standard 6.3 was Addressed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Intro to PE</td>
<td>- Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Course expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Modeling by faculty, GTAs and cooperating teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Review of Positive Dispositions Contract (for conferences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td>- Review of Candidate Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Negative Socialization**

- Lack of accountability (attendance) in initial PETE courses
- Impact of social media on expectations for maintaining confidentiality and professional relationships

In addition to having TCs sign a contract, faculty also reviewed the Candidate Dispositions Assessment with TCs prior to the convention to reinforce expectations. As Jackie recalled, “[W]e talk so much in regard to professionalism early on because …we talk about how they are not just representing themselves but SVU and the SVU PE program, especially when we go to state conferences, and we all go together.” In the same way, TCs were challenged to consider their “online professional presence”, as “there certainly have been [TCs] who have been turned away from student teaching
placements because what is on their social media, and so we started talking about that early on” (Jackie).

Regarding professional dress, TCs consistently encountered PETE faculty and cooperating teachers who modeled appropriate teaching attire. Within the PETE program, SVU warms ups and/or a polo shirt were considered proper dress for teachers in physical education settings. Sean felt confident Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) also upheld the program’s expectations concerning professional dress, as it was modeled for them during initial co-teaching situation with faculty members, which usually occurred before they were assigned a course to instruct on their own. He insisted, “[GTAs] have got a pretty good understanding as what it is to dress like a physical educator” (Sean).

Similarly, Sean believed proper attire was often observed by TCs in field experiences because the program had so many alumni in their pool of cooperating teachers, “Fortunately, we are able to often put our field experience students with our graduates, so they understand the requirements of the program.” However, it was acknowledged not all alumni turned out to be model teachers,

We know that some are better than others. You know, there are one or two of my graduates that I would not place my student teachers with. There are people who squeak through our program, but I would say the majority of our graduates are pretty confident, are doing a good job, and I’m ok sending our students to them. (Sean)

When engaging in conversations with TCs about the importance of professional dress, Sean described the following scenario:

I’ve been able to address it from the standpoint of, “If you were a student, what would you be thinking looking at this guy?” and they understand, they get it. And we talk about that, the first step to being accepted as a teacher is looking like a teacher. If you look like a gym rat, that’s how they’re going to treat you.
Maintaining confidentiality was another aspect of professional ethics consistently addressed throughout the PETE program. For example, when TCs collected data for different purposes, they were given specific instructions regarding expectations related to standards of privacy,

[W]hen we have discussions with [TCs], we have debriefings all the time after they go out in schools. We only allow them to use first names for anything that has documentation. They can either use first names, or first initial, or they just don’t utilize the name at all, even for the edTPA stuff. I make sure that they come up with the pretend school name, pretend cooperating teacher name, and they can only use first names that are not identifiable. So, we really try to keep confidentiality when it comes to [K-12] students. (Jackie)

Similarly, many conversations took place with TCs regarding how to handle shared information, whether the source was from a cooperating teacher or a student. TCs were presented with various scenarios, such as, “[Y]ou’re going to go out in schools and [cooperating] teachers are going to share information about some students potentially, and maybe they shouldn’t …[Y]ou have to keep that to yourself” (Jackie). At the same time, TCs were alerted of circumstances when it was necessary to break confidentiality to ensure the welfare of a student. Jackie communicated to TCs, “[I]f you’re in a situation where a student says X, Y, and Z, how are you going to handle that? You obviously have the cooperating teacher, so you can go to that person.”

In recent years, when PETE faculty at SVU addressed the importance of maintaining the confidentiality of K-12 students, many discussions around social media ensued. The expectations surrounding social media was perceived to be quite confusing for TCs, especially when they had seen pictures of students posted on the school’s social media sites. Jackie reiterated a conversation she had during the previous semester where she told a TC,
I understand the school district has a Twitter page and they want you to tweet through the school twitter account. That’s one thing because parents and guardians have given you permission, but you cannot go and take pictures of your teaching with students in there and upload it to Snapchat, Instagram, Facebook, Twitter, etc. that is not appropriate at all.

When considering how an atmosphere of respect and equitable treatment was promoted within the program, Sean believed many of the content and methods courses facilitated and cultivated such environments, thus allowing TCs to “live the curriculum”. He expanded, “[W]e have our [TCs] in Sport Education and we talk about the importance of respect within teams, respect between teams…. So, we like to think that we model [the dispositions] and we enable students to live it through the way that we run some of those courses.” Once TCs started engaging in field experiences, they may have seen teaching behaviors on both side of the spectrum, some positive, and some less than ideal. Due to the program’s emphasis on reflection, TCs were able to identify and discern the effectiveness of different situations they observed while out in schools,

[TCs] are able to be quite critical, sometimes over-critical actually. Sometimes I have to remind them, “Look we are not out there every day, we’re not out there all day, every day dealing with the same stuff, so let’s be a little bit understanding.” But sometimes there are things you can’t be understanding about, when one teacher spends all of his time leaving feedback to a small group of students and ignoring the rest. You can’t defend that. (Sean)

Of all the aspects of professional ethics addressed in Standard 6.3, the concept of maintain professional relationships with students in and out of the school setting seemed to be one of the most challenging expectations for TCs to navigate. Rachel stressed the impact she believed online social networking had on TCs’ and how they approached interactions with K-12 students,

Social media the last [several years] has skyrocketed and so has the level of ethics. When [TCs] are student teaching I say, “Listen, if you are teaching a high school, you may only be a couple years older than your students.” So, we talk
about what it means to be friendly, versus friends, not sharing emails and phone numbers and things like that. (Jackie)

Conversations addressing what it meant to maintain appropriate interactions with K-12 students occurred early and often throughout the PETE program. Faculty consistently expressed to TCs, “[W]e want you to develop rapport with students without a doubt. Yet, you are professional now, you are not their friend, you are not the same age as them, you are not in the same circumstances.”

Assessing 6.3. Many of the same rubrics which were being used to assess components of 6.1 and 6.2 also included items related to characteristics of professional ethics found in element three (Table 15). Such documents included the Candidate Dispositions Assessment, the Secondary Portfolio, and the Student Teaching assessment. The Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R), which is completed by instructors across five courses in the PETE curriculum, included the following items corresponded with Standard 6.3:

- (3.) Treats university faculty, colleagues, parents, and students fairly, equitably, and respectfully.

- (9.) Maintains confidentiality about student records unless disclosure serves a professionally compelling purpose or required by law.

- (10.) Demonstrate discretion when discussing colleagues, faculty, field sites, and personal information.

- (19.) Projects an appropriate professional appearance and demeanor in professional settings.

- (26.) Establishes and maintains mutually respectful interactions.

- (27.) Understands ethical standards.

As mentioned in the previous section, Jackie and Sean both spoke about the “positive dispositions contract”, a document first implemented before the 2016 state
SHAPE convention. In addition to the contract, faculty also spent time reviewing the Candidate Dispositions Assessment, specifically citing item 19, which assessed TCs’ demeanor in professional settings. Jackie explained, “[W]e have the [Candidate Dispositions] Assessment as well, and so we took that out, and we talk to the [TCs] and we actually have them sign contracts before they went to make sure that they are displaying positive dispositions.”

Table 15
Shady Valley University- Ways Standard 6.3 was Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Intro to PE</td>
<td>- Positive Dispositions Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Candidate Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Secondary Methods Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Student Teaching Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Negative Socialization                       | - Lack of inter-rater reliability between instructors on Candidate Dispositions Assessment |

Many dispositions related to professional ethics, such as timeliness and responsibility, were not only discussed, but also assessed in several places throughout the program. While the characteristics identified by PETE faculty were not explicitly outlined in the rating description for Standard 6.3, they do fit into the element statement concerning professional ethics provided by NASPE (2008). As such, TCs were held accountable for demonstrating appropriate attitudes and behaviors related to professional ethics. Found within the “Work Ethic” section of Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R), corresponding items included:

- (14.) Attends all class meetings and clinical experiences
- (15.) Demonstrates punctuality
- (26.) Completes work in a timely manner.

Again, the rubric was not specific to PETE, but was an assessment utilized across all teacher education programs at the university. For more information on the implementation on the Candidate Dispositions Assessment, please refer back to the “Overview of Professionalism Assessments” section.

Within the Secondary Methods Portfolio (Appendix T), one isolated item corresponded with Standard 6.3:

- (6.3) Teachers understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of conduct.

The corresponding artifact to the item was a satisfactory Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R). Thus, the TC had up to three completed assessments to utilize as evidence. However, Jackie perceived there to be a lack of inter-rater reliability among the instructors of courses in which the dispositions assessment was completed, “We have a wide variety of people, and with our dispositions assessments…I don’t think there’s any form of consistency whatsoever.” She believed the rubric played a “really minimal role” and was used more as a “check-off point” for accreditation purposes in most courses until the last practicum experience:

I really do believe that the university supervisors do a very nice job with the dispositions, and they really spend time with the student teachers, but before that I really don’t feel like time is really spent with [TCs] on it. It’s like, “Yeah, take a look at this.” Now it doesn’t mean that we don’t teach about stuff in regard to dispositions. We absolutely do, and I’m sure if we went and showed the [TCs], “Here is what the [Candidate] Dispositions Assessment is, this is what we’re talking about,” there would be a lot of correlation there. However, there is not a lot of, “Okay here’s the assessment, here’s what we’re talking about.” There’s not that type of connection I don’t think until the very end of the program. (Jackie)
Within the Student Teaching Assessment (Appendix S), there were three items listed on the rubric that were identified by the PETE program as aligning with Standard 6.3:

- (7.1) Candidate understands, upholds, and follows professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.

- (7.3) Candidate seeks opportunities to impact the quality of teaching, making school improvement, and increasing student achievement.

As previously noted, one other item on the Student Teaching Assessment document, item 7.2, was listed as having alignment with Initial PETE Standard 6.3. However, the item most strongly aligned with Initial PETE Standard 6.2:

- (7.2) Candidate takes responsibility or engaging in continuous purposeful professional development.

Additional information concerning the implementation of the Student Teaching Assessment, can be found in “Overview of Professionalism Assessments” section of SVU’s case description.

Addressing 6.4. Sean believed Initial PETE Standard 6.4 was addressed mostly through modeling and teachable moments in field experience courses like elementary methods and adapted physical education, rather than specific assignments or projects (Table 16). For example, when discussing the implementation of standards-based assessments during field experiences in the methods/content blocks, the concept of assessing respect for others through personal and social responsibility grades was highlighted. He maintained, “Some of the elementary schools that [TCs] go into are actually quite diverse, so they get to talk about English language learners. The Adapted course I think helps with that too because [TCs] get field experiences with students with special needs” (Sean). Jackie, on the other hand, didn’t believe the narrow scope of these inclusive experiences were enough to cultivate cultural responsiveness in TCs,
Yes, we want to have the inclusive environment, [TCs] can articulate that at a surface level. Do they get an adapted PE course? They do, and so I think when they look at ability and disabilities that would be what they come up to, but in regard to gender, and race, ethnicity, and SES and all that, unless they are having me they are not getting that very much.

When discussing culturally responsive teaching approaches, Sean cited Jackie as the primary professor who made an intentional effort to emphasize such practices with TCs. He described a recent class where she had introduced the cultural studies curriculum model to TCs in the secondary methods/content block. Jackie echoed his view point, maintaining cultural responsiveness was truly only emphasized within the courses she taught,

When they’re with me they get it and when they’re not with me they don’t get it… I do a lot in regard to teaching them from the intro class on about culturally responsive teaching, to what cultural diversity, cultural competency, cultural humility is, about social identities and about them exploring their own identities and how it is infused in every single class that I teach… I’m the only one that truly teaches that specifically.

Table 16
*Shady Valley University- Ways Standard 6.4 was Addressed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Intro to PE</td>
<td>- Modeling/Teachable moments in field experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Social Identity paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Socio-cultural journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Discussions after field experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Socialization</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Only emphasized in courses taught by Jackie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In recent years, Jackie had developed multiple assignments specifically addressing socio-cultural issues. For example, TCs in Jackie and Sean’s secondary methods/content block
wrote a social identity paper at the beginning of the semester. The purpose of the social identity paper was:

[T]o get them to explore themselves first and try to understand where they are privileged or potentially oppressed or marginalized, and how their identity, their philosophy, their experiences will influence them as a teacher and how they have to work through that [because] they’re going to work with a wide variety of people, not just the students, but with colleagues, etc. (Jackie)

Jackie believed the best way to teach cultural awareness was to “create opportunities for [TCs] to have these experiences and to break down some barriers, and where it has to start with is the self.”

Similarly, TCs in same course were required to keep a socio-cultural journal. Starting from the first day they set foot in the schools, Jackie asked them to reflect on their experiences as part of their grade in the course, “What did you hear? What did you see? What did you hear from the students, from the teachers, etc.?” Then, she explained, “I had [the journal entries] included as part of their midterm and final grades, so they can actually critique some of the scenarios that have happened” (Jackie). Many of the discussions thereafter stemmed from issues TCs observed in schools or wrote about in the journal assignment. For example, Sean recalled a recent discussion that occurred after a secondary methods course,

[W]hen we went out for one field experience this week the male and female teachers split the students up by boys and girls, because the girls had to finish up the fitness assessment. So, we talked about the appropriateness of that, and why it might have been done and why it might not have been needed to be done. So, we certainly make them aware of that…. We see something, and then we come back on our campus and we meet and debrief about our observations and we talk about that.

As someone who intentionally focused on social-cultural issues in her teaching and research, Jackie asserted, “I try to [expose] the different layers [of culturally responsive
teaching approaches] to try to educate [TCs] to go beyond awareness. That is ultimately what my goal is, to go beyond awareness.”

**Assessing 6.4.** As mentioned in the previous section, Jackie deliberately implemented assignments focused on culturally responsive teaching approaches, which subsequently impacted TCs’ grades. However, the assignments did not test TCs’ knowledge, but were more often presented as reflective prompts designed to encourage TCs to recognize and critically analyze the role cultural issues played in a physical education environment. Jackie perceived the assignments as extremely beneficial as TCs, and even other instructors, often had a difficult time making connections between cultural sensitivity and quality teaching practices, “I’m trying to teach [TCs] that, sure it can’t be a one size fits all, not everyone has the same identities because we’re not all the same people. That’s really difficult for my colleagues, never mind my own [TCs].” Concerning her emphasis on such topics and the ultimate impact it had on TCs’ perspectives, Jackie stated, “It’s interesting because I focus a lot of my work on socio-cultural issues in my research, and certainly my teaching. This semester I did this activity and [the TCs] looked at each other and were like, ‘We are rather similar.’”

In addition to the assignments Jackie included in the courses she taught, there were three rubrics utilized within the program that captured components of Standard 6.4: the Candidate Dispositions Assessment, the Secondary Methods Portfolio, and the Student Teaching Assessment (Table 17). The Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R) included the following items related to element four of Initial PETE Standard Six:

- (8.) Adapts to differences among people including differences of SES, gender, age, ability, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, etc.
- (11.) Respects the points of view of others.
- (20.) Demonstrates appropriate verbal and nonverbal communication.

Even though all the items embodied Standard 6.4 of the Initial PETE Standards, they were categorized in different sections of the Candidate Dispositions Assessment. Thus, items 8 and 11 were in the “Professionalism” section, while item 20 was found in the “Personal Qualities” section. More information regarding the implementation of the assessment can be found in the “Overview of Professionalism Assessments” segment.

Within the Secondary Methods Portfolio (Appendix T), one element corresponded with Standard 6.4:

- (5a.) Teachers treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.

The rubric descriptions addressed TCs ability utilize effective and appropriate communication skills to promote a positive learning environment, which were also key features of element four. The corresponding artifacts for item 5a included a narrative related to Video A, instructional materials, and a lesson plan. Video A was a 5-10-minute segment of a middle school teaching experience which highlighted the learning environment of a TC’s physical education class.

Table 17
_Shady Valley University- Ways Standard 6.4 was Assessed_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Intro to PE</td>
<td>- Assignments created by Jackie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Candidate Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Secondary Methods Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Student Teaching Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the Student Teaching Assessment (Appendix S), two items were identified within the rubric description as corresponding with Initial PETE Standard 6.4:

- (1.4) Candidate conveys knowledge of and respect for the cultural heritage, cultural experiences, and language skills of students in Physical Education.

- (6.1) Candidate communicates clearly and effectively.

Assessments were completed by both university supervisors and cooperating teachers at both student teaching placements. However, only scores from university supervisors were reported and utilized as assessment data for the CAEP report. More information regarding the implementation of the Student Teaching Assessment can be found in the Overview of Professionalism Assessments section.

**Ridgeview Heights University**

**Case Description**

**Institution profile.** Ridgeview Heights University (RHU) is a public institution of higher education located in the Southeastern United States. Chartered a little over 50 years ago, Ridgeview Heights had an overall enrollment of approximately 32,000 undergraduate students and almost 3,000 graduate students. The institution offered over 150 degrees across ten colleges, with the most popular majors including: business, education, computer sciences and social sciences. The university employed approximately 990 full-time and 780 part-time faculty and had a student-to-faculty ratio of 21 to 1. Like the other institutions, Ridgeview Heights was accredited through NCATE, first achieving its national accredited status in 1983.

**Participant profiles.** As a self-proclaimed “teacher educator at heart”, Pascal had spent the last 15 years working in physical education teacher education programs. With the bulk of his teaching occurring at the college level, his specialties included elementary
methods and Adapted Physical Education. As the PETE coordinator at RHU, Pascal had strong knowledge of the various ways TCs’ professionalism was addressed and assessed within the program.

Anthony, a Clinical Assistant Professor in the PETE program, spent 5 years teaching Adapted physical education in K-12 public schools before joining the faculty at RHU almost a decade ago. In addition to teaching a combination of courses within the PETE curriculum, he was also serving as the Field Experience Coordinator. His typical course load included tactical skills and games classes, as well as practicum courses such as secondary methods and student teaching.

**Program profile.** According to Pascal, the undergraduate PETE program was one of the original programs offered by the institution when first established. Pascal explained, “We were one of the original programs the university when it started 50+ years ago…. [RHU] started off as a teaching college, and it still has a deep legacy of sending out quality teachers.” The institution offered a P-12 licensure program in Health and Physical Education, which was one of two undergraduate majors and two minors offered in the department. There were four tenured faculty members with terminal degrees who taught in the PETE program and three lecturers/clinical instructors. Pascal described the make-up of the faculty as “a good mix of practical experience and academic experience…[M]ost of our lecturers have K-12 experience and have come from that situation, where the professors have more of an academic background.” Anthony believed the combination of expertise and experiences to be beneficial, as tenured faculty were routinely paired with lecturers in a co-teaching situation for methods and practicum courses.
**Teacher candidate profile.** Anthony described TCs enrolled in the PETE program as racially diverse with a variety of backgrounds in athletics and physical activity. He estimated there to be a 3 to 1 male to female ratio, with very few TCs outside of the traditional 18-22 age range. Likewise, Pascal perceived there to be fewer nontraditional students in the program compared to previous years, “[W]e still have probably two or three every year that come in who are nontraditional students in a group of 15 or 20, so probably 10% are nontraditional, and that number seems to be falling.” When considering potential explanations for the shift, Pascal expounded, “We are getting more people… because RHU is now a first choice [university] rather than a last chance school. So, we are seeing a lot more kids come out of high school directly into our programs.” Similarly, Anthony attested, “This University I would qualify now as more of a destination university. We have more students who live on campus or live close to campus. I think historically it has been more of a commuter university, but that has changed significantly.”

Despite the limited number of individuals in PETE who pursued coaching minors, Anthony estimated up to half the male TCs who initially enrolled in the program were primarily focused on coaching athletics, rather than teaching physical education,

Typically, they’ll come in with the desire to be a coach first and foremost…You know, [I ask], “Why do you want to be in physical education?”’ and the first words out of their mouth are, “I want to coach.”’…I think the one thing we struggle with there is trying to promote quality physical education….and sometimes they, the males that just want to be coaches, will kind of [discount] all that we’re talking about with quality instruction because they just want to go out and coach. They just want to be on a particular court, or a particular field and specialize in coaching that sport and “all this teaching stuff is, that’s for somebody else.”

However, many of the TCs who initially focused on coaching graduated from the program with a fresh excitement and respect for physical education,
We also see that evolution when they come in saying, “I’m going to be a high school football coach” and by the time they leave the program they’re saying, “I want to be an elementary PE teacher, this is awesome!” …. That’s where we see a real dynamic change in some of our majors, where they come in with that attitude, but by the time they go out, they get it. They understand what their role is, as a teacher first, and then as a coach.

Admissions requirements. Prior to admission to the teacher preparation program through the College of Education, applicants required to complete a background check. To be considered for admission for the teacher education program, an individual must have completed 45 hours of required coursework, have a cumulative grade point average of 2.75 or better, pass a Basic Skills Test and complete an Ethics exam. In addition to the criteria for admission to the institution’s teacher education program, the health and physical education licensure program also required potential TCs to submit an admission application outlining the following supplementary criteria: three faculty recommendations, satisfactory grades in majors’ courses, and acceptable evaluations on professional dispositions evaluations completed in PETE courses. Individuals interested in applying to the program were also required to submit a personal narrative describing their motivation for entering teacher education by emphasizing relevant teaching-related experiences. Additionally, applicants needed to provide documentation outlining their personal participation and contribution to professional activities related to physical education.

Program overview. While exact numbers on program enrollment were difficult to determine, Pascal estimated, “[If] we put down the number of PETE interests and students who are already admitted to the program, it's likely around 150.” Anthony believed the actual number of students enrolled in PETE Professional Education courses to be somewhere between 30 to 40 students. The program utilized a cohort model, with
acceptance into the PETE cohort occurring once a year, in the Fall semester. As students were typically admitted into the program starting in the Fall semester of their Junior year, each cohort of TCs went through a specific course sequence as a group.

**Curriculum overview.** TCs seeking to complete the physical education and health licensure program had to complete 127 credit hours, plus University-Wide requirements. The program credits were split into multiple divisions. Following the general education requirements, lower division requirements included courses focused on topics such as historical perspectives and contemporary issues in PE/Health and First Aid/CPR. Upper division requirements included credits in PETE Core and Professional Skills. The PETE Core was comprised of a number of discipline-specific courses such as exercise physiology and biomechanics exclusively for PETE majors. As Pascal explained, “[W]e took some of the science courses in-house to be more specialized for our majors.” The specialization of such content had the potential to make presented information more applicable, and thus more meaningful for students (Wiegand, Bulger, & Mohr, 2004). Professional Skills courses covered a variety of physical education content and were typically taught in the co-teaching situation described earlier.

The PETE program required majors to apply for admission to both the departmental program and the teacher preparation program through the College of Education in order to begin coursework in the Professional Education sequence. Once students were admitted to the program, they completed the Professional Education requirements, which included courses in elementary, secondary and health methods, assessment and measurements, and clinical field experiences, which included a year-long student teaching practicum. Pascal described the practicum experience, stating,
The idea was to get students immersed for a full-year into a school setting, so we have just recently gotten permission to change that a little more toward the typical student teaching model where the students will go out for one day a week in the fall semester to one school, then remain in that same school, for … the final spring semester like a [traditional] student teaching semester.

Overview of Professionalism
Assessments

Within the PETE program, three main rubrics were identified as assessments used to evaluate aspects of NASPE Initial PETE Standard Six: the PETE Dispositions Rubric, the State Performance Standards Assessment (SPSA) document (pseudonym), and the edTPA assessment. Data from each document with the exception of edTPA were used as artifacts in the program’s most recent CAEP accreditation review. The remainder of this section describes each of the identified documents, as they will be referenced throughout the chapter.

PETE Dispositions Rubric. Within the current structure of the program, TCs’ professionalism was assessed by as many as eight different people via the PETE Dispositions Rubric (Appendix U):

Every class [TCs] take in [PETE], the instructors are required to fill out a dispositions Excel spreadsheet. There are items like attendance, class participation, communication. So, we have [multiple] items we look for in terms of professional dispositions that we believe teachers should have. Every class that our [TCs] take, they will be given grades basically in all of these components. So, it really is an inherent part of our program, we look at professional attitudes from the very beginning, including beginner activities courses. (Pascal)

Typically, TCs did not see the scores they received on the PETE Dispositions Rubric in any given course unless they received a rating of marginal (Level Two/ L-2) or unacceptable (Level One/ L-1) on any item. Anthony noted, “Dispositions [Rubrics] are in place to pinpoint students who are a problem.” All disposition records were stored in an electronic database, which flagged a TC in the system if they received a score below
Level Three (L-3) on any of the 10 items. As Pascal explained, “If it's [L-3] or above, it's where they need to be…but if it's something below a [L-3], it's an indicator that something might be wrong, so we start digging deeper into it with the student and the [course instructor].”

Receiving L-2 or L-1 rating on even a single rubric item prompted different formal remedial actions to occur:

L-2 might just be a letter to them to let [the TC] know, “Hey, we are keeping track of this. If it continues to be a problem, we will take this a step further in terms of a formal remediation.” If it's an L-1, there's automatically a formal remediation, where we sit down and draw up a contract.

In situations where TCs received an L-1 rating, a formal remediation plan was developed by the course instructor, PETE coordinator, TCs’ academic advisor, and TC for the following semester. According to the letter of concern (Appendix V) sent to a TC following an L-1 rating, “Candidates cannot progress in the program until the remediation plan is completed and disposition concerns are effectively addressed.”

The PETE Dispositions Rubric was first created after an appeal concerning a dispositional issue with a TC made it all the way to the President of the university:

When you have had to deal with students who say, “I didn't do anything wrong”, and then they take it up the chain of command up through the University and it finally gets to legal, you make sure you have a plan like this in place. That was many years ago when I first got here, and it turned into a fiasco so we just decided we are going to nip that in the bud. As long as you backup everything and have evidence for the process, then usually you stop that from going so far. (Pascal)

Since the PETE Dispositions Rubric had been in place, appeals related to dispositional issues rarely made it past the departmental level. The format and contents of the rubric was adopted from a dispositions assessment article (Wayda & Lund, 2005) written prior to the publication of the 2008 Initial PETE Standards. Thus, weak alignment between
rubric items and corresponding category descriptions with the NASPE Initial PETE Standard Six could be observed. In essence, the categories included on the rubric focused more on the dispositions of TCs as university students (i.e. in-class performance; class preparation; group work; emotional control/responsibility) instead of addressing dispositions expected of those taking on the role of teachers (i.e. class atmosphere; interactions with K-12 students, parents, administrators).

**Student Performance Standards Assessment.** Another rubric utilized by RHU’s PETE program, the SPSA document (Appendix W), was a modified version of the state-wide evaluation tool utilized by K-12 principals to assess in-service teachers:

> It's a candidate assessment instrument and it looks at things like planning, professional knowledge, differentiated instruction. So, when our cooperating teachers are grading or assessing our candidates they are using a similar document. It's like a… light [in-service assessment rubric] for our [TCs]. We don't expect them to be professional teachers when they walk out our door, but we want them to have those same attitudes and those same skills behaviors that in-service teachers have.

At the time of the study, the SPSA had been in place for two years. The assessment document was not created by RHU, nor was is specific to PETE program. Anthony explained,

> [T]he state…developed and adopted a new teacher performance evaluation and [a] committee wanted the university teacher ed programs to utilize that same evaluation tool for measuring performance in the field… so that when [TCs] become certified and get their first job, they are already familiar with some of the expectations of the performance measures.

Observation forms based on the SPSA document were used to evaluate TCs in all courses with field experience components. For TCs enrolled in the year-long student teaching practicum, the document was completed by university supervisors at least twice before the midterm and twice before the end of the term. At the conclusion of each 16-week
segment of the student teaching practicum, the final SPSA evaluation was completed by university supervisors, collaborating teachers and TCs. Supplementary documentation, such as previous observations, other assessments, and reflections, were used to inform the scores and submitted as supporting evidence. As outlined in the course syllabus, TCs must achieve an overall average rating of proficient (Level Three/L-3) on the SPSA document to earn a satisfactory grade for the student teaching practicum.

**edTPA Portfolio Assessment.** Similar to Rocky Creek College and Shady Valley University, RHU required the edTPA Portfolio Assessment as a capstone project for all teacher education programs. The edTPA, as described by RHU’s teacher education website, was “the culmination of a teaching and learning process that documents and demonstrates the candidate’s ability to effectively teach his/her subject matter to all students.” Utilizing a combination of video clips, lesson plans, examples of student work, data analyses and reflective commentaries, TCs candidates completed three main tasks focused on five key components: planning instruction, delivering instruction, assessing student learning, analyzing the impact of their teaching, and supporting student’s academic language development (SCALE, 2015).

Concerning the evaluation process of the edTPA, Pascal explained, “It is sent to someone and [TCs] have to pay $300 for the privilege, which is what it really is. It is graded by somebody [TCs] don't know, somebody we don't know, and it is just this anonymous system they pay $300 to have done.” Starting in the Fall of 2015, TCs had to meet the minimum edTPA score requirements in order to receive a state teaching certificate, which would enable them to teach in the K-12 public school system. In the event a TC did not meet the minimum score, the individual had to complete a retake.
Depending on the circumstances, some retakes required the TC to resubmit one task and pay an additional $100, without having to return to the field. However, more pervasive issues with the document required TCs to complete a new portfolio in a semester-long student teaching practicum during a subsequent semester, and pay another $300 to be evaluated.

**Addressing and Assessing Teacher Candidates’ Professionalism**

**Addressing 6.1.** Several strategies across multiple courses were identified as ways in which the PETE program encouraged behaviors that were consistent with the belief that all students are capable of learning (Table 18). For example, Ben, the instructor who taught the Intro to PE course initiated discussions centered on the potential impact of individuals’ personal experiences in physical education environments. Such conversations encouraged TCs to consider how diverse the perception of PE may be among K-12 students:

> [Ben] challenges [TCs] to think about who is in their [field experience] classes and who our candidates are themselves, so he asks them to reflect about themselves. You know, we are a unique bunch of people, we like moving, and we don't realize in the beginning that a lot of people didn't like moving or still don't because they had bad PE experiences. (Pascal)

Anthony echoed a similar focus on the importance of considering potential differences in TCs’ experiences in physical education versus K-12 students’ PE experiences:

> I guess within my educational philosophy, and when I’m talking to [TCs]…we stress to them …you know it’s easy when we’re talking to a group of physical educators that all loved PE for the most part, and clearly, they chose this career path because of that. But, we address throughout [the program] that not all kids love PE, not all kids like to be active, and frankly, they are a higher priority if you will, from a teacher’s perspective. (Anthony)
Equally, many PETE courses included activities designed to encourage equitable participation for students of varying skill levels. For instance, the Adapted PE course provided opportunities for TCs to work with students of varying abilities, which included “[A] field experience where we… work one-on-one writing IEPs” (Pascal). TCs spent six weeks in schools teaching in adapted physical education environments. The benefit of such experiences, Pascal explained, was for TCs to “see not everyone has the same even potential, and that every child is different…”

Table 18
*Ridgeview Heights University*– *Ways Standard 6.1 was Addressed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Courses with Field Experiences</td>
<td>-Intra-task variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Elementary &amp; Secondary methods)</td>
<td>-Teach by invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Intro to PE</td>
<td>-Reflection assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Adapted PE</td>
<td>-Application tasks (writing IEPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>-Differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Modeling by faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Stated expectations (syllabus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Conversations about edTPA requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the curriculum, TCs were exposed to a variety of instructional strategies which promoted maximum participation in activities, especially for underperforming students, “We sometimes have to use intra-task variations, or teach by invitation when students aren’t getting it. So, when [TCs] see students who are struggling, we try to find out why they are struggling and then help them to whatever potential they can get to” (Pascal). Likewise, the concept of differentiation was emphasized by both RHU PETE faculty members a necessary strategy for TCs to implement:
Other than just generally approaching any field experience, whether they are teaching as a team or individually, we point out [how]...students need to be challenged at an appropriate level. I think it just kind of boils down to recognizing that there are differences in skill level in any class setting, and as [students] get older there’s even wider differences and you as a teacher need to be cognizant of [recognizing] how can you differentiate up and down to give every student an appropriate level of engagement and hopefully learning. (Anthony)

[W]e really try to stress...the differentiation part, even to kids that look the same. Two twins might have different interests and different abilities, so we tried to get them seeing that every child is different no matter what they look like and we need to teach them all in the best way possible for each one. (Pascal)

Similar to the PETE faculty at Shady Valley University, Anthony acknowledged edTPA as an aspect of the program where equitable provision of feedback is emphasized, “[edTPA] is a nice platform for me to use when we’re talking… the edTPA creates that opportunity for us to elaborate upon giving feedback to everybody, and the extra effort it might take to get your less skilled, less motivated students involved and learning.” In contrast, Pascal believed the edTPA requirements restricted the amount of instructional attention faculty were able to devote to the provision of equitable feedback within the curriculum:

We used to have a project that was all about [equitable feedback], but then with...the edTPA, it is so high-stakes, that we prepare our students for the test, for the edTPA. And so, we've lost some of our [assignments], like we used to do a feedback reflection where [TCs] would actually track how much feedback they gave.

For the edTPA assessment, Pascal explained, “[TCs] have to write about giving feedback to three different students and it's only three…. So, what we've done, unfortunately, is because this is such high-stakes, we've actually had to start saying, ‘Okay, find three people that you can prove that you gave feedback to.’” However, during peer teaching episodes and initial field experiences, TCs are encouraged, “Go and see as many people
as you can before the transition to the next task, and then see as many people as you can before you transition to the next task, always going give feedback, congruent feedback to learners” (Pascal).

When considering how faculty encouraged TCs to set high expectations for physical education students, three strategies identified: modeling within courses, emphasis during field experiences, and utilizing the standards as benchmarks. Pascal insisted, “We set high expectations for our [TCs], and some step up and some just meet them, so we try to do it by role modeling.” Additionally, observation experiences enabled TCs to develop a greater understanding of how to determine appropriate, yet challenging expectations, “I think sometimes with [TCs], as they go out into the field, they start to… get a general gauge on what expectations are, what high expectations are for students” (Anthony). For a given activity, TCs were taught to first look at state performance standards and SHAPE’s national grade-level outcomes when determining the level of proficiency students would be expected to achieve,

We allow our [TCs] to set the level of the bar. We show them where the bar is saying, “Here's the [state] standard. How high do you want to meet the standard?” Well, we tell them to push the boundaries and we role model this too. [We encourage them to] teach students things they've never learned before, expect them to go beyond where you think they can go.

To ensure all students were sufficiently challenged, TCs were encouraged to “over-plan” when developing lesson plans in order to accommodate a broad range of potential skill levels among students. Faculty often prompted TCs, “[H]ave twice as much as you think you'll need because I want you to push them as far as they can go” (Pascal).

Assessing 6.1. Within the PETE program, three main assessments were identified as evaluation tools which included aspects of NASPE Initial PETE Standard 6.1: the
PETE Dispositions rubric, the SPSA document, and the edTPA Portfolio Assessment (Table 19). The PETE Dispositions Rubric was completed by instructors in all PETE majors’ courses, while the SPSA was completed in courses with field experience components. A final, summative SPSA was completed at the end of the student teaching practicum. Similarly, edTPA were completed during the student teaching. Additionally, the capstone project in the Adapted PE class also assessed features of element one.

Table 19
Ridgeview Heights University- Ways 6.1 was Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- All PETE majors’ courses</td>
<td>- PETE Dispositions Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Elementary methods</td>
<td>- SPSA document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Secondary methods</td>
<td>- edTPA Portfolio Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of the Adapted PE course, children from the community were invited onto RHU’s campus to work one-on-one with TCs. Within the course, TCs also learned the process for developing and implementing IEPs. Then, as Pascal explained, “the capstone for that [course] is to write the Fall IEP that they work with across six weeks.”

From a superficial perspective, none of the items included on the PETE Dispositions Rubric (Appendix U) aligned specifically with element one. However, some of the more general features associated with professionalism included in the rubric were perceived by faculty to impact TCs’ ability to demonstrate achievement in Standard 6.1.

For example, the item related to “Communication” would generally tend to align more with Standard 6.3. Yet, Pascal described a situation where a TC had significant issues with speaking in front of a group, “[W]e had a situation where the [TC] was not
comfortable speaking in front of other people. And it's a rare case, academically fine, could do the school work, but got in front of students and just didn't speak.” Thus, the uneasiness experienced by the TC when communicating also prohibited him from being able to provide students with equitable amounts sufficient feedback, which is an aspect of professionalism outlined in Standard 6.1. After receiving a rating of L-1 on a Dispositions Rubric, a remediation plan was created to address the dispositional concern. Pascal recalled, “So, we said, ‘Okay, take a drama class; take a theater class; take another public speaking class.’ That was our remediation plan, to get the [TC] opportunities to stand in front of people and speak.”

While the PETE Dispositions Assessment was used in some situations to assess the provision of equitable feedback, the SPSA document (Appendix W) evaluated the ways in which TCs’ set of high expectations for all students. In addition, the document also assessed how well TCs’ maximized participation levels for students of varying skill levels. Standard Four of the SPSA document focused on differentiated instruction. Multiple items listed within Standard Four correlated to Initial PETE Standard 6.1:

- (4.1) Differentiates the instructional content, process, product, and learning environment to meet individual developmental needs.

- (4.2) Provides remediation, enrichment, and acceleration to further student understanding of the material.

- (4.5) Develops critical and creative thinking by providing activities at the appropriate level of challenge for students.

- (4.6) Develops high learning expectations for all students.

Within the assessment document, evaluators were required to include supporting evidence for each standard. The supplementary documentation was used as a reference which provided a detailed explanation for each item’s designated ranking. While a TC
could have received a ranking of N/E= No Evidence during the mid-term evaluation, the candidate had to demonstrate proficiency (which was backed by supporting evidence) by the final evaluation.

Finally, the edTPA Portfolio Assessment included components related to characteristics of Standard 6.1. As mentioned in the previous section, the provision of feedback was assessed within edTPA. Anthony explained,

> [W]ith the edTPA… there is an element to it where [TCs] have three focus students and they are supposed to represent three skill levels. So, by identifying a student who has an IEP or a 504 plan, maybe English as a second language, it kind of, promotes that idea that your best students and your least skilled students all deserve the same amount of feedback. They all deserve the same opportunities.

Despite edTPA’s limited scope in the area of feedback, Pascal insisted, “[TCs] will give feedback in their videos and in their teachings to everyone they come across, even though the only ones they actually have to pay attention to for [edTPA] are the three they choose.” While there were differing opinions among faculty concerning the value and benefit of edTPA, Anthony believed the concentrated focus on feedback to students of different ability levels, and the corresponding reflective component of the portfolio assessment was beneficial for TCs,

> At first it might appear to be a big burden, but I personally see a lot of value in it and over the years I’ve had my better students say, “God, there’s so much reflection in this.” It really just makes you think of all that you do and why you’re doing it that way…There’s always that sort of tendency to focus on the students who are lacking skills. The students who need more motivation to participate, [TCs] put more energy into those students than those who come in already fairly skilled and excited to participate.

**Addressing 6.2.** RHU faculty identified several strategies utilized by the PETE program to address TCs’ professional growth and collaboration (Table 20). Such strategies included faculty modeling, providing situations for TCs to engage in
collaborative activities, and encouraging participation in PD activities and volunteer opportunities within the community. Interviewees also described various improvement initiatives they were beginning to implement in response to an initial rating of “unacceptable” for Standard 6.2 on the program’s last NCATE evaluation.

According to Pascal, collaboration was modeled by faculty who co-taught several courses within the curriculum:

We have started role modeling from the very top, we do co-teaching in a lot of our classes now. So, in my [Intro to PE] course, I am co-teaching with another faculty member. In our student teaching seminars, even in my methods class, I co-teach with another faculty member.

The collaborative atmosphere generated by co-teaching situations, Pascal explained, “allowed us to reflect on how collaboration does work, and can work; the benefits; the disadvantages.” Ultimately, the implementation of co-teaching situations across the PETE curriculum led to many discussions about the effectiveness of co-teaching. Pascal affirmed, “We reflect on the process as faculty, and then we asked our students to do the same thing.”

Similarly, TCs are also given opportunities to co-teach with peers in multiple courses throughout the program:

In our early field experiences…we put them into team teaching situations where one [TC] is a primary teacher and one is, we call them para-pros or secondary teacher. We follow the plan of the primary teacher that day, along with cues, task progressions, anything like that, so [TCs] have to discuss what's going on before they actually step in front of the [K-12] students in the field experience.

In such situations, lack of strong collaboration between the lead teacher and the secondary teacher had the potential to greatly impact the effectiveness of an otherwise strong lesson plan. Anthony also highlighted field experiences as an area of the curriculum where aspects of Standard 6.2 were addressed. He attested, “[E]nhancing
collaboration and professional growth… comes through… being placed in the school with a mentor teacher and collaborating with them to deliver quality physical education” (Pascal).

Table 20
*Ridgeview Heights University- Ways 6.2 was Addressed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Secondary methods</td>
<td>- Faculty modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Opportunities for collaboration in various coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td>- Encouraging attendance and leadership within SHAPE organization and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promotion of volunteer opportunities within the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased emphasis on service learning across the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Socialization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No financial assistance</td>
<td>offered for TCs to attend PD activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No active PE Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding other remedial measures implemented by the program related to Standard 6.2, Pascal reported, “We can't require it, but we’ve started highly encouraging our [TCs] to go to professional meetings, whether it's [the state] AHPERD convention, [other PE] conferences, or regional SHAPE conferences.” Correspondingly, PETE faculty “always encourage one or two to become student leaders within the state organizations” (Pascal). Anthony reiterated, “We encourage [TCs] to join the state association…but it is not mandatory.” Several reasons for the absence of a PD requirement within the PETE curriculum were cited:

It costs money to attend and if [TCs] don't have the money, we can't force them to go…. Every year [the location of the state convention] switches to where it is in the state, sometimes it requires high hotel costs…. Our [TCs] are so freaked out
about all the changes in our program in the last five years that we haven't taken a lot of time to look at professional development for them….

Pascal maintained that faculty modeled the professional development aspect of 6.2 well, reporting most faculty maintained memberships in professional organizations and attended the annual state SHAPE convention. He insisted, “I think most of the things we asked them to do we are expected to do ourselves. And it's a common theme among our faculty. We role model the things we expect.”

After the last NCATE review, most faculty became more intentional in their efforts to promote PD opportunities for TCs, as those types of experiences “allow [TCs] to see and talk with other teachers that are currently practicing teachers. So, they get accustomed to talking to other people and seeing how other people do things” (Pascal).

Anthony, however, acknowledged his personal struggle with the idea of requiring TCs to participate in PD, as he perceived such endeavors to be an area of professionalism geared more toward in-service teachers:

To some degree…when I hear the term professional, professionalism, I often think of it as something as, “Ok, now you’re employed by a school system, now you’re a professional,” and we’re preservice at this point. So, maybe I’m passing the buck, but it’s almost like, the professional development is going to come once they’re in the profession. But, I see the value in trying to promote it at the university level; it’s one of our standards.

In addition to attending PE conferences and the state convention, TCs were also prompted to engage in PE-related volunteer opportunities within the community. Such experiences were perceived to be beneficial for TCs, “Doing a family fitness night; doing a field day for school; I think it is important to get out and see what it looks like in the real world” (Pascal). Again, such opportunities that promoted TCs professional growth were encouraged, but participation was not mandatory for a variety of reasons. Pascal
maintained, “There is an overwhelmed piece there because our [TCs] are taking 15 credit hours a semester, and many of them have either families or jobs, or combination of both. So, it's difficult to ask them to do things outside of class time.” Yet, as the university’s expectations were in the process of being updated to include more of an emphasis on service learning, Pascal anticipated, “[W]ithin a couple years, our program will probably start requiring that [TCs] will have to go out and do something outside of the classroom setting.”

While the PETE department was not able to offer TCs’ any financial assistance, in previous years the PE club was able to raise money and secure some funding for TCs to attend the state SHAPE conference, “The Major’s club raises a little bit of money through shirt sales, and also by being a registered student organization, and that money goes toward hotel rooms and registration costs” (Pascal). However, a lack of interest and leadership among TCs in the most recent cohort led to the PE Club to become inactive. Pascal reasoned,

[I]t is a cyclical thing…. It takes a passionate group of people to keep the majors club running, and if you don't have a passionate group coming through your program in each cohort, it dies and then it comes back, and then it dies and it comes back. So, we are looking at that global picture where we are in a downturn right now and don't even have a formal majors club because … no one really is running one right now.

Besides the necessity of recruiting passionate individuals who were willing to invest in the club, Pascal acknowledged the Fall-only cohort acceptance, coupled with the year-long student teaching practicum, contributed to the group’s lack of consistent leadership from year to year,

Two years ago, we were forced to change our student teaching model from a single semester [of] student teaching…to a year-long clinical experience…So, across a whole years-worth of time they are spending a lot of time out in schools
and a lot less time on campus. Between the scheduling of officers into our majors’ club, and then...when our juniors know that the next year they are leaving and they won't really be on campus...we just ran into a roadblock. (Pascal)

Though, even when the PE Club was active and thriving, the group’s primary initiatives centered on selling t-shirts and sending TCs to the state convention. Seeing the function of the PE Club as another potential area for improvement, Pascal stated, “My vision is, [PE Club] needs to do something beyond [t-shirts and convention].” He continued, “So, what we are going to have is a service learning piece where we go out and either run a field day, or do a fundraiser for a local school to get equipment. I want to bring [TCs] into the community” (Pascal).

**Assessing 6.2.** Consistent with the “unsatisfactory” rating RHU’s PETE program received on their most recent NCATE accreditation report for Standard 6.2, interviewed faculty struggled to identify specific ways in which the element was being assessed within their program (Table 21). Pascal acknowledged,

> It's hard to get to collaboration when [TCs] don't know what they're doing as an individual yet. But...that's probably why it was unacceptable. Because we focus so much on the individual students in our program, we kind of miss the whole collaboration piece. We [believe we] have to make sure everybody understands before they can collaborate.

The PETE Dispositions Rubric (Appendix U), which was completed by instructors in all PETE majors’ courses, included two categories related to Standard 6.2:

- Group Work
- Professional Growth and Involvement

The group work category was listed under the “Values Collaboration” section. As previously mentioned, the PETE Dispositions Rubric assessed TCs’ dispositions in relation to their “college student” roles more than in their roles as future teachers. Hence,
the category, and corresponding ratings only loosely align with Standard 6.2. Similarly, The PD category’s “Acceptable (L-3)” rubric description read, “Aware of professional organizations and/or professional publications. Occasionally participates in professional activities or events. Understands the importance of professional growth.” Across all PETE majors’ courses, TCs who did not achieve a rating of L-3 or higher in each category were subjected to remedial measures. However, a rating of “NA or 0” could be given by course instructors, as per the rubric directions, which stated, “If your course is not designed to allow for observation of one of the categories, please write NA or 0 in the section.” Thus, the absence of specific PD expectations or requirements within the curriculum permitted instructors to give a rating of “NA or 0” for the “professional development and involvement” category.

Table 21
*Ridgeview Heights University—Ways 6.2 was Assessed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- All PETE Majors’ Courses</td>
<td>- PETE Dispositions Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- SPSA document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At RHU, PETE instructors for every course with a field experience component completed the SPSA (Appendix W), while field supervisors submitted the final culminating SPSA assessment at the end of the student teaching placement. Within the assessment, two items listed in the ninth standard captured aspects of Initial PETE Standard 6.2:

- (9.5) Participates in ongoing professional growth activities based on identified areas for improvement.
- (9.7) Engages in activities outside the classroom intended for school and student enhancement.
While discussing PD related to a TC’s final practicum experience, Anthony stated, “When they are student teaching, [TCs] are expected to attend every meeting that the school has. So, if the school has PD days our students are supposed to be there… but they’re not driven by us. It’s more just what the school has to offer.” Thus, a TC may or may not have been presented with opportunities to engage in PD, depending on what all was offered by the placement school during the particular semester a TC was in student teaching. Even if a TC received low marks on the items related to Standard 6.2, they would still pass student teaching, as an average rating of “3” or above across the entire assessment is considered proficient.

In the discussion on Standard 6.2, Anthony shared his personal opinion regarding the addition of PD requirements for TCs:

Perhaps it is naive on my part, but it seems like when you’re in the university setting and you’re taking classes and learning all about your profession, that is professionalism. That’s just my perception…. Yeah, there’s always room to put something [extra], but it seems like [PD] is beyond our program. So, I don’t really see a place for additional professional development.

All in all, few examples were provided regarding the assessment of TCs’ professional growth and collaboration. Pascal concluded, “[Collaboration is] where we miss the mark. So, are we doing something about it? Absolutely.” Thus, PETE faculty had committed to several improvement initiatives associated with Standard 6.2, as described in the previous section.

**Addressing 6.3.** Interviewed faculty believed instructor modeling, informal conversations, and a seminar hosted by the university were the primary ways Standard 6.3 was addressed within the PETE program (Table 22). Stated expectations within the student teaching syllabus also related to multiple aspects of element three (NASPE,
of all the strategies identified, the ethics seminar and corresponding ethics exam were discussed most extensively in both interviews with PETE faculty members. Additionally, the two interviews revealed discrepancies among faculty concerning how strongly the dress expectations were encouraged and reinforced for TCs in field experiences.

Table 22
Ridgeview Heights University- Ways 6.3 was Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- All PETE majors’ courses</td>
<td>- Modeling by faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td>- Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ethics Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stated Expectations Faculty modeling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Socialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Negative modeling by cooperating teachers and instructors of activity courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to the beginning of student teaching, TCs were required to attend a seminar hosted by RHU. Anthony explained,

[The university] will have someone from the state come and present, basically, the professional standards or code of conduct that’s expected of teachers. Unfortunately, I kind of summarize it each semester as, “just don’t hit a kid” but they’ll spend two hours to talk about it…. They present and entertain [TCs] for two hours to go over everything and share real life situations and stories, examples.

Due to a variety of issues that arose with TCs across all teacher education programs in previous semesters, the seminar covered such topics as confidentiality, maintaining appropriate relationships with students and mandatory reporting, which are outlined in Standard 6.3. Anthony reflected,

We’ve certainly had instances in my 10 years here… relationships with students, we’ve had students who have disclosed information to our [TCs], or our
candidates have become aware of something. So, on a fundamental level we address some of those… legal requirements.

A corresponding state-mandated ethics exam was completed by TCs at program entry, and again at program exit, at which point TCs must receive a passing score to be eligible for licensure.

Outside of the ethics seminar, Anthony believed TCs inherently learned about professional ethics as they progressed throughout the program. He stated, “It’s just a process, and as [TCs] mature and go through that process, little by little they are picking up on these elements of [professional ethics].” Normally, discussions related to professional ethics were unplanned:

Oftentimes it’s conversations that occur in class. But, it’s interesting because I don’t have a bulleted list that I pinpoint: this is what I’m teaching today; this is what we’re discussing today. It just generally comes up in the conversations that we have, and sometimes talking about the good, the bad, and the ugly. (Anthony)

Regarding professional ethics, both faculty members mentioned having to address issues with overly competitive TCs. Especially within the content courses, faculty found it necessary to address the subject of emotional control. Anthony described on situation that necessitated the implementation of a remediation plan. He explained, “One student was just really, could never understand the level of competition and sportsmanship that was expected in our classes. [He] couldn’t keep his temper under control” (Anthony). In other circumstances, TCs who were unable to reign in their emotions ultimately chose to change their major:

We’ve had students that self-selected out [of PETE] because of behavior issues, ultra-competitiveness. That’s part of what some PE majors bring in, and they didn't know how to get rid of it and it was going to become a problem, in terms of, you really don't want to compete with your students. But, we can almost see it becoming a problem where they are competing with other teachers, with students in the classes. (Anthony)
Within the program, field experiences also provided significant opportunities to discuss professional ethics, particularly when negative examples were observed. Anthony recalled, “Sometimes what [TCs] see out there, we can learn what PE should not be! I always appreciate when [TCs] come back in and say, ‘Oh my gosh, my collaborating teacher is awful.’ And I hate to say that, but it does happen on occasion.” Thus, TCs were given opportunities during class to process the positive and negative teaching behaviors they observed out in the field.

Considering the program’s expectations for professional dress, Pascal explained,

We want our students in, whether they are teaching out in schools or they are in a peer teaching situation, khaki pants or khaki shorts. We like a polo shirt for the men. We will allow them to teach in a RHU T-shirt as long as it is a school-based T-shirt without anything inappropriate on it. We are okay with that because they are promoting the school. For women: khaki shorts, khaki pants, when the pants are okay. Let's see, yoga pants are not okay. Definitely moving shoes: sneakers, tennis shoes, we require that. Dress code says all tattoos must be covered. Women can wear only a certain number of piercings, and I think that's about it for requirements.

Anthony also reiterated the program’s stance on tight or revealing clothing, “Right now, it seems the big fad or fashion trend are these yoga pants, which we generally discourage that.” Especially when cooperating teachers didn’t model appropriate dress, faculty found it more difficult to hold TCs accountable to program expectations. Anthony expressed, “[Professional attire] can be a topic of conversation when [TCs] are getting ready to go out in their field experience: What do we wear? I generally say, don’t wear [yoga pants], yet we go to the school and there are teachers wearing [yoga pants], so it’s a tough one.”

Both faculty members believed professional dress was modeled well by instructors within program, at least in the methods courses and courses they each taught. Yet, Pascal disclosed, “When I look at [general] activity classes, no, [instructors] are not
General activity courses were non-majors’ courses offered to all students at the university. When attempting to reinforce the importance of professional dress, Pascal often told TCs, “Why do you want to exhibit professional dress? Because you are professional, and we want educators to look professional.”

Throughout the entire discussion on appropriate attire, Pascal was adamant program expectations in this area were rigorously addressed and reinforced during teaching situations across all PETE courses:

[W]e highly encourage [professional attire] in our classes. Where, if you are doing peer teaching, you will dress to the standard. If you are teaching in a school, you will definitely dress to that school's standard, and our standard. And, when you are student teaching, I don't care if the teacher comes in [the gym] in jeans and a sweatshirt, you will not do that. You still need to meet our standards of dress.

Oftentimes, the cooperating teachers who exhibited the best dispositions in terms of professional dress happened to be former TCs who graduated from RHU’s PETE program. Pascal explained,

I see whose graduated out of our program and we go out and we use them as [cooperating] teachers after three years. If they want a student teacher, we will allow them to have one… I do try to pick teachers in schools who are close by, but also model the teaching behaviors, dress behaviors, all these dispositional components.

Even when cooperating teachers failed to model appropriate attire, Pascal insisted TCs were still expected to uphold the program’s standards. He maintained, “You'll see teachers come in all kinds of dress, from jeans to basketball shorts. But it's their world and it's what they have promoted. So, we require our students to dress appropriately… whether their cooperating teacher does it or not.”
Anthony, on the other hand, expected collared shirts to be worn during field experiences, but also expressed to individual TCs, “Look to the culture of the school you’re in and what’s expected there.” He expanded,

I typically say, “Look to what’s going on in your school. I encourage you to wear a collared shirt, but if you’ve only got two collared shirts, and everyone else at your school is wearing t-shirts, that’s fine. If that’s what you’re going to wear, you’re going to be there five days a week and that’s what they wear, that’s fine.” (Anthony)

Thus, program expectations were perceived by Anthony to be strong suggestions coupled with enough flexibility for TCs to consider the specific context of each individual placement, rather than explicit blanket requirements.

Assessing 6.3. The PETE Dispositions Rubric, the SPSA document, and a required ethics exam were identified as the three primary ways TCs’ professional ethics were addressed within the program (Table 23). Pascal explained, “[W]e use the Dispositions [rubric] mostly because it covers a lot of the things about professional ethics…. Whether it's dress, attendance, communication, our dispositions form does a pretty good job of covering those things.” The items listed on the Candidate Dispositions Rubric (Appendix U) specifically related to 6.3 included:

- Attendance
- Respect for School Rules, Policies and Norms
- Emotional Control/Responsibility
- Ethical Behavior and Role Model

Similar to other cases, many general characteristics of professional ethics assessed within the program were not explicitly outlined in the 6.3 rating description, yet aligned with the element statement, which reads, “[TCs] demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with
the professional ethics of highly qualified teachers” (NASPE, 2008, p. 3). Since
Dispositions Rubrics were completed within every PETE course, faculty were able to
identify potential issues and track individuals with consistently low marks even before
they were admitted to the program. Pascal explained, “[Rubrics are completed] any time
[TCs] take a PETE course, and those are looked at during the admissions process. Then,
while they’re in the program if [TCs] have dispositional issues, we can do a remediation
plan.”

Table 23
Ridgeview Heights University- Ways 6.3 was Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- All PETE Majors’ Courses</td>
<td>- PETE Dispositions Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- SPSA document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ethics Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Pascal and Anthony reported marginal ratings on “Attendance” to be one of
the most common items on the rubric to trigger a remediation plan. Anthony recalled, “I
have had maybe one or two remediation plans over the years here, but it’s typically on
attendance, it’s not been related to relationships with others. It’s typically been, “Hey,
you need to be in class. You need to be here on time.” Similarly, Pascal echoed, “[W]ith
professional behaviors, you are expected to show up for work every day, so we expect
that in our classes. Attendance is probably the most common [issue].”

While the PETE Dispositions Rubric focused more on student-related aspects of
TCs’ professional ethics, the SPSA document (Appendix W) included primarily
educator-specific items. Such items, found in Standards Nine and Ten, included:

- (9.1) Carries out duties in accordance with federal and state laws, Code of Ethics,
  and established state and local school board policies, regulations, and practices.
- (9.2) Maintains professional demeanor and behavior.
- (9.3) Respects and maintains confidentiality
- (9.8) Maintains appropriate interactions with students, parents, faculty, and staff.
- (10.4) Adheres to school and district policies regarding communication of student information.
- (10.9) Engages in appropriate conversations and maintains confidentiality of information related to students, parents, faculty, and staff. Such conversations include text messaging, social media, emails, etc.

Within Standard 9.2, professional demeanor and behavior included aspects related to appearance, punctuality, and attendance. To demonstrate TCs’ proficiency in each of the listed items, candidates or university supervisors could submit attendance logs, parent contact logs, and disposition evaluations as potential evidence and/or documentation.

Along with the PETE Dispositions Rubric and the SPSA document, PETE faculty reported the state-mandated ethics exam also assessed many areas of professional ethics outlined in Standard 6.3. Regarding the contents and objective of the exam, Anthony believed, “It is essentially a test over [TCs’] understanding, and I guess through written responses, [TCs’] application of knowledge relating to the state teacher ethics.” The cost of the exam was $30, and TCs were required to take the exam at program admission and exit.

The two PETE faculty members had different perspectives on the purpose of the initial exam since there was no minimum passing score. Anthony conjectured, “At program admission, there is no passing score per se, I guess it’s just part of the larger data collection to see, are there changes happening over the course of a teacher education program.” Conversely, Pascal shared his frustration with the requirement, “[TCs] need to take an ethics exam to actually be admitted to our program. Now the crazy part is, they
don't have to pass the exam, they just have to take the exam. So, it's just another way to get $30 out of their pockets somehow and it doesn't count for anything.”

While Anthony confirmed TCs did have to pass the exam at program exit, he was unaware of what constituted a passing score on the ethics exam. Yet, he was confident TCs in the PETE program had always completed the exam in a satisfactory manner, “I have in my years here never had any knowledge of a student not passing those examinations. It was always a requirement for student teaching and a requirement for graduation and I’ve never known a student not to pass.” Pascal was unaware of the passing requirement, and did not personally see a significant purpose or benefit in the exam requirement, “I don't know what it accomplishes but they have the word ethics in it, so it must be ethical right? ....I don't believe it's a useful tool unless you make it consequential.” Pascal believed the exam lacked meaning and value for candidates as well, as he had never received feedback about the exam from TCs, and had also never been provided with exam results. He supposed, “They pay their 30 bucks; they watch little modules; they answer the questions, and because there's no consequence for it, it probably just rolls off their back and they don't care.”

Addressing 6.4. Besides the inherent “teachable moments” where aspects of professionalism were modeled during field experiences, two courses were identified by faculty as areas within the curriculum that emphasized culturally responsive teaching approaches: Intro to PE and a socio-cultural education course. The Intro course was taught by Ben, a newer faculty member within the department who had expertise in social justice, while the socio-cultural class, offered by the education department, was a requirement for all educator preparation programs. Due to the heavy emphasis on edTPA,
Pascal cited a lack of curricular space available within the program to adequately address such topics within multiple PETE courses:

[Ben] is taking us there one step at a time in his own way with his social justice lens. So, [Standard 6.4] is really only [addressed] in one [PETE] class and it's the first one [TCs] see within our professional education sequence. Beyond that, I wish I had time to time to address everything that is a concern in PE, but I barely have time to cover the content we are supposed to cover and get our [TCs] ready to present an [edTPA] project that I don't really believe in. So, it's like, where do we find time to fit it all in?

Table 24
Ridgeview Heights University- Ways 6.4 was Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Intro to PE</td>
<td>- Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Socio-Cultural Influences in Education</td>
<td>- Modeling/Teachable moments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Courses with field experiences (Elementary &amp; Secondary Methods)</td>
<td>- Assignments and activities within courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Socialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Within PETE, only emphasized in courses taught by Ben</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the lack of objectives dedicated to components of element four, courses with field experiences provided faculty with consistent opportunities to address how TCs could communicate in ways that demonstrated sensitivity and respect (Table 24). In Anthony’s experience, “It comes up in conversation, but it’s not a PowerPoint presentation where I go in and talk about, what is respectful language, etc... I think it just tends to be a part of our conversation piece during the field experiences.” For example, Pascal referenced discussions he’s led with TCs in his elementary methods course after cooperating teachers displayed poor dispositions when communicating with students, “[W]e have some sarcastic teachers out there in our local schools and we tell [TCs],...
‘That's not a good way to teach in elementary school; they don't understand it. And, in secondary schools [students] are not really receptive to sarcasm; most students are not.’”

TCs were able to experience a great amount of diversity while teaching in schools, as nearby placements utilized for practicums ranged from very affluent to severely impoverished. Pascal attested, “We are in a pretty good place for our [TCs] to see [school differences] because within one county they can see every socioeconomic status, Title I school, rich school, non-diversity, high-diversity, white, minority schools.” He went on to reiterate, “It's amazing the diversity we have within our placements” (Pascal). Anthony agreed, “[TCs] experience diversity in their placements being in [the surrounding] area, we tend to have pretty diverse student populations…so they’re getting exposure.”

Ben, the professor who taught Intro to PE, was mentioned by both faculty members as the primary individual within the PETE program responsible for strategically incorporating elements of Standard 6.4 into course curriculum.

I know that he has a number of books they use for that course, and one of them specifically is focused on cultural diversity, language diversity, within physical education. So, it’s kind of part of the program when they take his class… and some of that has been his own writing and research. (Anthony)

[A] new professor is changing things here…. Ben is here now and he's the one who started the social justice perspective, right from the first class they take in our program with [Intro to PE]. And, he's taken that in a whole new direction that is so positive for students. (Pascal)

According to Pascal, Ben stressed the importance of inclusive teaching practices because his perception was, “[T]here are some underserved populations out there, so let's get our [TCs] to understand that just because of gender orientation…just because of color of skin, just because of socioeconomic status, we can't put people in boxes.” Ben’s influence
within the program was not limited to TCs, as his outlook and teaching philosophy also impacted fellow faculty members:

It's actually been positive for me personally as a faculty member and other faculty members to have a new perspective on health and physical education. You know, here is someone who did not have a good experience in PE, and he knows why it didn't happen, and he wants to change it, and he is changing through a social justice lens. (Pascal)

[Ben’s office] is across the hall from me, so we will have conversations. And it’s interesting, sometimes he’s like, ‘People are continuing to miss this piece of the social justice issue around movement and quality physical activity and physical education.’ I think he addresses some of those concepts in his class with his students, so I’m the beneficiary on the back end. (Anthony)

Apart from Ben’s class, TCs in the PETE program only completed one other course which intentionally highlighted aspects of Standard 6.4. Anthony reported, “There’s a class that all teacher candidates take here as part of any Teacher Ed program that also gets into cultural and language diversity….So, our students take a class in that; not within the department, but an education course.” The socio-cultural course was developed after the university recognized the substantial focus on cultural inclusiveness shared by many accreditation agencies, as noted within the corresponding educator preparation program standards. According to Anthony,

[T]he university basically went though and said… ‘What are the themes between [CAEP and INTASC standards] and what do they share?’ And, the one that stood out to everyone was being to show how we… promote cultural sensitivity, so [the university] put a new class together.

Assessing 6.4. When asked the ways in which the PETE program assessed aspects of Standard 6.4, Pascal responded, “The same ways as probably everything else we've talked about. We use documentation in terms of professional teaching behaviors, whether it's the [Dispositions] assessment or the [SPSA].” Thus, TCs were held accountable for communicating in ways that demonstrated sensitivity and respect in every PETE course
they completed, ranging from activity courses to methods classes with field experience components. In addition, Anthony also identified the edTPA portfolio project as a document in which components of Standard 6.4 were assessed (Table 25).

**Table 25**  
*Ridgeview Heights University - Ways 6.4 was Assessed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- All PETE Majors’ Courses</td>
<td>- PETE Dispositions Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- SPSA document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- edTPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three items included on the PETE Dispositions Rubric (Appendix U) correlated with aspects of element four:

- Relationships with Others

- Emotional Control/Responsibility

- Communication

In the “Relationship with Others” category, TCs who demonstrated acceptance of others “despite differences in ability, race, gender, or ethnicity” were rated as Acceptable (L-3). Similarly, TCs who achieved an L-3 rating in the category “Emotional Control/Responsibility” were able to listen to the perspectives of others. The descriptions loosely echoed the rating of “Acceptable” on Initial PETE Standard 6.4, as it stated, “TC demonstrates respect for cultural differences.” Lastly, to achieve a rating of Acceptable (L-3) for the Communication category on the Dispositions Rubric, TCs were expected to “generally use language that is acceptable and not offensive”. The description corresponded with the element four of Standard Six, which emphasized the avoidance of sarcasm and putdowns when interacting with K-12 students.
The SPSA document (Appendix W) had a standard titled “Professionalism” made up of nine sub-standards devoted specifically to aspects of communication. The sub-standards most closely aligned with Initial PETE Standard 6.4 included:

- (10.1) Uses verbal and non-verbal communication techniques to foster positive interactions and promote learning in the classroom and school environment.
- (10.8) Listens and responds with cultural awareness, empathy, and understanding to the voice and opinions of stakeholders.
- (10.9) Uses modes of communication that are appropriate for a given situation.

The document, as Pascal explained, was the light version of a state assessment used by principals to evaluate in-service teachers. The SPSA was utilized in early field experiences to “help [TCs] understand that not every student out there likes movement; not every student is the same in any way, and so…we try to show them [culturally responsive teaching approaches] way up front, and way early.” Acceptable documentation of proficiency in each of the listed sub-standards could consist of communication logs, informal/formal observation notes, sample emails, newsletters, parent letters, and/or unit plans.

Lastly, the edTPA was identified as a document which assessed TCs on the extent to which they communicated with sensitivity and respect. As Anthony stated, “[Aspects of Standard 6.4] are assessed within the edTPA. It is just expected when observations occur, that you’re seeing [culturally responsive teaching] on the videos of TCs in the field, [and] certainly… during the practicum experiences.” While no specific rubric items on the edTPA corresponded with Standard 6.4, written responses to prompts in the Planning Commentary section of Task One assessed TCs ability to critically consider and apply their knowledge of students as it pertained to, and informed their teaching. In the
edTPA Physical Education Handbook (SCALE, 2015), the corresponding prompt for Section 2b: “Personal, cultural, and community assets related to the central focus” read, “What do you know about your students’ everyday experiences, cultural and language backgrounds and practices, and interests?” (p. 14). Within the section, TCs written commentary had to make clear connections between students’ assets and other relevant information such as prior academic learning and research/theory.
CHAPTER V
CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS

In the previous chapter, comprehensive case descriptions entailing the ways in which three SHAPE/CAEP accredited PETE programs addressed and assessed aspects of TCs’ professionalism were presented. An overview of these case descriptions can be found in Table 3.1. This chapter highlights common themes which emerged from a cross-case analysis of the three cases. All references to interviewed faculty include a program designation (e.g. Rachel [RCC]). To maintain formatting continuity, themes were categorized according to the corresponding element. Structuring themes by element allowed analyzed data to be presented as they pertained to each of the research questions:

Q1 In what ways do the selected PETE programs prepare TCs to meet each individual element of NASPE Initial PETE Standard Six?

Q2 In what ways do the selected PETE programs assess TCs across each individual element of Standard Six (e.g., when, who, how, and what aspects of professionalism are assessed)?

Analyses for each element will be followed by a discussion section presented in the next chapter, where findings will be considered in the context of previous research and the conceptual framework of occupational socialization.

Introduction

All six interviewed PETE faculty in this multi-case study agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “Candidate dispositions can be changed as a result of participation in a teacher education program.” Thus, faculty shared similar perceptions concerning the potential impact of teacher education programs on candidates’ attitudes
and beliefs. In addition, several patterns emerged with regard to the instructional approaches and assessment strategies utilized to teach and assess the professionalism of TCs.

### Addressing 6.1

**Central Theme: Aspects Addressed Throughout Curriculum**

While interviewed faculty members from each case provided different examples of how their program addressed components of 6.1, many of the same instructional strategies were identified (Table 26). The reported teaching approaches were utilized in a wide variety of courses across each programs’ curriculum. Based on patterns observed, the central theme is broken down by instructional strategy into multiple sub-themes.

**Discussion.** All three programs discussed aspects of Standard 6.1 with TCs in numerous formal and informal settings. Discussions generally occurred in content courses, methods courses (which typically included a field experience component), and student teaching. At Rocky Creek, discussions related to Standard 6.1 occurred across all areas of the curriculum, including sub-disciplinary courses. Though most Biomechanics courses focus more on science based concepts, Kelli (RCC) utilized opportunities during class to link lesson content to physical education situations by prompting TCs to consider various ways to keep students engaged and challenged as they moved their bodies in efficient ways. Kelli (RCC) also reported discussing differentiation and the concept of teaching by invitation in her Biomechanics class.

Often, classes with practicum components provided relevant opportunities to discuss aspects of 6.1. At Ridgeview Heights, TCs in field experience settings discussed the same instructional strategies presented by Kelli (RCC) to her Biomechanics students.
Before teaching episodes out in schools, Pascal (RHU) often engaged candidates in discussions regarding the importance of incorporating various strategies to increase participation and enjoyment among students.

Table 26  
Case Summaries- Addressing 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Creek College</td>
<td>- Individual Sports (Content)</td>
<td>- Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Team Sports (Content)</td>
<td>- Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Elementary methods</td>
<td>- Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Analysis &amp; Assessment of PE</td>
<td>- Teach by invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Biomechanics</td>
<td>- Challenge by choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Valley University</td>
<td>- Intro to PE</td>
<td>- Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Application of simplifications, extensions during field experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Lectures on concepts and theories related to motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- Debriefing after field experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeview Heights University</td>
<td>- Intro to PE</td>
<td>- Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Application tasks (writing IEPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Courses with field experiences (Elementary &amp; Secondary methods)</td>
<td>- Role modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- Teach by invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Intra-task variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reflection assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stated expectations (syllabus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Conversations about edTPA requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While TCs at RHU discussed such topics before teaching episodes, SVU faculty utilized time after field experience teachings to address aspects of 6.1. Sean (SVU) often prompted TCs to consider the provision of feedback, and strategic implementation of simplifications, extensions and applications. It was noted Sean (SVU) perceived TCs to be more proficient in writing such modifications into their lesson plans than actually
executing them during their teaching episodes. Lack of execution was the reason he chose to address such topics after teaching, when details of lesson plans were not fully utilized.

**Opportunities for engagement.** In addition to fostering relevant discussions, field experiences also offered beneficial opportunities for TCs to apply strategies designed to promote aspects of Standard 6.1. All three schools identified opportunities for engagement as ways in which their programs encouraged TCs to address the components of professionalism embodied in element one. The instructional strategies discussions which ensued in debriefing sessions with Sean (SVU) were later applied by TCs in teaching episodes with K-12 students. Both Shady Valley and Ridgeview Heights identified student teaching as an area in the curriculum which afford TCs opportunities for engagement with the instructional strategies discussed throughout the program.

Additionally, Rocky Creek faculty reported opportunities for engagement in content courses and the Adapted course. Likewise, RHU incorporated application tasks related to 6.1 into their Adapted class. Specifically, TCs spent time in inclusive physical education environments learning how to provide all students equitable opportunities to participate. Within the course, an IEP project at RHU promoted the application of positive teaching behaviors addressed in element one, as TCs were challenged to develop and write IEPs for students in a one-on-one situation.

**Faculty modeling.** Furthermore, faculty at RCC and RHU both reported faculty modeling as another way aspects of 6.1 were promoted within the program. However, the specific aspects which were demonstrated and exhibited by faculty differed between programs. Pascal (RHU) reported modeling by faculty as one of the primary ways the program encouraged TCs to set high expectations for physical education students,
whereas Kelli (RCC) spoke on how she personally attempted to model the appropriate teaching behaviors she expected of her TCs.

**Assessing 6.1**

**Central Theme: Frequency of Assessments and Assignments Related to 6.1**

All three cases in the study measured TCs’ achievement of element one through an assortment of assignments and assessments (Table 27). Generally, the identified assignments inadvertently assessed aspects of Standard 6.1, while most of the formal assessments purposefully aligned with the Initial PETE Standards which then served as artifacts in program SPA reports for CAEP accreditation. The content of programs’ assessments varied, but most exhibited similar formats. Multiple formal assessments featuring aspects of Standard 6.1 were completed during student teaching practicums in all three cases. Analyzed data revealed none of the individual assessments utilized by any program evaluated all five specific features outlined in element one. However, the combination of assessments implemented by each program created a comprehensive representation of TCs’ achievement across all characteristics. Sub-themes were separated by utilization of patterns observed.

**Assignments/assessments within coursework.** In each case, the previously identified areas that addressed Standard 6.1 also included corresponding assessments. For instance, the Adapted PE course at RHU both addressed and assessed the provision of equitable opportunities for participation, as well as lesson adaptations for underperforming students. Throughout the course, experiential learning was promoted as TCs interacted with children from the community in a practicum setting and were taught
the process of designing and executing an IEP. Then, as part of a capstone project, TCs worked one-on-one with a child as they developed and implemented an IEP for the student over a six-week timespan. While the project was not created with the Initial PETE Standards in mind, features of the assignment aligned with the rubric description for element one.

Table 27
*Case Summaries- Assessing 6.1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Creek College</td>
<td>- Individual Sports (Content)</td>
<td>- Feedback Analysis rubrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Team Sports (Content)</td>
<td>- Candidate Dispositions Assessment (self-assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Competencies Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Valley University</td>
<td>- Intro to PE</td>
<td>- Self-observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Feedback Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Pathways Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ALT- PE 2-3/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Dispositions Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- edTPA Portfolio Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- Student Teaching Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeview Heights University</td>
<td>- All PETE majors’ courses</td>
<td>- PETE Dispositions Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Elementary methods</td>
<td>- edTPA Portfolio Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- SPSA document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Secondary methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, courses at Rocky Creek College and Shady Valley University which addressed TCs’ provision of feedback and opportunities for participation through various instructional strategies, also included associated assessment components. RCC utilized rubrics within its content courses to assess feedback, while SVU implemented systematic observations such as feedback analyses, pathway analyses, and ALT- PE in methods.
courses to measure and document TC achievement across aspects of 6.1. SVU’s prior use of systematic observation forms in the PETE program were reported by Pascal, which he went on to note were discontinued due to the rigorous nature of edTPA requirements. However, edTPA was identified by SVU and RHU as an assessment which specifically evaluated TCs’ feedback, though only for select students. Even though edTPA was implemented and evaluated the same way across all three programs, RCC did not acknowledge it as an assessment which correlated with Standard 6.1.

**Utilization of a dispositions assessment.** All three programs implemented some form of a dispositions assessment through which various components of TCs’ professionalism were monitored and assessed. The dispositions assessments utilized by RCC and SVU were general forms utilized across all teacher education programs at each university, while RHU’s disposition form was specifically designed for use with PETE TCs. How often the dispositions rubric was completed varied by program. TCs at Ridgeview Heights were assessed in every PETE majors’ course, but TCs never saw their scores unless they received a low rating in one or more categories. In contrast, Rocky Creek only utilized the Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P) during the student teaching practicum. TCs completed the self-assessment and were required to submit evidence to support each rating given, while field supervisors utilized the corresponding Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment (Appendix O). Shady Valley fell in the middle of the spectrum, designating four courses within the curriculum to evaluate TC using the Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R), including one education course taught in the School of Education. Similar to RHU, TCs at Shady Valley were only made aware of their scores if low marks triggered remedial measures to
be considered. However, TCs in the elementary and secondary methods were provided the document to complete as a formative self-assessment, though it was not submitted to the instructor.

While none of the disposition assessments addressed all the components outlined in element one’s rubric description, RCC’s Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P) and corresponding Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment (Appendix O) evaluated four of the five characteristics embodied in 6.1, omitting the aspect related to setting high expectations for all students. SVU’s Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R) did not assess the provision equal feedback or the setting of high expectations. As mentioned in RHU’s case description, their PETE Dispositions Rubric was focused more toward dispositions displayed by college students rather than future teachers. Despite the alternative focus, instructors perceived the “communication” category as a component which could be used to assess how often and to what degree TCs’ provided feedback.

**Requirements/assessments within student teaching.** In addition to the dispositions rubrics, all three programs employed additional assessments completed during the student teaching practicum which assessed aspects of Standard 6.1. Rocky Creek utilized the Competencies Checklist (Appendix N), which mirrored the 2008 Initial PETE Rubric published by NASPE. Thus, the description on the checklist reflected the exact words used in the rubric for element one of Standard Six. While RCC implemented an additional assessment that was specific to PETE, the other two programs completed general assessment forms utilized by all educator preparation programs at their respective institutions.
At SVU, field supervisors evaluated TCs’ in a summative fashion at the end of each 8-week placement using the Student Teacher Assessment. Although the form was used across all teacher education programs, the PETE program’s version of the assessment included a section identifying which Initial PETE Standards (NAPSE, 2008) aligned with each item. Both the field supervisor and the cooperating teacher completed the assessment, but only data collected from the field supervisor were utilized in SPA report for CAEP accreditation. Within the assessment, the first two items corresponded with element one, specifically addressing the aspects related to adapting lessons for underperforming students and the setting of high expectations.

The additional assessment utilized by Ridgeview Heights was the SPSA document (Appendix W), a consolidated version of a state-mandated assessment designed to evaluate in-service teachers. Since the format of the student teaching practicum was a year-long clinical experience, the final SPSA document was completed by cooperating teachers, field supervisors, and TCs. As with RCC’s Dispositions Rubric and the edTPA portfolio assessment, evaluators for were required to include supporting evidence for each standard. The document assessed all five components outlined in Initial PETE Standard 6.1, minus the feature concerning feedback.

**Addressing 6.2**

**Central Theme One: Encouraging a Culture of Collaboration**

Across the three cases, varying examples of the ways in which programs demonstrated and encouraged professional collaboration were identified (Table 28). TCs not only observed collaboration among faculty, but were also provided with opportunities to personally engage in collaborative activities. Hence, sub-themes address patterns
observed in the ways faculty exhibited collaboration and the ways TCs experienced collaboration across all programs.

**Modeling by faculty.** All cases identified faculty modeling as a way the collaboration aspect of 6.2 was addressed. Both Shady Valley and Rocky Creek incorporated co-teaching situations within their respective programs. At SVU, elementary and secondary methods courses were coupled with corresponding content classes to create two six-hour blocks. Since the courses were scheduled back-to-back, the unique situation allowed instructors to collectively teach and engage TCs for double the amount of time typically allotted for a single three-credit class.

Similarly, clinical instructors were consistently paired with professors to co-teach many of the content courses offered at RHU. TCs in such classes had the potential to garner immense benefit from both the clinical instructors’ wealth of practical teaching experience and the tenured professors’ depth of applied theoretical knowledge.

Additionally, faculty were able to model an array of collaborative teaching approaches, which TCs would then be able to apply later in the program as they engaged in co-teaching experiences with peers during field experiences. Alternatively, at RCC, collaboration was exhibited by Kelli (RCC) and her colleagues as they prepared to host a state conference on their campus, which was anticipated to attract more than 100 in-service K-12 teachers from around the area and neighboring states. Thus, the faculty responsible for organizing the conference put forth a great amount of shared effort when planning the PD event, which was also attended by TCs in the PETE program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institution</strong></th>
<th><strong>Courses</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strategies</strong></th>
<th><strong>Negative Socialization</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Creek College</td>
<td>- Secondary methods</td>
<td>- Modeling by PETE/School of Ed faculty (collaboration and PD)</td>
<td>- Modeling from Liberal Arts faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Consistent encouragement to pursue PD opportunities</td>
<td>- No active PE Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- Hosting PD on campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Courses taught by Kelli</td>
<td>- Inviting TCs to PD sessions presented by faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stated expectations (Student Teaching syllabus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Valley University</td>
<td>- Elementary methods</td>
<td>- Modeling by PETE faculty (Collaboration and PD)</td>
<td>- No active PE Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Secondary methods</td>
<td>- Promoting PD events/activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td>- Sharing/offering volunteer opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Providing opportunities for TC collaboration across coursework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Inviting TCs to assist in faculty presentations at state conventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- PETE program covering cost of TCs’ registration at state convention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- PD addressed in course readings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Exploration of PE websites encouraged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeview Heights University</td>
<td>- Secondary methods</td>
<td>- Modeling by faculty (collaboration and PD)</td>
<td>- No financial assistance offered for TCs to attend PD activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Encouraging attendance at PD events</td>
<td>- No active PE Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td>- Promoting volunteer opportunities within the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Providing opportunities for TCs to co-teach with peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased emphasis on service learning across the university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunities for engagement: Arranging collaborative experiences. Within each program, TCs were provided opportunities to engage in collaborative experiences. Pascal affirmed the strong prevalence of group work across SVU’s curriculum, which required TCs to use and develop strategies to make such situations positive and productive for all involved. Assignments ranged from group projects to collaborative teaching episodes.

Similarly, TCs from RHU co-taught lessons with their peers multiple times throughout the PETE program when. Co-teaching scenarios consistently occurred in the form of in-class, peer-teaching episodes, as well as teaching experiences encompassed within elementary and secondary practicums. Most often, co-teaching in k-12 settings consisted of one main teacher and one assistant, which forced TCs to navigate how to effectively collaborate with a peer when one played more of a lead role during a lesson.

While faculty from SVU and RHU described co-teaching scenarios as a predominant way Standard 6.2 was addressed within their programs, faculty at RCC cited the collaboration which inherently occurred between TCs and cooperating teachings during student teaching practicums. In fact, an entire section in the student teaching syllabus was devoted to addressing such interactions. Specifically, the section outlined expected outcomes regarding the interactions which would inevitably ensue between TCs and their cooperating teachers during a 16-week placement.

As the student teaching practicum was an area of the curriculum which highlighted collaboration at RHU, Sean reported opportunities for TCs at SVU to collaborate and assist faculty with session presentations at the annual state SHAPE convention. Sean (SVU) noted the benefits of co-presenting, as it engaged TCs in the
profession while also promoting collaboration. While at the conference, TCs were also able to engage in collaborative experiences as they embraced opportunities to interact and dialogue with other teachers.

Central Theme Two: Highlighting Professional Growth and Development

The prevalence and emphasis on PD was a major theme across all cases. Though the extent to which each program promoted PD differed, similarities existed among the strategies utilized to address the professional growth of TCs. Sub-themes were delineated by patterns detected in the instructional approaches utilized.

Modeling by faculty. As previously mentioned, interviewees from all three cases reported varying degrees of PD involvement among faculty. Just as organizing, presenting, and attending PD activities promoted collaboration, it also encouraged professional growth among TC as well. In fact, in all three cases, faculty modeling was identified as a primary way Standard 6.2 was addressed. Faculty in all cases maintained memberships in state and national organizations, and attended annual conferences and conventions, while RCC and SVU also reported how faculty regularly presented sessions at such events. Beyond their participation in SHAPE-affiliated events, Rocky Creek faculty helped to organize and execute state-level conferences which they hosted.

Opportunities for engagement: Promoting engagement in professional development activities. As faculty from each program regularly participated in PD activities, PETE TCs were also encouraged to attend such events. At RCC and SVU, PD attendance was not merely encouraged, but required in some courses. For example, TCs in both programs were at some point required to attend the state SHAPE convention.
However, SVU was the only program that offered financial assistance to help offset the costs. Even with the requirements, faculty in both PETE programs continued to promote attendance at various events beyond program requirements by regularly highlighting upcoming PD opportunities. For example, faculty from RCC and SVU reported sharing information about the national SHAPE convention.

**Opportunities for engagement: Fostering volunteer opportunities.** As voluntary involvement in community events contributed to TC’s professional growth, SVU and RHU made an effort to identify and share information about such activities. Examples of potential opportunities ranged from K-12 school-based activities (e.g. field days, after school activity programs) to community-related functions (e.g. family fun-runs, free events hosted by the local recreation center). Pascal (RHU) believed one benefit of volunteering was the real-life, hands-on experience it provided TCs.

Within the PETE program at SVU, Jackie (SVU) discussed the process she developed to organize groups of TCs when volunteer opportunities were presented. Since TCs’ were recruited through the program, Jackie (SVU) always made it a point to reiterate expectations concerning professionalism, as TCs were representing RCC as they went out into the community. For school-based events, the physical education teacher was also included in the briefing process to ensure details and expectations were clearly communicated to everyone involved.

**Central Theme Three: Absence of a Physical Education Student Organization**

Part of the description for the acceptable rating in Initial PETE Standard 6.2 states, “TC participates in professional opportunities beyond the program requirements,
such as major’s club…” Interestingly, none of the programs offered a student organization specific to TCs majoring in physical education. Due to the graduate-only structure of the PETE program at Rocky Creek, the vast majority of courses were scheduled in the evenings as TCs worked full-time jobs during the day. Thus, the evening block-course scheduling coupled with long commutes did not create conducive situation to establish and maintain an active PE club. Furthermore, RCC had no intention of establishing a student organization for majors’ in the future.

On the contrary, the PETE programs at SVU and RHU had thriving PE clubs within the past four years that had since deteriorated and become inactive. Interviewees from both programs cited a lack of motivation and leadership among TCs as potential explanations for the clubs’ eventual discontinuation. Sean (SVU) and Pascal (RHU) described cyclical situations where a motivated TC would step up and run the club for a time, but finding TCs who were willing to step into the position of leadership proved to challenging. Ultimately, the breaks in consistent leadership necessary to maintain the organization led both programs to become inactive. However, faculty at SVU and RHU were open to re-establishing the PE clubs with their programs, given there were TCs willing to take responsibility for leading the student organization.

Assessing 6.2

Central Theme: Expectations for Professional Growth and Development

During cross-case analysis, patterns emerged concerning the prevalence of professional development expectations (Table 29). Though the extent to which TCs’ PD involvement was assessed varied by program, similarities regarding the ways in which
TCs were (or were not) held accountable for professional growth and development were observed. Emergent patterns within the central theme were divided into two sub-themes: requirements/assessments embedded in regular coursework, and requirements/assessments completed during the student teaching practicum.

Table 29
Case Summaries- Assessing 6.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Creek College</td>
<td>- Secondary methods</td>
<td>- Individual course requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teaching Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Professional Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- Candidate Dispositions Assessment (self-assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Competencies Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Valley University</td>
<td>- Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Elementary methods course requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Candidate Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- Secondary Methods Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeview Heights University</td>
<td>- All PETE majors’ courses</td>
<td>- PETE Dispositions Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>- SPSA document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requirements/assessments within coursework. Rocky Creek College and Shady Valley University incorporated PD requirements into coursework leading up to student teaching. Ridgeview Heights utilized a curriculum-wide dispositions rubric that assessed aspects of 6.2, yet struggled to document TCs’ proficiency in the areas of professional growth and collaboration. However, the program was in the process of updating their expectations and assessment strategies to more fully align with aspects of element two.
Rocky Creek exhibited the strongest presence of PD, and the most rigorous expectations for TCs. Rachel (RCC) also identified three courses within the curriculum with required PD components. For instance, TCs enrolled in the Sport Law course were required to attend at least one type of workshop or clinic addressing some aspect of safety. Examples of PD activities included completion of a pool safety course, an aquatics clinic, or a weight-training safety workshop. The PD did not necessarily occur face-to-face, as approved online activities could also satisfy the course requirement.

Beyond specific course requirements, Rachel (RCC) insisted all TCs would be required to attend the one-day, education-centered conference that was to be hosted by RCC later that semester. Though, the process of accountability for TCs’ attendance participation remained unclear. Moreover, as RCC held TCs to high expectations regarding participation in PD, none of the course requirements assessed TCs’ professional collaboration.

While PD course requirements at RCC focused on workshops, clinics, and on-campus events, SVU required TCs enrolled in elementary methods (or student teaching) each Fall to attend the annual state SHAPE convention. Pascal (RCC) explained that faculty felt justified in making Thursday sessions a requirement, since TCs would have otherwise been in class for elementary methods up until noon that day, so they weren’t necessarily missing much of any other classes. Additionally, the program paid TCs’ registration fees to the conference, which meant TCs were only responsible for costs associated with transportation. SVU was the only program that provided financial support for TCs’ PD endeavors.
Besides the PD requirement in the elementary methods course, TCs were also held accountable for their professional growth and collaboration in the secondary methods/content block, via the Secondary Methods Portfolio (Appendix T). The portfolio rubric included items related to both professional development and TCs’ collaboration. Within the portfolio, candidates were required to provide evidence demonstrating competency across each item in the form of supplemental artifacts. Thus, documentation helped to substantiate the ratings given by instructors on each rubric item.

In addition, SVU’s Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R) includes an item related to TCs’ collaboration. Instructors across five courses complete the rubric, allowing TCs’ dispositions to be tracked throughout the program. However, ratings had the potential to be highly subjective, as a rubric description had not been developed, and instructors were not required to provide evidence to support the ratings they selected. Rachel (SVU) perceived there to be very little inter-rater reliability among instructors designated to complete the rubric.

Similar to SVU’s Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R), instructors of all PETE majors’ courses at RHU completed the PETE Dispositions Rubric (Appendix U) for each TC. Ideally, a candidate’s performance across each of the 10 categories could be tracked throughout their time in the program, with any rating below “Acceptable” activating remedial measures (Appendix V). Two of the ten categories corresponded to both aspects of Standard 6.2. However, rubric descriptions were fairly vague, and the rubric focused on “college student” dispositions rather than “future teacher” dispositions. Since there were no PD requirements within any of the PETE course, instructors could easily mark “NA or 0” for the category related to TCs’ professional growth. Thus, the
corresponding data provided faculty with weak evidence that could only be loosely correlated to TCs’ performance of element two. Additionally, no supporting documentation was required, which made the ratings highly subjective. Faculty acknowledge the inadequate nature of the rubric, and were in discussions about how to hold students more accountable, especially in areas related to Standard 6.2

Requirements/assessments within student teaching. Within the student teaching practicum, all three programs utilized formal assessments. At least one assessment from every case required supporting documentation to verify TCs’ achievement in each category. However, only Rocky Creek and Shady Valley explicitly communicated and reinforced specific expectations for TCs’ PD involvement during the practicum.

TCs enrolled in student teaching at RCC and SVU were required to attend a certain number of these PD events. For example, RCC candidates had to attend trainings on diversity, bullying, school safety and child abuse, while SVU required TCs enrolled in student teaching during the Fall semester to attend the state SHAPE convention. In addition, TCs at RCC and RHU were expected to attend all PD activities their cooperating teachers were obligated to attend. However, at RHU, the mirroring the cooperating teacher’s PD schedule was the only real expectation expectations for TCs in terms of mandatory PD attendance, even though the SPSA document (Appendix W) assessed items related to professional growth and development.

Multiple assessments utilized by RCC and SVU included components designed to document TCs’ level of achievement across multiple areas, including the aspects of professionalism embodied in element two. Rocky Creek exhibited the most robust set of
assessments completed during student teaching, with three different documents assessing aspects of 6.2. For the Professional Portfolio, TCs had to provide documentation for the item entitled “Evidence of Membership in Professional Organizations”, while the Competencies Checklist (Appendix N) paralleled the Initial PETE Standards rubric.

The Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment (Appendix O) and the Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P) were the final, most comprehensive assessments utilized by RCC, as the former was completed by the field supervisor and the latter was a self-assessment was completed by the TC. Together, the two forms of the assessment provided a holistic overview of TCs’ performance of each item. An additional feature of the self-assessment required TCs to articulate how they demonstrated and could further develop each disposition. Two items on the rubric addressed TCs’ professional growth and collaboration.

Similar to RCC’s Candidate Disposition Assessment, Shady Valley’s Student Teaching Assessment (Appendix S) required TCs to provide documentation to substantiate the rubric ratings for each item. Of all assessments utilized across all three cases, the Student Teaching Assessment included the most items assessing aspects of Standard 6.2. Of the 34 items, seven highlighted characteristics of element two: four focused on aspects collaboration, one was related to professional growth and one addressed both.

Ridgeview Heights also implemented an assessment that required supporting documentation, the SPSA document (Appendix W). The rubric was not developed by the PETE program or School of Education, but was a modified version of a state assessment used to evaluate in-service teachers. The assessment rubric stated the form was “to be
completed by supervisors using evidence from the pre-conference, the lesson plan, the observation, the post-conference, and other sources.” On SPSA evaluations completed prior to final assessment, evaluators could mark N/E (no evidence) if no supporting documentation was provided, but N/E was not a valid rating on the final evaluation. To be considered proficient on the SPSA, TCs had to achieve an overall average rating of “3” or higher, which allowed for some items to be rated as “ineffective” or “needs development” with no definitive consequence.

**Addressing 6.3**

**Central Theme One: The Matter of Professional Dress**

Regarding the topic of appropriate teaching attire, similarities in the ways each case defined and reinforced program expectations were observed (Table 30). In all three cases, through discussion and modeling, TCs were encouraged to adopt and internalize program norms related to professional dress. Patterns of negative socialization also existed across two cases, as TCs observed educators who failed to model professionalism in their choice of attire.

**Discussion.** In all cases, frequent discussions centered on definitions of appropriate attire and program expectations occurred. With little variation, the general description of professional dress was the same for each program. In all cases, TCs were expected to wear a collared shirt and/or athletic warm-up apparel displaying the institution’s name or logo. SVU allowed TCs to wear t-shirts, as long as the shirt promoted the university in a professional manner. Rocky Creek and Ridgeview Heights both included statements concerning proper footwear in their guidelines. Faculty from RHU provided the most comprehensive description of what professional dress consisted
of for their program. For example, instead of RHU warm-up pants, TCs were permitted to wear khaki pants or shorts, but yoga pants were strictly prohibited. In addition, expectations regarding visible tattoos and piercings were also communicated. Yet, discrepancies existed among RHU faculty regarding the extent to which such expectations were actually enforced during field experiences.

Table 30
*Case Summaries- Addressing 6.3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Negative Socialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Creek College</td>
<td>- Courses taught by Kelli</td>
<td>- Discussion</td>
<td>- Negative modeling by cooperating teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Biophysical Foundations</td>
<td>- Modeling by faculty (PETE Program, School of Ed, entire College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td>- Course expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- All courses offered at RCC (i.e. academic integrity, equitability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Valley University</td>
<td>- Intro to PE</td>
<td>- Discussion</td>
<td>- Lack of accountability (attendance) in initial PETE courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adapted PE</td>
<td>- Modeling by faculty, GTAs and cooperating teachers</td>
<td>- Impact of social media on expectations for maintaining confidentiality and professional relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Stated expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>- Review of Positive Dispositions Contract for conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td>- Review of Candidate Dispositions Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeview Heights University</td>
<td>- All PETE majors’ courses</td>
<td>- Discussion</td>
<td>- Negative modeling by cooperating teachers and instructors of activity courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Teaching</td>
<td>- Modeling by faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ethics Seminar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beyond the definitions, patterns were also observed in approaches utilized by programs when framing the importance of professionalism dress in physical education settings. The perceptions of others triggered by an individual’s teaching attire were consistently highlighted. At RHU, Pascal stressed the fact that teaching is a profession, and since candidates were preparing to be PE teachers, it was important for them to look the part. Kelli (RCC) took a slightly different approach by encouraging TCs to view teaching episodes in field experiences as job interviews. She wanted TCs to be aware that impressions were being made every time they walked into a school. Sean (SVU), on the other hand, asked students to reflect on their own impressions of poorly dressed PE teachers. In such conversations with TCs, he often highlighted how inferences made solely based on attire had the potential to impact an individual’s credibility.

**Modeling: Positive and negative.** Across all cases, PETE faculty were identified as positive role models in terms of professional dress. Pascal (RHU) acknowledged he had observed inappropriate attire from instructors who taught general activity courses at RHU, but those individuals did not teach majors’ courses, nor were they under the PETE umbrella. Rachel (RCC) reported the faculty at Rocky Creek always dressed professionally, even to the extent of wearing formal business attire when teaching in classroom settings. Sean (SVU) maintained appropriate attire was consistently modeled for TCs by faculty and GTAs within Shady Valley’s PETE program.

While TCs in each program observed appropriate teaching attire by PETE faculty, the socializing effect cooperating teachers had on TCs varied by case. Faculty from RCC and RHU described numerous situations where cooperating teachers served as negative role models for TCs in terms of professional dress. However, Rachel (RCC) noted an
exception to such issues occurred when the cooperating teachers were RCC alumni. Since she had witnessed many alumni continue to uphold and reinforce program expectations, Rachel (RCC) was ecstatic any time she placed a TC with an RCC. Pascal (RHU) and Sean (SVU) echoed the same sentiment, holding the firm belief that appropriate teaching attire was consistently modeled for TCs during field experiences due, in part, to the large number of cooperating teachers who were graduates from their respective programs.

Central Theme Two: Addressing Professional Ethics with Future Teachers

Even with the myriad of characteristics embodied within the term “professional ethics”, subthemes emerged concerning the teaching strategies utilized by faculty to address such topics. Across all three cases, faculty primarily utilized discussion and faculty modeling. The extent to which each program emphasized certain components varied, yet certain features were addressed by all three programs. For example, general concepts of timeliness, along with issues pertaining to protecting student confidentiality and TCs’ emotional control were addressed though formal and informal discussions in all three programs. Moreover, modeling by faculty was a primary strategy used across all programs to address aspects of professional ethics related to respect, equal treatment, sound judgment.

Discussion. Of all aspects of professional ethics, timeliness was identified as one of the most frequent topics of discussion. Rocky Creek considered attendance to be part of professional conduct, which Rachel (RCC) described as a consistent theme woven throughout the program. Promptness was also outlined in RCC’s Professionalism Guidelines document, and discussed before TCs’ engaged in field experiences. Jackie
(SVU) spoke at length about how many TCs’ struggled to be on time, and at the same time, didn’t seem to consider punctuality a monitored aspect of professional behavior. The lack of accountability for timeliness in early majors’ courses, Jackie believed, contributed to TCs’ indifference toward matters of timeliness and punctuality. Similarly, faculty from RHU identified attendance as one of the most common issues that warranted remediation plans. The expectations for in-service teachers was a common discussion Pascal (RHU) initiated with TCs. He consistently emphasized how the program expectations purposely mimicked expectations TCs’ would be held accountable to once they joined the ranks of licensed K-12 physical educators.

In addition to timeliness, faculty from RCC and RHU identified having to consistently address issues regarding TCs’ emotional control, especially in initial majors’ courses. Rachel (RCC) elaborated extensively on the many discussions that stemmed from inappropriate demonstrations of emotion, ranging from a candidate slamming down a book in frustration, to ultra-competitive TCs losing their cool in content courses. Likewise, Anthony (RHU) and Pascal (RHU) both recalled issues with overly aggressive candidates who couldn’t control their tempers when participating in active lessons. In such situations, faculty addressed the importance of sportsmanship, reminding TCs the purpose of such activities was to learn how to teach the content, not to win the game they were playing.

**Faculty modeling.** Considering the various ways in which programs attempted to teach and address aspects of professional ethics to TCs, faculty modeling was identified as one of the approaches used across two cases. Interviewees from RHU and SVU reported that faculty modeled an array of aspects related to professional ethics.
Specifically, SVU and RHU faculty maintained attitudes of respect toward TCs, and exhibited equal treatment among all candidates. In addition, Rachel (RCC) insisted that dispositions such as standards of trust, character, and integrity were consistently modeled and promoted across the School of Education and Rocky Creek College as a whole. Though RHU did not report a significant amount of faculty modeling, the university did host an ethics seminar for student teachers, which addressed many aspects of professional ethics outlined in Standard 6.3.

Assessing 6.3

Central Theme One: Frequency of Assessments Related to Professional Ethics

Across all three cases, multiple assessments addressed aspects of Standard 6.3, though the frequency and timing of when such assessments were completed varied by program (Table 31). Admissions requirements for two of the PETE programs included assessment components related TCs’ professional ethics. In all three cases, aspects of Standard 6.3 were assessed at various times throughout the program. RHU implemented the most wide-spread assessment plan, as features of TCs’ professional ethics were assessed in every PETE majors’ course. During the student teaching practicum, all three cases assessed candidates’ attitudes and behaviors related to professional ethics. Patterns detected were divided into two sub-themes: requirements/assessments embedded in regular coursework, and requirements/assessments completed during the student teaching practicum.
Table 31
*Case Summaries - Assessing 6.3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Negative Socialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Creek College</td>
<td>-Secondary methods -Biophysical Foundations -Student Teaching</td>
<td>-Course expectations -Candidate Dispositions Assessment (self-assessment) -Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment -Competencies Checklist -Letters of recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Valley University</td>
<td>-Intro to PE -Adapted PE -Elementary methods/content block -Secondary methods/content block -Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>-Positive Dispositions Contract -Candidate Dispositions Assessment -Secondary Methods Portfolio -Student Teaching Assessment</td>
<td>-Lack of inter-rater reliability between instructors on Candidate Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeview Heights University</td>
<td>-All PETE majors’ courses -Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>-PETE Dispositions Rubric -SPSA document -Ethics Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessments prior to program admittance.** PETE faculty from RCC and RHU reported TCs’ professional dispositions were assessed prior to them being admitted into the program. In each case, assessments specifically addressed aspects of professional ethics. To be admitted to the graduate PETE program at Rocky Creek College, applicants were required to submit two letters of recommendations, along with a 2-3-page personal statement outlining their interest in the program and teaching philosophy. As Program Coordinator, Rachel often considered the information gathered during the application process to determine if an applicant exhibited the professional ethics expected of TCs.
Alternatively, the completion of an ethic exam was required for admittance into the PETE program at Ridgeview Height. However, the requirement was perceived by Pascal (RHU) to be more of a formal technicality, as there was no consequence for TCs’ who failed the entry Ethics Exam.

**Assessments throughout the program.** All three programs assessed features of TCs’ professional ethics in multiple courses. SVU and RHU utilized standardized dispositions assessment forms, completed by instructors in numerous courses. SVU’s Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R), developed and distributed by the institution’s School of Education, was completed by instructors in four courses. In contrast, instructors in all PETE majors’ courses at RHU completed the PETE Dispositions Rubric (Appendix U), which was developed solely for PETE. Alternatively, RCC did not utilize a standardized dispositions rubric to assess TCs across multiple courses, though Rachel (RCC) reported examples of strategies individual instructors used to assess the attitudes and behaviors embodied within Standard 6.3.

**Assessments within student teaching.** In addition to assessments completed throughout the program, patterns were also observed in assessments completed during student teaching practicum. Though none of the assessments addressed all the features outlined in the Initial PETE rating descriptions for 6.3, each evaluation document included at least one item related to professional ethics. Three separate assessments utilized by RCC evaluated aspects of element three: the Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment (Appendix O), the Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P), and the Competencies Checklist (Appendix N). Similarly, TCs as SVU were assessed using the Student Teaching Assessment (Appendix S), which contained an item that specifically
addressed professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct. Likewise, the SPSA document (Appendix W), completed by field supervisors at RHU, addressed multiple aspects of 6.3, including appearance, confidentiality and appropriate interactions. Across all three cases, supporting documentation was required for at least one assessment competed during student teaching.

Central Theme Two: Assessments Related Exclusively to Professional Ethics

Beyond the standardized disposition rubrics used to assess multiple facets of professionalism, faculty from each program identified at least one additional assessment designed specifically to address TCs’ professional ethics. As previously discussed, Rachel (RCC) described how letters of recommendation and a personal essay were used. At SVU, the Program Coordinator found it necessary to create a “positive dispositions contract” after a few unbecoming situations involving TCs’ occurred at the last state SHAPE convention. Starting in Fall 2016, TCs were required to sign the contract, which outlined program expectations for TCs’ behavior when attending conferences. The additional assessment required for TCs in RHU’s PETE program, and every other teacher education program at the institution, was the state-mandated Ethics Exam. TCs were required to take the exam prior to program entry, and again at program exit, but only needed to pass it the second time.

Central Theme Three: Prevalence of Assessment Items Focused on Specific Aspects of 6.3

The statement corresponding to Standard 6.3 states, “[TCs] demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the professional ethics of highly qualified teachers” (NASPE,
2008, p.3). The “Acceptable” rating description listed on the corresponding rubric highlights characteristics related to professional dress, maintaining confidentiality, equitable treatment of students, and maintaining professional relationships. While all programs utilized assessments addressing Standard 6.3, the extent to which specific rating description components were assessed varied.

Apart from RCC’s Competencies Checklist (Appendix N), which mirrored the Initial PETE Standards rubric, SVU’s Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R) was the only other rubric across the three programs to include items addressing all four features. In fact, some features, such as maintaining confidentiality, were assessed within multiple items within the rubric. However, the other assessments utilized by SVU (Secondary Methods Portfolio and Student Teaching Assessment) only considered professional ethics as an overall concept. Similarly, the PETE Dispositions Rubric (Appendix U) employed by RHU addressed features of professional ethics not included in the rating descriptions, such as attendance, emotional control, and ethical behavior. The SPSA document (Appendix W) did not assess aspects of equitability, but did include one item related to TCs’ adherence to laws, code of ethics, and school board policies. Within RCC’s Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment (Appendix O) and Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P), one item addressed general concepts of professional ethics, as well as professional dress. The rubric was the only assessment across all cases to include an item assessing the TCs’ ability to foster respectful environments among students, a characteristic featured solely in the “Target” rating description.
Addressing 6.4

Central Theme One: Addressing Cultural Responsiveness

Through cross-case data analysis, patterns in the approaches programs used to expose TCs to culturally responsive teaching practices were observed (Table 32). Though specific illustrations of how aspects of 6.4 were addressed within each program varied, examples could be grouped into three general settings. Thus, sub-themes were characterized by the context within which cultural competency was addressed.

Table 32
Case Summaries- Addressing 6.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Negative Socialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Creek College</td>
<td>-Historical &amp; Cultural Context in PE</td>
<td>-Faculty modeling of expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Analysis &amp; Assessment of PE</td>
<td>-Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Adapted PE</td>
<td>-Course Assignments</td>
<td>Only intentionally taught in courses taught by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Rhythms, Dance &amp; Gymnastics</td>
<td>-Cultural dance unit</td>
<td>Jackie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Student Teaching</td>
<td>-Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Valley University</td>
<td>-Intro to PE</td>
<td>-Discussion after field experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Adapted PE</td>
<td>-Modeling/Teachable moments in field experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td>-Social Identity paper</td>
<td>-Within PETE, only intentionally taught in courses taught by Ben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>-Socio-cultural journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>-Other assignments created by Jackie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeview Heights</td>
<td>-Intro to PE</td>
<td>-Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>-Socio-Cultural Influences in Education</td>
<td>-Modeling/Teachable moments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Courses with field experiences (Elementary &amp; Secondary methods)</td>
<td>-Assignments and activities within courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunities for engagement: Direct instruction/focused assignments.

Across all three cases, faculty identified numerous ways TCs acquired knowledge and understanding of the concepts outlined in element four. For instance, candidates at Rocky Creek learned about cultural responsive teaching practices through a series of workshops, seminars, and course specific lectures and assignments. Due to the institution-wide emphasis on inclusiveness, the college frequently offered workshops centered on diversity, which were open to faculty and students. Coursework and lectures embedded into various classes also provided opportunities for TCs to learn cultural responsive teaching practices. Rachel (RCC) recalled one course in which TCs were introduced to 11 different international sports. Similarly, the Rhythm, Dance, and Gymnastics course included an entire unit devoted to cultural dances. Overall, Kelli (RCC) believed the PETE program employed a very comprehensive approach to teaching cultural competency.

At Shady Valley, Jackie (SVU) made it a point to incorporate lessons and projects into her classes designed to promote cultural awareness and sensitivity. In fact, she reported infusing socio-cultural concepts into every class she taught. Relevant examples of such assignments included a social identity paper and a socio-cultural journal, which were completed by TCs in the secondary methods/content block. Likewise, TCs were also instructed on appropriate ways to teach and assess individuals’ personal and social responsibility within a physical education setting. Thus, many features of Standard 6.4 were addressed through assignments implemented by Jackie.

Similar to Jackie (SVU), Ben (RHU) also made an intentional effort to incorporate a social justice perspective into the Intro to PE course he taught. Through a
variety of lectures and assignments, characteristics of 6.4 were strategically incorporated into course curriculum. Beyond the Intro to PE course, the School of Education also required TCs in all teacher education at the institution to complete a socio-cultural class. According to Anthony (RHU), the course highlighted many aspects of 6.4, including cultural and language diversity. The socio-cultural class was the only course identified across all cases specifically devoted to developing TCs’ cultural competency.

**Discussion/modeling: Positive and negative.** Faculty from all three programs reported addressing features of element four through discussion stemming from modeling, which faculty described as teachable moments, which occurred often during field experiences. TCs enrolled in courses with practicum components were frequently exposed to culturally and economically diverse environments, as each program sought placements in a variety of rural, suburban, and urban settings. In each case, situations observed during practicums served as catalysts to initiate discussions focused on relevant aspects of cultural competency. At RCC and SVU, TCs’ observations during field experiences prompted candid conversations about contemporary issues related to gender. Through such discussions, Rachel (RCC) gained insight and knowledge from TCs as they shared information acquired from attending workshops hosted by the university. Similarly, after TCs observed a cooperating teacher use sarcasm with elementary children, Pascal (RHU) utilized the debriefing session as an opportunity to discuss why such language was not appropriate, especially with younger students.

**Opportunities for engagement: Guided practice.** Beyond acquiring knowledge of cultural competency and discussing situations that arose during field experience observations, TCs from all programs also learned to communicate in ways that promoted
sensitivity and respect through activities designed to demonstrate TCs’ deep understanding of the content. Such activities included authentic assessments and supervised teaching episodes. For example, TCs enrolled in the Rhythm, Dance, and Gymnastics course at RCC not only learned about different cultural dances, but were also expected to recognize specific dances and be able to teach different dances in a peer setting. Likewise, Kelli (RCC) elaborated on a situation where she encouraged a TC placed in a culturally diverse elementary school to implement a “Games from Around the World”. Through the experience, the TC was able to utilize what he had learned in the program to create an inclusive environment that celebrated cultural diversity and enhanced students’ respect for individual differences.

Within the PETE programs at SVU and RHU, Jackie (SVU) and Ben (RHU) provided assignments and various teaching episodes designed to challenge TCs’ to move beyond cultural awareness. As previously mentioned, TCs at SVU discussed how to effectively incorporate standards-based assessments focused on personal and social responsibility. Then, as a way to combine theory with practice, TCs were given opportunities to implement such assessments during corresponding field experiences. Likewise, by the time TCs reach student teaching, Anthony (RHU) expected TCs to implement culturally responsive teaching approaches since they had all already taken classes with Ben (RHU).

Central Theme Two: Prevalence of Content Expert

Interestingly, within each case, interviewed faculty identified one specific instructor as the program expert when it came addressing aspects of 6.4. Rachel (RCC) identified herself as the expert within the program, citing numerous multicultural
education books and article she’d written over the years. At SVU and RHU, the identified individual was almost deemed solely responsible for teaching and promoting characteristics of cultural competency within the program. Jackie (SVU) acknowledged being the only PETE faculty member who integrated socio-cultural concepts into course curriculum. Similarly, Ben (RHU) was acknowledged to be an expert in issues of social justice. As such, when asked to provide examples of how 6.4 was addressed within the program, both Pascal (RHU) and Anthony (RHU) provided examples of what Ben (RHU) was doing, rather than what they were doing, to enhance TCs’ cultural competency. Thus, the primary attention given to characteristics outlined in 6.4 stemmed not from multiple individuals across multiple courses, but from a single faculty members’ passion and conviction to address such topics in the classes they taught.

Assessing 6.4

**Central Theme One: Frequency of Assessments related to Cultural Competency**

Across all cases, characteristics of Standard 6.4 were assessed at various times throughout the program (Table 33). Data analysis revealed each program utilized assessments addressing cultural competency within regular coursework, as well as standardized assessments during student teaching. Hence, observed patterns were divided into two sub-themes: requirements/ assessments embedded in regular coursework, and requirements/ assessments completed during the student teaching practicum.

**Requirements/assessments within coursework.** Interviewees from each program identified specific examples of assessments implemented within coursework
prior to student teaching that addressed aspects of Standard 6.4. Various projects across multiple courses in the PETE programs at RCC and SVU were developed to specifically address features of cultural competency and cultural awareness. For example, the courses at RCC which addressed aspects of element four which were identified in the previous section (Historical & Cultural Context in PE, Analysis & Assessment of PE, Adapted PE, Rhythms, Dance & Gymnastics) also included corresponding assessments components. Rubrics were used to assess TCs’ understanding of cultural concepts, and ability to integrate such concepts in a physical education setting.

Table 33  
Case Summaries- Assessing 6.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Creek College</td>
<td>-Historical &amp; Cultural Context in PE</td>
<td>-Course assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Analysis &amp; Assessment of PE</td>
<td>-Candidate Dispositions Assessment (self-assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Adapted PE</td>
<td>-Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Rhythms, Dance &amp; Gymnastics</td>
<td>-Competencies Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Valley University</td>
<td>-Intro to PE</td>
<td>-Assignments created by Jackie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Adapted PE</td>
<td>-Candidate Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Elementary methods/content block</td>
<td>-Secondary Portfolio Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Secondary methods/content block</td>
<td>-Student Teaching Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeview Heights University</td>
<td>-All PETE majors’ courses</td>
<td>-PETE Dispositions Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Student Teaching Practicum</td>
<td>-SPSA document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-edTPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, Jackie (SVU) assigned a variety of projects intended to move TCs’ beyond cultural awareness, such as the socio-cultural journal and the social identity
paper. In addition to assignments and projects, SVU’s PETE program also assessed features of Standard 6.4 through the Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix R) and the Secondary Methods Portfolio (Appendix T). Within the assessments, relevant items evaluated TCs’ demonstration of respect for different cultures and perspectives, equal treatment among students, and appropriate communication. Likewise, RHU’s PETE Dispositions Rubric (Appendix U) assessed pertinent aspects of TCs’ dispositions relating to element four, including relationships with others, emotional control, and communication.

**Requirements/assessments within student teaching.** As with the other three elements comprising Initial PETE Standard Six, assessments employed during student teaching also addressed characteristics of 6.4. RCC’s Student Teaching Dispositions Assessment (Appendix O) and Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P) specifically assessed the extent to which TCs made students feel valued and provided a positive and supportive learning environment. Likewise, at RHU, the SPSA document (Appendix W) featured items pertaining to cultural awareness, along with two items focused on TCs’ ability to communicate respectfully and with sensitivity. The Student Teaching Assessment (Appendix S) at SVU also assessed TCs’ dispositions related to respect and appropriate communication. The Competencies Checklist (Appendix N) utilized by RCC was the only assessment across all three programs that mirrored the rubric and rating descriptions for element four in the Initial PETE Standard Six (NASPE, 2008). Though the edTPA portfolio was implemented in all three cases, faculty from RHU were the only ones to identify the portfolio assessment as an area of the curriculum that assessed aspects of cultural competency as outline in 6.4.
Central Theme Two: Lack of Curricular Space to Address 6.4

In each case, faculty acknowledged how many areas of element four were not integrated or assessed unless an instructor had expertise in some area of cultural responsiveness. Rachel (RCC) explained how methods courses at Rocky Creek focused more on the pedagogical components of teaching, which left little room for instructors to address or assess other content or material, including cultural awareness. Beyond methods courses, faculty from SVU and RHU cited a lack of time available across the entire curriculum to deeply engage TCs’ with topics related to cultural diversity and inclusiveness. Pascal (RHU) spoke with great frustration with how little time instructors actually have to educate students on all the contemporary issues they may encounter as in-service physical education teachers.

Summary

Cross-case analysis demonstrated patterns in the strategies programs used to address aspects of professionalism, which included discussion, modeling, and offering opportunities for engagement. In some cases, TCs observed negative modeling of professional behaviors (e.g. appropriate attire, equitable feedback, inclusive teaching practices) from cooperating teachers, except in situations where cooperating teachers were graduates of the PETE program. Data analysis also revealed programs utilized multiple assessment techniques (e.g. systematic checklists, rubrics, standardized evaluations) to assess TCs’ professionalism during coursework and student teaching. Two programs had assessments in place to track and monitor TCs’ dispositions at various points in the program. Additionally, two of the three programs employed a formal
remediation process to address dispositional issues. In the following chapter, findings will be discussed within the context of previous research and the conceptual framework of occupational socialization.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

Discussion

With the inclusion of Standard Six in the 2008 Initial PETE Standards (NASPE, 2008), programs have been challenged to integrate, teach, monitor, and assess TCs’ professionalism. According to CAEP, programs seeking to achieve or maintain national accreditation have the freedom to determine how dispositions, which contribute to candidates’ overall professionalism, are assessed within their programs. To date, sporadic research exists describing the actual teaching and assessment practices of PETE programs pertaining specifically to TCs’ professionalism. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the ways in which three nationally accredited PETE programs taught and assessed Standard Six of the NASPE (2008) Initial PETE Standards. Framed by occupational socialization theory (Lawson, 1983), two research questions were utilized to examine the instructional strategies and assessment practices implemented by PETE program during the professional socialization phase of TCs’ socialization process:

Q1 In what ways do the selected PETE programs prepare TCs to meet each individual element of NASPE Initial PETE Standard Six?

Q2 In what ways do the selected PETE programs assess TCs across each individual element of Standard Six (e.g., when, who, how, and what aspects of professionalism are assessed)?

This chapter is arranged into two sections: (a) discussion, and (b) conclusions. Within the context of occupational socialization theory, the discussion of research
findings is presented, as it pertains to the research questions, in comparison with relevant literature. In the conclusions section, key themes will be summarized and synthesized, along with a presentation of final recommendations for future research regarding the teaching and assessment practices of PETE programs in relation to TCs’ professional responsibility, as defined by the most recent edition of the National Standards for Initial PETE (SHAPE, 2017).

**Occupational Socialization Theory**

The conceptual framework of occupational socialization was utilized to frame this study, as the theory seeks to explore the ways in which PETE programs recruit, prepare, and socialize TCs seeking to enter the field of physical education (Richards, Templin, & Graber, 2014). While the value, function, definition, and assessment of dispositions has generated ongoing debate within teacher education, all the interviewees in this study believed their program had the ability to positively impact TCs’ professionalism. Consistent with 88% of respondents from the survey developed and administered by Zost et al. (2014), all six interviewed PETE faculty in this multi-case study agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “Candidate dispositions can be changed as a result of participation in a teacher education program.” The overwhelming consensus supports Schussler’s (2006) hypothesis that dispositions can be fostered and supported within teacher education programs. Similarly, Carroll (2005) argued that “dispositions for teaching develop in a socio-cultural process through which individuals negotiate the meaning of their experience, in light of the underlying beliefs and attitudes they bring to teacher education, in the context of communities of practice” (p. 94-95). Thus, in order to promote and influence professionalism in positive ways, it is essential for instructors and
experienced professionals to provide TCs with the necessary scaffolding related to dispositions throughout various learning contexts (Cummins & Asempapa, 2013).

Previous research has supported the use of various teaching strategies employed by PETE programs to develop the beliefs and values expected of future teachers (Betourne & Richards, 2015; Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008; Curtner-Smith & Sofu, 2004; Hemphill, Richards, Gaudreault, & Templin, 2014; Richards, Templin, et al., 2014). Regarding research question one, findings align with relevant literature, in that a combination of discussion, modeling, and opportunities for engagement were utilized across all three cases to address the four elements of Standard Six (Cummins & Asempapa, 2013; Gore, 1990; Notar, Riley, Taylor, Thornburg, & Cargill, 2009; Payne and Summers, 2008; Zenkert, 2013). Findings related to research question two, which describe programs’ assessment techniques, also support literature, which has suggested programs utilize a compilation of self-evaluations, rubrics, checklists, observations, and a series of artifacts to assess TCs’ professional dispositions (Notar et al., 2009; Young & Youngs, 2005).

**Meeting Standard Six through Similar Preparation**

Q1 In what ways do the selected PETE programs prepare TCs to meet each individual element of NASPE Initial PETE Standard Six?

While each program certainly had their own approaches, interviewees often identified the same types of courses in which aspects of Standard Six were addressed. Such courses included content and methods courses, especially those with field experience components, and the student teaching practicum. These findings are consistent with those presented by Brouwer and Korthagen (2005), who described a comprehensive initial teacher preparation program that facilitated reflection through progressive
practicums in conjunction with PETE coursework. Similarly, research findings have shown numerous strategies and approaches have been used to enhance and develop professional dispositions in TCs (Stoddard, Braun, Dukes, & Koorland, 2007). Programs in this study identified three categories of teaching strategies employed to address elements of Standard Six: discussion, faculty modeling, and offering opportunities for engagement.

**Discussion**

Discussion was one of the most consistently identified teaching strategies utilized to address elements of Standard Six. In fact, discussion was mentioned by all three programs across all four elements, with the exception of element two (professional growth and development). However, even though interviewees did not explicitly identify discussion as a strategy utilized, they did mention talking through situations concerning professionalism, such as when SVU faculty discussed and reinforced expectations for conference attendance with TCs. Discussions concerning differentiation, professional ethics, and diversity frequently occurred in classroom settings, while others took place immediately before or after field experiences.

Often, reflective debriefings were initiated by an instructor when inappropriate attitudes or behaviors were observed during field experiences, in an attempt to combat negative socialization. Previous research has acknowledged the values, ideas, and dispositions observed in schools sometimes contradict what TCs learn in PETE (Dodds, 1989; Johnson & Lamberth, 2008; Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013), emphasizing the importance of addressing such situations. Payne and Summers (2008) found
discussion to be a beneficial way to address circumstances where observations of poor dispositions could lead to TCs’ adopting the same behaviors.

Discussions related to elements 6.1 and 6.3 often involved TCs reflecting on their own experiences in physical education. Richards and Templin (2011) encouraged teacher educators to acknowledge TCs’ prior experiences and pre-existing beliefs. Class discussions provided instructors frequent opportunities to challenge TCs to reflect on and question their current beliefs and values.

Research findings suggest TCs come into PETE programs with a relatively stable, pre-established set of subjective theories about physical education, which are formed through early socialization experiences (Schempp & Graber, 1992). At times, TCs’ subjective theories do not align with those promoted in a PETE program, especially for candidates with strong coaching orientations (Curtner-Smith, 1997, 2009). Faculty from both cases that offered undergraduate PETE degrees expressed dispositional issues with TCs who viewed themselves as coaches first. In accordance with existing literature, the incorporation of small and large group discussions were found to be effective teaching strategies for encouraging TCs to identify, reflect on, and apply concepts related to professionalism (Cummins & Asempapa, 2013; Gore, 1990).

Modeling

Upon examination of stakeholders’ beliefs related to the “dispositions” in teacher education, Zenkert (2013) concluded, “The field, alone, cannot just magically create quality teachers. Neither can coursework. Knowledge, skills, and dispositions must be explicitly modeled… in both the field and the college classroom” (p. 187). Findings support Zenkert’s (2013) conclusion, as modeling was identified as a central instructional
strategy in each program studied to address all four elements of Standard Six. Similarly, Payne and Summers (2008) attested, “If we are to expect of our candidates that they engage in behaviors in accordance with a set of professional dispositions, then we, as teacher educators, must be bound by the same expectations” (p. 44). In this study, PETE faculty in each case held themselves to many of the same expectations impressed upon TCs. For example, faculty consistently modeled aspects of professionalism outlined in Standard Six by setting high expectations (6.1), participating in PD activities (6.2), dressing professionally (6.3), exhibiting respect and sound judgment (6.3), and demonstrating inclusiveness (6.4). Previous research has indicted that TCs can benefit greatly from modeling of desired dispositional characteristics by instructors in teacher education programs (Noddings, 1987; Steward & Davis, 2005). Faculty influenced the socialization of candidates not only through words, but also through action, supporting the notion that “[t]eacher educators not only have the role of supporting [TCs’] learning about teaching, but in so doing, through their own teaching, model the role of the teacher.” (Korthagen, Loughran, & Lunenberg, 2005, p. 111).

Researchers have found field experiences provide TCs with authentic opportunities to observe and apply aspects of professionalism (Beverly, Santos, & Kyger, 2006). As such, Powers (1999) recommended TCs be placed with cooperating teachers who offer exemplar models for professionalism. Faculty in this study found cooperating teachers who were program alumni consistently modeled appropriate dispositions, surmising graduates knew of and continued to adhere to program expectations regarding professionalism. However, some interviewees acknowledged times when TCs observed cooperating teachers or other university faculty modeling poor dispositions. To offset the
observation of negative modeling, faculty often facilitated concentrated reflections during
debriefing sessions, a strategy Brouwer and Korthagen (2005) found to be impactful on
TCs’ subjective theories concerning the beliefs and behaviors of physical educators.

**Opportunities for Engagement**

Notar and colleagues (2009) acknowledged the incorporation of dispositions into
coursework to be a fairly uncommon practice among teacher education programs, but
suggested the integration of professionalism would prove to be beneficial. In this study,
programs reported TCs were provided various opportunities to engage with concepts
related to professionalism. Such opportunities encompassed any activity provided by the
PETE program that enabled TCs to plan, act, and reflect on dispositions. Examples
included fulfillment of pertinent course requirements, teaching episodes, participation in
relevant activities, assignments, workshops, or clinics.

Doyle (1997) suggested it is a teacher education program’s responsibility to
challenge [TCs’] own beliefs through participation in relevant experiences and
opportunities. Similarly, Stewart and Davis (2005) determined offering opportunities for
TCs to become active members of teacher organizations was one strategy teacher
education programs could employ to enhance the professional dispositions of TCs.
Programs in this study addressed Standard 6.2 by encouraging TCs to participate in PD
activities, with special attention given to state SHAPE conventions. Such findings are
similar to those of Hetland & Strand (2010), who reported 79.5% (n=35) of surveyed
PETE programs gave TCs the opportunity to attend a conference or convention. In fact,
RCC and SVU made attendance at the annual state SHAPE convention mandatory for
TCs enrolled in specific courses.
Results also align with Steward and Davis (2005), who found involvement in professional organizations was perceived by faculty to enhance TCs’ professional growth and collaboration. However, contrary to Steward and colleagues’ (2005) recommendation that PETE faculty sponsor student organizations, all PE Clubs and other PE-specific student organizations were reported as inactive. The PETE program at RCC did not believe a PE Club was necessary due to it being a master’s level program, given most classes were held in the evenings and many TCs had long commutes.

In addition to promoting participation in PD activities, programs in the current study also utilized various course assignments designed to encourage reflection of TCs’ current beliefs and values, especially concerning the topic of cultural competency. As has been shown by research, constructivist instructional approaches and guided questions can be used to help TCs examine their own cultural assumptions (Banks et al., 2005; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Richards, Templin, et al., 2014). Through reflection essays and journaling assignments, TCs at RHU were given numerous opportunities to increase awareness and understanding of personal beliefs related to socio-cultural issues. Similar to RHU’s social identity essay assignment, Betourne and Richards (2015) encouraged the use of autobiographical essays to help TCs examine and critique their prior experiences.

Strategies comparable to RHU’s socio-cultural journal, which attempt to surface, challenge, and transform TCs’ beliefs, especially when coupled with actual experiences or focused inquiry, have been utilized by educators in several teacher education programs (Banks et al., 2005; Tinning, 2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). In addition to these strategies, other constructivist teaching approaches found to be effective ways to influence reflective dispositions include case-based learning (Hemphill, Richard,
Gaudreault, & Templin, 2015), portfolios (Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2000), and critical incidents (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004). Future research should investigate the extent to which these additional strategies advocated within the literature promote and encourage aspects of professionalism outlined in the Initial PETE Standards.

Cummins and Asempapa (2013) suggested teacher educations strive to support TCs in their awareness and understanding of professionalism and help TCs to reflect through continued application in field-based experiences. The three programs employed a variety of formative assignments designed to measure the extent to which TCs were applying dispositions in the field. For example, RCC and SVU both provided TCs with opportunities to record, analyze, and reflect on their frequency, quality, and provision of feedback during teaching episodes. Similarly, assignments in the Adapted PE class at RHU allowed TCs’ opportunities to demonstrate dispositions addressed in Standard 6.1 and 6.3, such as setting high expectations for all students and providing equitable treatment and participation opportunities for all students regardless of skill level. These experiences aligned with Splitter’s (2010) contention that it was not enough for a TC to be able to define what a disposition was, but they also must be able to apply these dispositions in the field.

**Assessing Standard Six through Similar Techniques**

Q2 In what ways do the selected PETE programs assess TCs across each individual element of Standard Six (e.g., when, who, how, and what aspects of professionalism are assessed)?

Similar to findings from existing research, programs in this study utilized a compilation of self-evaluations, rubrics, checklists, observations, and artifacts to assess TCs’ professional dispositions (Notar et al., 2009; Young & Youngs, 2005). While the
comprehensiveness of each program’s assessments varied, all employed at least one assessment focused specifically on dispositions. In addition, the assessment procedures differed by program, with 4-8 people completing dispositions assessments, and two of the programs including self-assessments. Interestingly, even though all programs required TCs to submit and pass the edTPA portfolio assessment, only one program identified edTPA as an area of the program that assessed aspects of Standard Six.

How Dispositions were Assessed:
Origin of Assessments

Lund et al. (2007) highlighted the process of identifying, creating, validating, and implementing a dispositions rubric to be of upmost importance for PETE programs. Several teacher education programs have documented the process they pursued when attempting to create an instrument to measure TCs’ dispositions (Beverly et al., 2006; Koeppen & Davison-Jenkins, 2006; Miller & Maninger, 2012; Payne & Summers, 2008; Shiveley & Misco, 2010). In contrast to Lund and colleagues’ (2007) recommendation, all the programs in this study utilized assessments developed outside of the PETE program to measure TCs’ professionalism.

Interestingly, RHU used a dispositions rubric developed by Wayda and Lund (2005). However, since the rubric was created prior to the introduction of the 2008 Initial PETE Standards, there did not appear to be complete alignment with Standard Six. Dispositions included in the rubric were originally identified within employment literature as desirable dispositions for K-12 teachers. While studies have established the validity and reliability of Wayda and Lund’s (2005) dispositions (Ignico & Gammon, 2010; Lee et al., 2014), items listed on the document only vaguely align with aspects of professionalism outlined in Standard Six rubric. As such, characteristics included on the
rubric focus more on assessing dispositions of a successful college student or future professional (e.g. attendance, in class performance, group work), instead of dispositions expected of an educator who teaches and interacts with K-12 students (e.g. provides equal amounts of feedback and equitable participation opportunities for all students).

Additionally, Wayda and Lund (2005) suggested instructors introduce the rubric to TCs early in the program, and TCs fill out a corresponding self-assessment. While the rubric was used to assess TCs in every PETE majors’ course at RHU, faculty indicated TCs never saw the rubric, nor was a self-assessment ever administered.

One assessment in the study aligned specifically with Standard Six of the Initial PETE Standards. The RCC Competencies Checklist was an exact replication of the Initial PETE Standards Rubric (NASPE, 2008). The checklist was completed for each TC toward the end of student teaching by a field supervisor, with aggregated data from the assessment utilized in the program’s NCATE/CAEP accreditation program report. TCs were aware of what the rubric consisted of, as a copy of the rating descriptions were included in the Student Teaching Handbook. Interestingly, though all programs were SHAPE/CAEP accredited, this was the only assessment identified by faculty across all three cases that specifically align Initial PETE Standards in mind.

**Assessment Implementation Procedures**

**When did assessments occur?** Previous research findings suggest disposition assessments should be introduced early and referenced often as candidates are assessed multiple times throughout the program, allowing for numerous opportunities to promote TCs’ growth and reflection (Beverly et al., 2006; Brewer, Lindquist, & Altemueller, 2011; Diez, 2006; Zenkert, 2013). In this study TCs’ professionalism was assessed
anywhere from 2-8 times throughout each program. The dispositions of TCs at RCC were measured twice during student teaching using two different assessments, while candidates’ dispositions at SVU were assessed by instructors across four courses, including one general teacher education course housed in the School of Education. RHU reported implementing the PETE Dispositions Assessment (Appendix U) in every PETE majors’ course offered.

While programs assessed candidate dispositions at multiple points, it did not appear the majority of these assessments were utilized for reflection purposes. In most cases, TCs were unaware of their scores on the dispositions assessments unless the ratings identified a dispositional issue, which then triggered remedial measures. Thus, the uniform dispositions assessments implemented served to monitor the prevalence of unacceptable dispositions, but were not structured in such a way as to allow opportunities for candidate growth and reflection.

Who assessed teacher candidates’ professionalism? Relevant literature has suggested a more well-rounded view of TCs’ professionalism is represented when multiple assessors are considered in the evaluation process (Ignico & Gammon, 2010; Wayda & Lund, 2005). In this study, TCs’ dispositions were assessed by 3-8 individuals, in some cases including the TC themselves. Generally, assessments were completed by PETE instructors, field supervisors, and cooperating teachers. However, in some situations within the student teaching practicum, the cooperating teacher and TC would also provide input for the one assessment submitted by the field supervisor.

It has been deemed beneficial for teacher education programs to provide multiple self-assessment opportunities for TCs as part of their ongoing reflective process (Ignico
According to Osguthorpe (2013), “The development of dispositions appears to require active participation on the part of the [TC], including some form of self-assessment and reflection at regular intervals throughout a [TC] program” (p. 25). In this study, RCC reported utilizing self-assessments, but only required TCs to complete the form once. Self-assessments were submitted to the Associate Dean of Graduate Advising, who compared instructor ratings to TC ratings. Thus, the process of self-assessment at RCC suggests the contents of the form were not discussed with TCs or compared to faculty evaluations, leaving candidates with little to no feedback or guided reflection. At SVU, one faculty member reported opportunities for TCs to self-assess using the same form completed by faculty. However, the purpose of the self-evaluation seemed to function as a formative way to familiarize TCs with the assessment, as they were not collected or compared to faculty ratings.

**Which aspects of professionalism were assessed?** All three cases identified multiple assessment strategies to assess the features of professionalism. The specific
aspects assessed within each assessment varied by case, but when considered all together, each characteristic outlined within each element of Standard Six was assessed within each program. In some cases, aspects were assessed multiple times. Since all the assessments used to assess aspects of TCs’ professionalism (with the exception of RCC’s Competencies Checklist) were developed outside of the PETE program, many of the dispositions assessed were not addressed explicitly in NASPE’s (2008) rating description for the Initial PETE Standards, but were still considered by faculty to fit within the element statement.

For example, many programs assessed TCs’ attendance and punctuality within 6.3 (professional ethics). However, attendance is not listed within the “Acceptable” or “Target” rating descriptions document. Similarly, any assessment item associated with “communication” was automatically categorized by faculty as pertaining to element four, though the rating description only explicitly addresses the following aspects: culturally responsive teaching, respect for cultural differences and inclusiveness, and the avoidance of negative or demeaning language. Thus, assessments that included disposition items developed without consideration of the Initial PETE Standards may generally relate to, but often do not address specific aspects of the four elements included in Standard Six.

Summary

Programs in this study utilized a variety of instructional strategies to promote the development of TCs’ professionalism, including discussion, modeling, and offering opportunities for engagement. Such strategies have been recognized as effective way to influence reflective dispositions (Cummins & Asempapa, 2013; Gore, 1990; Notar et al., 2009; Payne & Summers, 2008; Zenkert, 2013). Other constructivist teaching approaches
that provide TCs’ opportunities to engage with such topics include case-based learning (Hemphill et al., 2015), portfolios (Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2000), and critical incidents (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004). These strategies should be considered by PETE programs seeking additional ways to address TCs’ professionalism.

In this study, programs primarily implemented dispositions assessments and student teaching evaluations developed and distributed by their respective Schools/Colleges of Education. The INTASC Standards were used as a guiding document for many of the assessments, which also influenced the Initial PETE Standards. Yet, the language and focus of the assessments often did not exhibit strong alignment with the ways dispositions were operationalized in Standard Six. In such situations, programs stretched to find evidence of achievement for individual elements that did not specifically align with items used in the assessment documents. While it may not be feasible for most PETE programs, findings in relevant literature encourage programs to develop their own dispositions assessments (Lund et al., 2007). Future research should examine the validity, reliability, and utility of assessments not specifically developed for standards they are used to evaluate.

**Limitations**

Within this research study, several limitations existed. Due to qualitative nature of this investigation, and the limited number of cases included, it is challenging to transfer and apply these findings to other PETE programs. All 450+ SHAPE/CAEP accredited PETE programs received the initial questionnaire via email and were invited to participate in the study. However, it is difficult to ensure the questionnaire went to the correct individual, as changes in leadership may have occurred. Likewise, some
information on institutions’ websites were outdated, which made it challenging to identify current program coordinators.

This study was limited by participants’ willingness to accurately describe the teaching and assessment practices utilized by their institution. Similarly, another limitation was participants’ potential lack of familiarity concerning the ways in which colleagues taught and assessed professionalism within individual classes. Interviewed faculty may have been unaware of assignments or activities employed by colleagues that addressed aspects of professionalism outlined in the Initial PETE Standards. Future research utilizing a case study approach should consider interviewing all PETE faculty of instructional strategies and assessment practices used to ensure a comprehensive description is reported. In addition, credibility could be enhanced by adding student interviews and observations, which would strengthen triangulation by adding additional perspectives.

Another limitation was that programs included in this study led to undergraduate and graduate degrees. Interviewed faculty insisted the teaching and assessment strategies utilized to address and assess TCs’ professionalism were the same regardless of the degree being sought. However, the age and experience differences between traditional undergraduate students and older second career individuals may have inadvertently impacted the ways faculty addressed aspects of professionalism. Had the study only examined graduate only or undergraduate only programs, the findings may have been different. More research is needed to investigate potential differences between the attitudes and beliefs of TCs in undergraduate and graduate PETE programs.
The size of PETE programs included in the study could also be a limitation. Programs in this study reported graduating between 15-35 TCs during the previous year. Differences may exist in the way significantly larger or smaller programs approach the development and assessment of TCs’ professionalism. Future research should specifically examine programs with a substantial number of yearly graduates in order to gain a better understanding of how program size may affect teaching and assessment approaches related to professionalism.

Conclusions

In the words of Edgington and Cox (2015), “One of the greatest challenges facing teacher preparation programs is preparing candidates for the professional dispositions inherent in being a teacher” (p. 47). Findings revealed programs in this study faced such challenges, but appeared to focus more on monitoring TCs’ professionalism rather than promoting the development of appropriate dispositions. Thus, while a variety of instructional strategies were utilized by programs to address TCs’ attitudes and beliefs, the assessment processes employed did not appear to aid in the development of candidate dispositions. Even in cases where progressive, systematic assessments were applied, the intent of the assessments centered more on product rather than process, as TCs were not privy to instructors’ ratings unless there was an issue. In essence, assessments identified in this study were implemented more to monitor rather than to develop TCs’ professionalism.

Osguthorpe (2008) urged teacher education programs to “move away from the ‘moral dispositions police’ approach to teacher education—the approach that merely seeks to identify [TCs] of deficient disposition and poor moral character for the purpose
of removing them from the program” (p. 297). Programs in this study weren’t merely “policing” TC dispositions, as two of three programs did report having a formal remediation process to handle issues with TCs’ professionalism. However, dispositional growth did not appear to be a primary goal for any of the programs; as long as TCs achieved a rating of “Acceptable” or “Meets Expectations”, there was no attention given to the assessments. TCs were not encouraged to move toward “Target” or “Exceeds Expectations” ratings. Diez (2006) alleged the integration of meaningful dispositions could occur throughout a program instead of being used a screening tool. Thus, when programs fail to review and discuss results of dispositions assessments with TCs, a powerful opportunity to promote TCs’ growth and reflection in such areas is lost.

Misco (2007) warned about dispositions measures that are perceived as a non-essential part of the program simply discussed at the end of the academic year. In response to such challenges, Shiveley and Misco (2010) recommended programs strive to implement a dispositions assessment plan that is proactive instead of reactive. In doing so, assessment procedures could promote development and reflection, rather than merely reinforce expectations for professionalism in punitive ways.

Also, findings from this study suggest programs implemented evaluation techniques more than assessment techniques when measuring TCs’ professionalism. According to researchers, “Assessment is widely recognized as an ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving student learning.” (Parker, Fleming, Beyerlein, Apple, & Krumsiegl, 2001, p. 1). In contrast, “Evaluation is recognized as a more scientific process aimed at determining what can be known about performance capabilities and how these are best measured.” (Parker et al., 2001, p. 1). In this study, interviewed faculty across all
cases identified and discussed dispositions “assessments” utilized within their respective PETE programs. However, based on the definition, it would appear programs were actually implementing various dispositions “evaluations”, as very little reflection or growth occurred as a result of the completed forms.

The discrepancies between assessment and evaluation reflects a trend observed in teacher education programs wherein assessment is framed as development (Murrell, Diez, Feiman-Nemser, Schussler, 2010). At times, programs might claim they are helping to develop TCs’ professionalism through periodic assessments, even though nothing is actually done with the data collected from the intermittent assessments to encourage TCs’ growth or reflection. While Rocky Creek’s Candidate Dispositions Assessment (Appendix P) required TCs to indicate how they could further develop the dispositions listed on the rubric, no feedback concerning a field supervisor’s perception of the quality or accuracy of the responses was provided. Thus, TCs were prompted to consider ways they might further develop professional dispositions, but received no support or accountability for such progress.

As Feiman-Nemser and Schussler (2010) affirmed, “An assessment by itself holds little value. Assessments possess value when they measure something meaningful. Assessments for dispositions are meaningful when they are used as tools for development” (p. 199). To more effectively promote TCs’ professional dispositions, it may be prudent for PETE programs to continue utilizing current assessment practices, but incorporate multiple opportunities for growth and reflection. Research should continue to examine the feasibility of integrating continuous assessment strategies throughout the curriculum designed to develop candidates’ attitudes and beliefs.
With the release of the most recent version of the National Initial PETE Standards by SHAPE America in February 2017 (Table 5), PETE programs will again be faced with the challenge of modifying current curriculum and assessment plans to adequately address the new revisions. Standard Six of the 2017 Standards is titled “Professional Responsibility” and is comprised of three components. One of the most prominent revisions appears in component 6.c, which addresses the promotion and advocacy of physical education and expanded opportunities for physical activity. The inclusion of this component will require programs to assess the advocacy effort of TCs, and will facilitate the need for more studies. Research questions could address the ways PETE programs choose to demonstrate TCs’ achievement of this newest inclusion to Standard Six for future SHAPE/CAEP accreditation reports. Similarly, future studies could examine how programs choose to define competency for TCs regarding the three components of Standard Six.
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APPENDIX A

1995 NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR BEGINNING PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS
National Standards for Beginning
Physical Education Teachers
(NASPE, 1995)

Standard 1: Content Knowledge
The teacher understands physical education content, disciplinary concepts, and tools of inquiry related to the development of a physically educated person.

Standard 2: Growth and Development
The teacher understands how individuals learn and develop, and can provide opportunities that support their physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development.

Standard 3: Diverse Learners
The teacher understands how individuals differ in their approaches to learning and creates appropriate instruction adapted to diverse learners.

Standard 4: Management and Motivation
The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Standard 5: Communication
The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster inquiry, collaboration, and engagement in physical activity settings.

Standard 6: Planning and Instruction
The teacher plans and implements a variety of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies to develop physically educated individuals.

Standard 7: Learner Assessment
The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to foster physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development of learners in physical activity.

Standard 8: Reflection
The teacher is a reflective practitioner who evaluates the effects of his/her actions on others (e.g., learners, parents/guardians, and other professionals in the learning community) and seeks opportunities to grow professionally.

Standard 9: Collaboration
The teacher fosters relationships with colleagues, parents/guardians, and community agencies to support learners' growth and well-being.
APPENDIX B

2003 NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR BEGINNING PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS
National Standards for Beginning Physical Education Teachers (NASPE, 2003)

Standard 1: Content Knowledge
Physical education teachers understand physical education content and disciplinary concepts related to the development of a physically educated person.

Outcomes—Teacher candidates must do the following:
1.1 Identify critical elements of motor skill performance and combine motor skills into appropriate sequences for the purpose of improving learning.
1.2 Demonstrate competent motor skill performance in a variety of physical activities.
1.3 Describe performance concepts and strategies related to skillful movement and physical activity (e.g., fitness principles, game tactics, skill improvement principles).
1.4 Describe and apply biophysical (anatomical, physiological, and biomechanical) and social-psychological concepts to skillful movement, physical activity, and fitness.
1.5 Understand and debate current physical education/activity issues and laws based on historical, philosophical, and sociological perspectives.
1.6 Demonstrate knowledge of approved state and national content standards and local program goals.

Standard 2: Growth and Development
Physical education teachers understand how individuals learn and develop and can provide opportunities that support their physical, cognitive social, and emotional development.

Outcomes—Teacher candidates must do the following:
2.1 Monitor individual and group performance in order to design safe instruction that meets student developmental needs in the physical, cognitive, and social/emotional domains.
2.2 Understand the biological, psychological, sociological, experiential, and environmental factors (e.g., neurological development, physique, gender, socioeconomic status) that influence developmental readiness to learn and refine movement skills.
2.3 Identify, select, and implement appropriate learning/practice opportunities based on understanding the student, the learning environment, and the task.

Standard 3: Diverse Students
Physical education teachers understand how individuals differ in their approaches to learning and create appropriate instruction adapted to these differences.
Outcomes—Teacher candidates must do the following:

3.1 Identify, select, and implement appropriate instruction that is sensitive to students’ strengths/weaknesses, multiple needs, learning styles, and prior experiences (e.g., cultural, personal, family, community).
3.2 Use appropriate services and resources to meet diverse learning needs.

Standard 4: Management and Motivation
Physical education teachers use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a safe learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Outcomes—Teacher candidates must do the following:
4.1 Use managerial routines that create smoothly functioning learning experiences and environments.
4.2 Organize, allocate, and manage resources (e.g., students, time, space, equipment, activities, teacher attention) to provide active and equitable learning experiences.
4.3 Use a variety of developmentally appropriate practices to motivate students to participate in physical activity in and out of the school.
4.4 Use strategies to help students demonstrate responsible personal and social behaviors (e.g., mutual respect, support for other, safety, cooperation) that promote positive relationships and a productive learning environment.
4.5 Develop an effective behavior management plan.

Standard 5: Communication
Physical education teachers use knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal and media communication techniques to enhance learning and engagement in physical activity settings.

Outcomes—Teacher candidates must do the following:
5.1 Describe and demonstrate effective communication skills (e.g., use of language, clarity, conciseness, pacing, giving and receiving feedback, age-appropriate language, nonverbal communication).
5.2 Communicate managerial and instructional information in a variety of ways (e.g., bulletin boards, music, task cards, posters, internet, video).
5.3 Communicate in ways that demonstrate sensitivity to all students (e.g., considerate of ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, ability, and gender differences).
5.4 Describe and implement strategies to enhance communication among students in physical activity settings.

Standard 6: Planning and Instruction
Physical education teachers plan and implement a variety of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies to develop physically educated individuals, based on state and national (NASPE K-12) standards.
Outcomes—Teacher candidates must do the following:
6.1 Identify, develop, and implement appropriate program and instructional goals.
6.2 Develop long- and short-term plans that are linked to both program and instructional goals and student needs.
6.3 Select and implement instructional strategies, based on selected content, student needs, and safety issues, to facilitate learning in the physical activity setting.
6.4 Design and implement learning experiences that are safe, appropriate, relevant, and based on principles of effective instruction.
6.5 Apply disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge in developing and implementing effective learning environments and experiences.
6.6 Provide learning experiences that allow students to integrate knowledge and skills from multiple subject areas.
6.7 Select and implement appropriate (i.e., comprehensive, accurate, useful, safe) teaching resources and curriculum materials.
6.8 Use effective demonstrations and explanations to link physical activity concepts to appropriate learning experiences.
6.9 Develop and use appropriate instructional cues and prompts to facilitate competent motor skill performance.
6.10 Develop a repertoire of direct and indirect instructional formats to facilitate student learning (e.g., ask questions, pose scenarios, promote problem solving and critical thinking, and facilitate factual recall).

Standard 7: Student Assessment
Physical education teachers understand and use assessment to foster physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development of student in physical activity.

Outcomes—Teacher candidates must do the following:
7.1 Identify key components of various types of assessment, describe their appropriate and inappropriate use, and address issues of validity, reliability, and bias.
7.2 Use a variety of appropriate authentic and traditional assessment techniques (including both self-and peer assessments) to assess student understanding and performance, provide feedback, and communicate student progress (i.e., for both formative and summative purposes).
7.3 Involve students in self-and peer assessment.
7.4 Interpret and use learning and performance data to make informed curricular and/or instructional decisions.

Standard 8: Reflection
Physical education teachers are reflective practitioners who evaluate the effects of their actions on other (e.g., students, parents/guardians, fellow professionals) and seek opportunities to grow professionally.

Outcomes—Teacher candidates must do the following:
8.1 Use a reflective cycle involving description of teaching, justification of teaching performance, the setting of teaching goals, and implementation of change.
8.2 Use available resources (e.g., colleagues, literature, professional organizations) to develop as a reflective professional.

8.3 Construct a plan for continued professional growth based on the assessment of personal teaching performance.

**Standard 9: Technology**

Physical education teachers use information technology to enhance learning and to enhance personal and professional productivity.

**Outcomes—Teacher candidates must do the following:**

9.1 Demonstrate knowledge of current technologies and their application in physical education.

9.2 Design, develop, and implement student-learning activities that integrate information technology.

9.3 Use technologies to communicate, network, locate resources, and enhance continuing professional development.

**Student 10: Collaboration**

Physical education teachers foster relationships with colleagues, parents/guardians, and community agencies to support students’ growth and well-being.

**Outcomes—Teacher candidates must do the following:**

10.1 Identify strategies to become an advocate in the school and community to promote a variety of physical activity opportunities.

10.2 Actively participate in the professional physical education community (e.g., local, state, district, national) and within the broader education field.

10.3 Identify and actively seek community resources to enhance physical activity opportunities.

10.4 Pursue productive relationships with parents/guardians and school colleagues to support student growth and well-being.
APPENDIX C

2008 NATIONAL INITIAL PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION STANDARDS
National Initial Physical Education  
Teacher Education Standards  
(NASPE, 2008)

**Standard 1: Scientific and Theoretical Knowledge**
Physical education teacher candidates know and apply discipline-specific scientific and theoretical concepts critical to the development of physically educated individuals.

**Elements – Teacher candidates will:**
1.1 Describe and apply physiological and biomechanical concepts related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness.
1.2 Describe and apply motor learning and psychological/behavioral theory related to skillful movement, physical activity, and fitness.
1.3 Describe and apply motor development theory and principles related to skillful movement, physical activity, and fitness.
1.4 Identify historical, philosophical, and social perspectives of physical education issues and legislation.
1.5 Analyze and correct critical elements of motor skills and performance concepts.

**Standard 2: Skill and Fitness Based Competence**
Physical education teacher candidates are physically educated individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary to demonstrate competent movement performance and health enhancing fitness as delineated in the NASPE K – 12 Standards.

**Elements – Teacher candidates will:**
2.1 Demonstrate personal competence in motor skill performance for a variety of physical activities and movement patterns.
2.2 Achieve and maintain a health-enhancing level of fitness throughout the program.
2.3 Demonstrate performance concepts related to skillful movement in a variety of physical activities.

**Standard 3: Planning and Implementation**
Physical education teacher candidates plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state, and national standards to address the diverse needs of all students.

**Elements – Teacher candidates will:**
3.1 Design and implement short and long term plans that are linked to program and instructional goals as well as a variety of student needs.
3.2 Develop and implement appropriate (e.g., measurable, developmentally appropriate, performance based) goals and objectives aligned with local, state, and /or national standards.
3.3 Design and implement content that is aligned with lesson objectives.
3.4 Plan for and manage resources to provide active, fair, and equitable learning experiences.
3.5 Plan and adapt instruction for diverse student needs, adding specific accommodations and/or modifications for student exceptionalities.
3.6 Plan and implement progressive and sequential instruction that addresses the diverse needs of all students.
3.7 Demonstrate knowledge of current technology by planning and implementing learning experiences that require students to appropriately use technology to meet lesson objectives.

**Standard 4: Instructional Delivery and Management**
Physical education teacher candidates use effective communication and pedagogical skills and strategies to enhance student engagement and learning.

**Elements – Teacher candidates will:**
4.1 Demonstrate effective verbal and non-verbal communication skills across a variety of instructional formats.
4.2 Implement effective demonstrations, explanations, and instructional cues and prompts to link physical activity concepts to appropriate learning experiences.
4.3 Provide effective instructional feedback for skill acquisition, student learning, and motivation.
4.4 Recognize the changing dynamics of the environment and adjust instructional tasks based on student responses.
4.5 Utilize managerial rules, routines, and transitions to create and maintain a safe and effective learning environment.
4.6 Implement strategies to help students demonstrate responsible personal and social behaviors in a productive learning environment.

**Standard 5: Impact on Student Learning**
Physical education teacher candidates utilize assessments and reflection to foster student learning and inform instructional decisions.

**Elements – Teacher candidates will:**
5.1 Select or create appropriate assessments that will measure student achievement of goals and objectives.
5.2 Use appropriate assessments to evaluate student learning before, during, and after instruction.
5.3 Utilize the reflective cycle to implement change in teacher performance, student learning, and/or instructional goals and decisions.

**Standard 6: Professionalism**
Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate dispositions essential to becoming effective professionals.

**Elements – Teacher candidates will:**
6.1 Demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the belief that all students can become physically educated individuals.
6.2 Participate in activities that enhance collaboration and lead to professional growth and development.
6.3 Demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the professional ethics of highly qualified teachers.
6.4 Communicate in ways that convey respect and sensitivity
APPENDIX D

2017 NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR INITIAL PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION
National Standards for Initial Physical Education
Teacher Education
(SHAPE, 2017)

**Standard 1: Content and Foundational Knowledge**
Physical education candidates demonstrate an understanding of common and specialized content, and scientific and theoretical foundations for the delivery of an effective preK-12 physical education program.

**Components – Candidates will:**
1.a Describe and apply common content knowledge for teaching preK-12 physical education.

1.b Describe and apply specialized content knowledge for teaching preK-12 physical education.

1.c Describe and apply physiological and biomechanical concepts related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for preK-12 students.

1.d Describe and apply motor learning and behavior-change/psychological principles related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for preK-12 students.

1.e Describe and apply motor development theory and principles related to fundamental motor skills, skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for preK-12 students.

1.f Describe the historical, philosophical and social perspectives of physical education issues and legislation.

**Standard 2. Skillfulness and Health-Related Fitness**
Physical education candidates are physically literate individuals who can demonstrate skillful performance in physical education content areas and health-enhancing levels of fitness.

**Components – Candidates will:**
2.a Demonstrate competency in all fundamental motor skills, as well as skillful performance in a minimum of four physical education content areas (e.g., games and sports, aquatics, dance and rhythmic activities, fitness activities, outdoor pursuits, individual-performance activities).

2.b Achieve and maintain a health-enhancing level of fitness throughout the program.

**Standard 3. Planning and Implementation**
Physical education candidates apply content and foundational knowledge to plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state and/or SHAPE America’s National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education through the effective use of resources, accommodations and/or
modifications, technology and metacognitive strategies to address the diverse needs of all students.

**Components – Candidates will:**

3.a Plan and implement appropriate (e.g., measurable, developmentally appropriate, performance-based) short- and long-term plan objectives that are aligned with local, state and/or SHAPE America’s National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education.

3.b Plan and implement progressive and sequential content that aligns with short- and long-term plan objectives and that addresses the diverse needs of all students.

3.c Plan for and manage resources to provide active, fair and equitable learning experiences.

3.d Plan and implement individualized instruction for diverse student needs, adding specific accommodations and/or modifications for all students.

3.e Plan and implement learning experiences that require students to use technology appropriately in meeting one or more short- and long-term plan objective(s).

3.f Plan and implement learning experiences that engage students in using metacognitive strategies appropriately to analyze their own performance results.

**Standard 4. Instructional Delivery and Management**

Physical education candidates engage students in meaningful learning experiences through effective use of pedagogical skills. They use communication, feedback, technology, and instructional and managerial skills to enhance student learning.

**Components – Candidates will:**

4.a Demonstrate verbal and nonverbal communication skills that convey respect and sensitivity across all learning experiences.

4.b Implement demonstrations, explanations and instructional cues that are aligned with short- and long-term plan objectives.

4.c Evaluate the changing dynamics of the learning environment and adjust instructional tasks as needed to further student progress.

4.d Implement transitions, routines and positive behavior management to create and maintain a safe, supportive and engaging learning environment.

4.e Analyze motor skills and performance concepts through multiple means (e.g., visual observation, technology) in order to provide specific, congruent feedback to enhance student learning.
**Standard 5. Assessment of Student Learning**

Physical education candidates select and implement appropriate assessments to monitor students’ progress and guide decision making related to instruction and learning.

**Components – Candidates will:**

5.a Select or create authentic, formal assessments that measure student attainment of short and long-term objectives.

5.b Implement formative assessments that monitor student learning before and throughout the long-term plan, as well as summative assessments that evaluate student learning upon completion of the long-term plan.

5.c Implement a reflective cycle to guide decision making specific to candidate performance, student learning, and short- and long-term plan objectives.

**Standard 6. Professional Responsibility**

Physical education candidates demonstrate behaviors essential to becoming effective professionals. They exhibit professional ethics and culturally competent practices; seek opportunities for continued professional development; and demonstrate knowledge of promotion/advocacy strategies for physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities that support the development of physically literate individuals.

**Components – Candidates will:**

6.a Engage in behavior that reflects professional ethics, practice and cultural competence.

6.b Engage in continued professional growth and collaboration in schools and/or professional organizations.

6.c Describe strategies, including the use of technology, for the promotion and advocacy of physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities.
APPENDIX E

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
APPROVAL LETTER
Institutional Review Board

DATE: November 29, 2016
TO: Brandy Lynch
FROM: University of Northern Colorado (UNC O) IRB
PROJECT TITLE: [86951-1] Addressing the Assessment of Professionalism in PETE Teacher Candidates: A Multi-Case Study of CAEP Accredited Programs
SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project
ACTION: APPROVAL/VERIFICATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
DECISION DATE: November 29, 2016
EXPIRATION DATE: November 29, 2020

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this project. The University of Northern Colorado (UNC O) IRB approves this project and verifies its status as EXEMPT according to federal IRB regulations.

Brandy,

Thank you for your patience with the UNC IRB process. Your materials are clear, thorough and well-prepared. Please amend the contact information at the end of all consent forms for mistreatment as a research participant verbally as follows: ‘If you have any concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please contact Sherry May, IRB Administrator, in the Office of Sponsored Programs, Kepner Hall, University of Northern Colorado Greeley, CO 80639; 970-351-1910.’ These minor changes should be made before use of the forms but do not need to be submitted for further review.

Best wishes with your interesting and relevant dissertation research.

Sincerely,

Dr. Megan Stellino, UNC IRB Co-Chair

We will retain a copy of this correspondence within our records for a duration of 4 years.

If you have any questions, please contact Sherry May at 970-351-1910 or Sherry.May@unco.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.
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EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS
Dear PETE Coordinator,

My name is Brandy Lynch, and I am a doctoral candidate in the School of Sport and Exercise Science at the University of Northern Colorado. I am conducting a dissertation study investigating the ways in which CAEP accredited physical education teacher education programs address the assessment of professionalism in teacher candidates, as outlined by Standard Six of the 2008 National Initial PETE Standards. I would appreciate your participation in completing an online questionnaire by xxxxx. It should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete, and also includes a place at the end to upload any pertinent documents related to the topics of interest. Therefore, it would be helpful to have your most recent NCATE/CAEP report, and documents pertinent to your evaluation of teacher candidates' professionalism close at hand. The questionnaire contains questions regarding demographic information, the teaching and assessment practices of TC dispositions, and your willingness to continue further with the study. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Northern Colorado. If you are willing to participate in the study, please click on the following link to access the survey:

Addressing the Assessment of Professionalism in PETE Teacher Candidates

*note:
If this link does not work, please copy and paste: https://unco.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_8IxyG3wgLEEzyvsp into your web browser.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to participate in the study. Please feel free to pass this email along to anyone else who might be willing and able to complete this questionnaire as well. If you have questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me at brandy.lynch@unco.edu.

Best,

Brandy M. Lynch, M.S. Ed., CSCS
Doctoral Candidate, Sport Pedagogy
School of Sport & Exercise Science
University of Northern Colorado
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INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE & DOCUMENT COLLECTION INFORMED CONSENT
What is the purpose of the study?
The primary purpose of this study is to describe the ways in which CAEP accredited PETE programs address the assessment of professionalism in teacher candidates, as outlined by Standard Six of the 2008 National Initial PETE Standards. Therefore, the purpose of this questionnaire is to solicit PETE program coordinators who may be willing to participate in a research study examining the ways in which PETE programs teach and assess professionalism in teacher candidates.

What will you be asked to do?
Complete a confidential, online questionnaire on your PETE program’s teaching methods and assessment practices related to teacher candidates’ professionalism. The questionnaire will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete, and include a place at the end to upload any pertinent documents related to the topics of interest. The questionnaire contains questions regarding demographic information, the teaching and assessment practices of TC dispositions, and your willingness to continue further with the study. This is not a test; there are no “right” or “wrong” answers. So, just answer as honestly and thoroughly as you can. Your answers will not be shared with anyone other than the researchers, and all information will be kept confidential. Your name will not be attached to your answers and therefore you are anonymous in your responses to our questions, unless you are willing to continue further with the study and provide your contact information. The information you provide will be saved on private, secure computer storage devices to which only the researcher will have access. One hard copy of the information will remain with the researchers and be kept in their locked offices on the UNC campus.

What are the possible risks and discomforts?
Potential risks in this project are minimal. You may feel uncomfortable sharing your opinions and experiences.

Will you receive any compensation for taking part in this study?
There is no compensation for participating in this study.
Will you benefit from taking part in this study?
Study findings will help the researcher understand the ways in which CAEP accredited PETE programs teach and assess professionalism in teacher candidates and better inform dispositional assessment practices in physical education teacher education. If selected for the multi-case study, a comprehensive overview of your program’s teaching and assessment practices related to TC professionalism will be provided upon request at the completion of this study so you might learn from the findings if interested.

What if you have questions?
If you have questions about the study, you can contact Brandy Lynch, 970-XXX-XXXX or brandy.lynch@unco.edu.

Informed Consent
Participation is voluntary. You may decide not to participate in this study and if you begin participation you may still decide to stop and withdraw at any time. Your decision will be respected and will not result in loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Having read the above and having had an opportunity to ask any questions, please sign below if you would like to participate in this research. A copy of this form will be given to you to retain for future reference. If you have any concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please contact Sherry May, IRB Administrator, in the Office of Sponsored Programs, Kepner Hall, University of Northern Colorado Greeley, CO 80639; 970-351-1910.

If you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, please click on the button below to proceed to the questionnaire. If you wish not to participate, please close your internet browser at this time.
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INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS
1. Informed Consent

2. Select your Institution (drop down list).

3. What is your position within the teacher education program? Check all that apply.
   a. Dean/Associate Dean
   b. Department Chair
   c. PETE Program Coordinator
   d. Faculty Member
   e. Assessment Coordinator
   f. Field Placement Coordinator
   g. Other—please specify

4. For the 2015 – 2016 academic year, how many students graduated from your
   physical education teacher education program (who are preparing for licensure)?

5. The last SHAPE/CAEP (or NASPE/NCATE) Accreditation or Reaccreditation
   Review took place during what calendar year?

6. In what year do you plan to obtain Reaccreditation?

7. Please indicate which of the following NASPE/SHAPE defined ratings, as
determined by your last SHAPE/CAEP (or NASPE/NCATE) assessment,
describes your program's most recent performance on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Standard 6.1</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Standard 6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Standard 6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Standard 6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Does your program have a system in place to monitor the professional growth and
development (outside of required coursework) of teacher candidates?
   a. Yes --- You can upload any pertinent documents at the end of this
      questionnaire. (If useful, please explain.)
   b. No

9. Are students held accountable for their professional growth and development
   (outside of required coursework) throughout the program?
   a. Yes --- You can upload any pertinent documents at the end of this
      questionnaire (If useful, please explain.)
   b. No

10. How does your program define “dispositions”?
a. We use the definition provided by NASPE/NCATE: The attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities. These professional dispositions support student learning and development (NCATE, 2008).

b. Other—please specify

11. Does your program have a standardized procedure in place to assess teacher candidate dispositions?
   a. Yes (If a, go to question 13.)
   b. No (If b, go to question 12.)

12. Please indicate which of the following are reasons why your program has not developed a standardized professional dispositions assessment procedure. Check all that apply.
   a. Too difficult to define this concept.
   b. Candidate dispositions are difficult to quantify.
   c. Unable to agree internally on a procedure.
   d. In the process of developing a procedure, but have not yet completed it.
   e. Concerns with the legal implications of implementing such a procedure.
   f. We would like to implement a standardized procedure in the future.
   g. Other—please specify (Any answers on this question, go to question 13.)

13. How are candidate dispositions assessed within your program? Check all that apply.
   a. Assessment instrument acquired from an external supplier. (If a, go to question 14.)
   b. Assessment instrument we developed.
   c. Internal letters of recommendation.
   d. External letters of recommendation.
   e. Cooperating teachers' and/or college supervisors' evaluations prepared during the student teaching experience.
   f. Reference, employment, and/or criminal background checks.
   g. Campus judicial records.
   h. Interviews with candidates. (If b – h, go to question 15.)
   i. Other—please specify

14. Please note the name of the assessment instrument and the supplier.

15. When are candidates' dispositions assessed? Check all that apply.
   a. Before entry to the teacher education unit
   b. Before a candidate's teaching practicum (first field experience)
   c. During practicum experiences
   d. Before a student teaching assignment is made
   e. During student teaching
f. After most program requirements are met (including student teaching), but before graduation

g. Dispositions are assessed continuously (either in every course or every semester)

h. Other—please specify

16. How many different people potentially assess teacher candidates throughout the program?

17. Are there opportunities for teacher candidates to complete self-assessments related to professional dispositions?
   a. Yes (If a go to 18.)
   b. No (If b go to 19.)

18. Approximately how many times are teacher candidates given the opportunity to complete self-assessments throughout the program?

19. How are the results of the disposition assessment used? Check all that apply.
   a. Determining who should be admitted to the teacher education program
   b. Determining who should proceed to the next step in the program
   c. Determining the extent of candidates' (as a group) personal and professional growth in the program
   d. Determining the impact on candidates (as a group) of a specific course or instructional approach in the program
   e. To give feedback to individual candidates regarding their dispositions so that they may grow professionally
   f. Results are collected for accreditation purposes only and are not actually used for program evaluation or to give feedback to individual candidates
   g. Other—please specify

20. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statement:
    "Candidate dispositions can be changed as a result of participation in a teacher education program."
    a. Strongly Disagree
    b. Disagree
    c. No Opinion
    d. Agree
    e. Strongly Agree

21. What are the potential consequences of a negative dispositional report? Check all that apply.
    a. Remedial counseling
    b. Remedial coursework
    c. Probationary status
    d. Temporary suspension from the program
    e. Permanent removal from the program
f. Meeting with a specific individual (Example: Chair, Department Head, Dean, Certification Officer, etc.)
g. Meeting with a specified committee
h. Referral to the Student Judicial Board
i. Other—please specify

22. To the best of your knowledge, how many teacher candidates have been eliminated from your program (dismissed or self-removed) in the last five years due to dispositional concerns?

23. Please upload any pertinent documents you are willing to share related to the ways in which professionalism/professionalism is addressed and assessed within your program (Upload up to three documents.)

24. Would you be willing to participate in future phone interviews to discuss how professionalism is being taught and assessed in your program?
   a. Yes
   b. No

25. Would you be able to identify one other knowledgeable faculty member in your department who would be willing to participate in a phone interview to discuss how professionalism is being taught and assessed in your program?
   a. Yes
   b. No
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CONTACT TO SELECTED PARTICIPANTS
Hi XXXXXXXX,

My name is Brandy Lynch, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Sport Pedagogy Program at the University of Northern Colorado. I am contacting you in regards to my dissertation study, in which I am investigating the ways in which CAEP accredited physical education teacher education programs address the assessment of professionalism in teacher candidates. Based on your responses to my questionnaire, which you filled out a few weeks ago, I would like to invite you to participate in a phone interview.

Specifically, I am seeking to interview you regarding the ways in which physical education teacher candidates' professionalism is taught and assessed throughout your program.

Here are the details for the interviews:

- Each semi-structured interview will be scheduled for 30-60 minutes at a time convenient to the individual participant
- Each interview will be digitally recorded and then typed into transcripts prior to data analysis
- Each participant will be assigned a pseudonym and data will be treated confidentially

Another aspect of the research involves collecting and reviewing pertinent documents related to the assessment of teacher candidates' professionalism. If you have other pertinent documents you'd be willing to share (besides the ones you already uploaded to my questionnaire), I will request a copy of those additional electronic or paper documents, as they may be utilized as part of the analysis and final report. No student evaluation data will be requested (aside from a copy of the CAEP report, if willing to share), but simply examples of documents utilized in the assessment of professionalism.

I am requesting a response to this inquiry that would indicate your interest in participating in my study by XXXXXXXX. I have also attached a copy of the informed consent.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me (970-XXX-XXXX or brandy.lynch@unco.edu), or my research advisor, Dr. Mark Smith, Associate Dean in the College of Natural and Health Sciences (970-351-1736 or mark.smith@unco.edu).

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Brandy M. Lynch, M.S. Ed., CSCS
Doctoral Candidate, Sport Pedagogy
School of Sport & Exercise Science
University of Northern Colorado
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PHONE INTERVIEW INFORMED CONSENT
CONSENT FORM FOR HUMAN PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

Project Title: Addressing the Assessment of Professionalism in Teacher Candidates: A Multi-Case Study of CAEP Accredited PETE Programs

Researcher: Brandy Lynch, M.S. Ed., 970-XXX-XXXX, brandy.lynch@unco.edu
School of Sport and Exercise Science

Research Advisor: Mark Smith, Ph.D., 970-351-1736, mark.smith@unco.edu
School of Sport and Exercise Science

What is the purpose of the study?
The primary purpose of this study is to describe the methods employed by PETE programs to teach and assess teacher candidates’ professionalism, as outlined in Standard Six of the 2008 National Initial PETE Standards.

What will you be asked to do?
Participate in a phone interview about your PETE program’s teaching and assessment methods of teacher candidates’ professionalism, specifically related to professional dispositions and professional growth and development. You will also be asked to gather and submit (scan or copy) any additional artifacts and documents related to the assessment of teacher candidates’ professionalism you utilize and implement within your program. The phone interview will take approximately 30-60 minutes to complete and will be audio recorded according to the participant’s preference. Audio recordings will be transcribed verbatim. Audio recordings, artifacts, documents and any other identifiable data will be stored in the researcher’s office on the UNC campus and destroyed three years following the end of the data collection for this project.

A copy of the transcribed interviews will be sent for you to read and confirm the accuracy of the content; you also may request additions, deletions, or changes in this material. The review copies of the transcriptions will have the pseudonyms in place, and you will have the opportunity to check the pseudonyms and look for identifying data that may have been overlooked, as well as request changes if necessary. You will also have the opportunity to review the pseudonyms and aggregated data that will be used in place of identifying information in physical activity program artifacts and documents.
What are the possible risks and discomforts?
Due to the nature of your career and the steps that will be taken to maximize your confidentiality, I believe participation in this study poses no more than minimal risks, such as those encountered during typical participation in an interview/meeting. Researchers, however, cannot guarantee your anonymity. You should refrain from disclosing any information about your career path and physical education teacher education program that could be damaging to your financial standing, employability, or reputation to the researchers. You should carefully examine interview transcriptions and artifact/document data to ensure that any potentially identifying information has been replaced with pseudonyms or reported in the aggregate.

Will you receive any compensation for taking part in this study?
There is no compensation for participating in this study.

Will you benefit from taking part in this study?
There is no benefit from taking part in this study. Study findings will help the researcher understand the ways in which CAEP accredited PETE programs teach and assess professionalism in teacher candidates and better inform dispositional assessment practices in physical education teacher education. Upon completion of the study, a comprehensive overview of your program’s teaching and assessment practices related to TC professionalism will be provided upon request so you might learn from the findings if interested.

What if you have questions?
If you have questions about the study, you can contact Brandy Lynch, 970-XXX-XXXX or brandy.lynch@unco.edu.

Informed Consent
Participation is voluntary. You may decide not to participate in this study and if you begin participation you may still decide to stop and withdraw at any time. Your decision will be respected and will not result in loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Having read the above and having had an opportunity to ask any questions, please sign below if you would like to participate in this research. A copy of this form will be given to you to retain for future reference. If you have any concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please contact Sherry May, IRB Administrator, in the Office of Sponsored Programs, Kepner Hall, University of Northern Colorado Greeley, CO 80639; 970-351-1910.

Participant’s Signature

Date

Researcher’s Signature

Date
APPENDIX K

SEMI-STRUCTURED PHONE INTERVIEW GUIDE
Introduction:

Hello! My name is Brandy Lynch and I am enrolled in the doctoral program in Sport Pedagogy at the University of Northern Colorado. I am doing some research to examine the ways in which CAEP accredited PETE programs teach and assess TCs across each individual element of Standard Six of the 2008 NASPE Initial PETE Standards. My questions today revolve around learning about your experiences with teaching and assessing TCs’ professionalism, specifically regarding students’ dispositions and professional growth and development outlined in the standards. I am hoping you may be able to share your knowledge and thoughts on this subject as we go along.

Distribute and explain the informed consent.
- Have the participant sign the informed consent
- Provide the participant with an additional copy of the informed consent for their records

Potential Questions/Topics:
These are some options of topics that may be of interest, but the actual questions used will not be decided upon until after cases have been chosen based on similarities of answers from selected designators found in the initial questionnaire.

- What academic programs are included in your department?
- How many students do you have in each program?
- How long has your PETE program been in existence?
- When are students admitted to the PETE program?
- Are there specific requirements for admission to the PETE program?
- What are these requirements?
- Is there an application process? Please describe the process.
- Do you have statistics regarding the job placement of your students upon leaving your PETE program?
- What is your role in the teacher education program?
- Describe your teacher preparation program.
• How did you determine the scope and sequence of your program?
• How does your program define professionalism?
• What strategies do you employ to train your students in the area of professionalism?
• How do you feel the CAEP accreditation process has impacted your program curricula?
• In your department, who is responsible for preparing accreditation or program assessment documents?
  o How would you describe the process for preparing the accreditation portfolio?
  o How much time is spent preparing the portfolio?
  o What type of support does that individual(s) receive to assist in this process?
• How did you decide what artifacts to include that related to Standard Six?
• What are the processes utilized within your program for addressing each element of Standard Six?
  o How was this process developed?
• What method(s) are used to monitor and assess TC dispositions?
• When are TC dispositions assessed?
• Who monitors TC professionalism/dispositions?
  o What does that process look like?
• Who assesses TC dispositions?
• What method(s) used to monitor and assess TC professional growth and development?
• How expectations are communicated with TCs?
• Please describe the ways in which TCs are held accountable for professionalism?
• What type(s) of intervention utilized?
• Have you dismissed a TC from your program in the last 5 years due to issues with professionalism? Please explain.
• Do you feel the standards assist in the socialization of students?
  o What experiences do you give TC to help them adopt the standards? Specifically, Standard Six?
  o How do you encourage your students to utilize the standards in their own teaching practices? Specifically, Standard Six?
• How would you describe your program philosophy for educating TCs?
  o How do you feel this has impacted your approach toward teaching?
  o What steps do you take to ensure your students adopt the goals and objectives related to professionalism that are presented in your programs?

Other:
• Is there anything else you would like to tell me or that would be of use to me related to the ways in which your program addresses or assess professionalism in TCs?
• Is there anything else you would like to tell me or that would be of use to me related to your experience with compiling or documenting evidence of achievement of Standard Six for accreditation purposes?

Closing:
• Thank you for participating in this interview
• Written results will use your pseudonym only to increase confidentiality of your responses
• I will be typing out our conversation today and creating a transcript
• I will send the word document (transcription) to you via e-mail. I ask that you read over it for accuracy. Please note any changes needed – I want it to be an accurate account of our time together today
• You can send me written feedback via email
APPENDIX L

INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of PETE program graduates in 2015-2016 academic year. (n=25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10 TCs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 TCs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 TCs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+ TCs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs’ most recent performance rating on: SHAPE/CAEP Initial PETE Standard 6.1. (n=21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs’ most recent performance rating on: SHAPE/CAEP Initial PETE Standard 6.2. (n=21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs’ most recent performance rating on: SHAPE/CAEP Initial PETE Standard 6.3. (n=21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs’ most recent performance rating on: SHAPE/CAEP Initial PETE Standard 6.4. (n=21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program has a system in place to monitor the professional growth and development (outside of required coursework) of TCs. (n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How program defines “dispositions”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition provided by NCATE/CAEP</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program has a standardized procedure in place to assess TCs’ professional dispositions. (n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways in which TC dispositions were assessed within a program. Checked all that applied. (n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment instrument we developed.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal letters of recommendation.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evals completed by cooperating teachers/field supervisors during the student teaching.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference, employment, and/or criminal background checks.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with candidates.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**When TCs’ dispositions are assessed. Checked all that applied. (n=20)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>When</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
<th><strong>%</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before entry to the teacher education unit.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before a candidate's teaching practicum (first field experience).</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During practicum experiences.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before a student teaching assignment is made.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During student teaching.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions are assessed continuously (every course/semester)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How many different people potentially assess TCs throughout their time in the program? (n=19)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Number of People</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
<th><strong>%</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 People</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 People</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 People</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7 People</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9 People</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ People</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Are there opportunities for teacher candidates to complete self-assessments related to professional dispositions? (n=19)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
<th><strong>%</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ways disposition assessments are used? Checked all that applied. (n=19)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ways disposition assessments are used?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
<th><strong>%</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determining admission to the teacher education program</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining who should proceed to the next step in the program.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining the extent of TCs (as a group) personal and professional growth in the program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining the impact on TCs (as a group) of a specific course or instructional approach in the program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give feedback to individual TCs regarding their dispositions so that they may grow professionally</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results collected for accreditation purposes only and are not used for program evaluation/to give feedback to individual TCs.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The extent to which participants agreed with the following statement: "TC dispositions can be changed as a result of participation in a teacher education program." (n=18)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
<th><strong>%</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential consequences of a negative dispositional report. Checked all that applied. (n=18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial counseling</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial coursework</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary status</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary suspension from the program</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent removal from the program</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with a specific individual (Example: Department Head)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral to the Student Judicial Board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To the best of participants’ knowledge, number of TCs eliminated from PETE program (dismissed or self-removed) in the last five years due to dispositional concerns? (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 TCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 TCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 TCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ TCs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M

FIRST & SECOND MEMBER CHECK EMAIL
TO PARTICIPANTS
Hi (name of Selected Participant),

Once again, thank you very much for taking time out of your busy schedule to do a phone interview and talk with me about how professionalism is addressed and assessed within your PETE program! I really enjoyed hearing about all the ways in which your program promotes and encourages professional growth and development, as well as professional dispositions among your teacher candidates.

Attached please find the transcription of our phone interview. Please review it carefully and make note of the following:
- Any changes you would like to make to the interview content
- Any information you would like add
- Any information you would like to delete

When finished reviewing the transcription, please contact me (either email or phone) and let me know of any changes you may have. Please also contact me if you have no changes so I know that you are satisfied with the transcription and interview information as it is.

If you have not already sent me any documents related to how your program addresses or assesses professionalism, please feel free to email me those as well.

Please feel free to contact me if you have further questions or concerns.

Best,

Brandy M. Lynch, M.S. Ed., CSCS
Doctoral Candidate, Sport Pedagogy
School of Sport & Exercise Science
University of Northern Colorado
APPENDIX N

ROCKY CREEK COLLEGE COMPETENCIES
CHECKLIST
### Assessment 7: Assessing Teacher Candidates’ Professionalism (Coincides with Standard Six)

**Name_______________________________________   Date______________________**

**Activity______________________________________ Grade Level_______________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NASPE Element for Teacher Candidates</th>
<th>Unacceptable (1 pt)</th>
<th>Acceptable (2 pts)</th>
<th>Target (3pts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) 6.1 Demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the belief that all students can become physically educated individuals.</td>
<td>TC demonstrates characteristics of “motor elitism” by providing more feedback to highly skilled students. TC excludes students during the lesson by having them participate less often in drills, games, or physical activity. TC fails to make adaptations in lesson for underperforming students.</td>
<td>TC provides equal amounts of feedback to students regardless of skill level. All students are encouraged to participate and equitable opportunities for participation in drills, games or physical activity are provided. TC makes adaptations in lesson for underperforming students.</td>
<td>TC provides equal amounts of feedback to students regardless of skill level. All students are encouraged to participate and equitable opportunities for participation in drills, games, or physical activity are provided. TC makes adaptations in lesson for underperforming students. TC sets high expectations for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 6.2 Participate in activities that enhance collaboration and lead to professional growth and development.</td>
<td>TC participates in professional growth and development opportunities when directed to do so. TC meets the minimum professional development requirements for the program. TC fails to document any collaboration with faculty, parents, supervising teachers and/or service</td>
<td>TC participates in professional growth and development opportunities when they are offered. TC participates in professional opportunities beyond the program requirements, such as major’s club, attendance at state conventions, health fairs, and Jump/Hoop for Hearts activities. TC documents</td>
<td>TC takes every opportunity to participate in professional development opportunities. TC participates in professional opportunities beyond the program requirements, such as making presentations at professional conventions, providing leaderships in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 6.3 Demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the professional ethics of highly qualified teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects as required by the program.</td>
<td>collaboration with faculty, parents, supervising teachers and/or service projects as required by the program.</td>
<td>student groups, and planning activities. TC documents collaboration with faculty, parents, supervising teachers and/or service projects beyond program requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC’s dress is inappropriate for school setting in violation of school and university dress codes. TC fails to maintain confidentiality regarding colleagues, students, or families. TC demonstrates favoritism for specific students or groups of students. TC has inappropriate contact with students outside of the classroom or uses inappropriate language with or around students. TC exhibits behaviors that are indicative of gender or racial bias.</td>
<td>TC fails to maintain confidentiality regarding colleagues, students, or families. TC demonstrates behaviors that are consistent with equitable treatment for all students. TC maintains professional relationships with students in and out of the school setting.</td>
<td>TC’s dress exceeds the requirements of the school and university guidelines. TC maintains confidentiality regarding colleagues, students, or families. TC demonstrates behaviors that are consistent with equitable treatment for all students and foster an environment where all students are respectful of each other. TC maintains professional relationships with students in and out of the school setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC attempts to teach in a culturally responsive way. TC demonstrates respect for cultural differences and exhibits teaching behaviors that are inclusive. TC avoids sarcasm and</td>
<td>TC teaches using culturally responsive approaches. TC demonstrates respect for cultural differences and creates an atmosphere in the classroom that is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC interacts with others in a professional manner, but sometimes resorts to the use of “slang” terms during conversations with students. TC sometimes “puts down” students in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
front of classmates. TC occasionally demonstrates behaviors or language that is insensitive to culturally differences.  

“put downs” while interacting with students.  

inclusive. TC never uses “put downs” or sarcasm while teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Points Awarded (Max 12)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 12       A- 11   B+ 10   B  9   B- 8  C+ 7   C  6  C- 5  D 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O

EXCERPTS OF ROCKY CREEK COLLEGE
STUDENT TEACHING DISPOSITIONS
ASSESSMENT
Throughout the student/supervised teaching semester, please observe the candidates’ dispositions. After adequate opportunity for observation, complete the rubric for each candidate. Score each item as Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, or Target with Target being the highest score.

**TO BE COMPLETED BY COLLEGE FIELD SUPERVISOR**

Name of Candidate________________ Field Supervisor ___________ Date__________

The following dispositions have been selected and adapted from the Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers (INTASC) and are aligned with the Conceptual Framework and with the dispositions encouraged throughout our curriculum.

**THE CANDIDATE APPEARED TO EXHIBIT THE FOLLOWING DISPOSITIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New INTASC dispositions</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1 pt.)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (2 pts.)</th>
<th>Exemplary (3 pts.)</th>
<th>Pts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.) The teacher respects students’ differing strengths and needs and is committed to furthering each student’s overall development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.) The teacher is committed to work toward each student’s mastery of disciplinary content and skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.) The teacher sees him/herself as a student continuously attempting to broaden, deepen, and integrate his/her own content knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.) The teacher fulfills the expectations of the profession including code of ethics, professional standards of practice, professional behavior, dress and presentation, and relevant law and policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.) The teacher takes initiative to grow and develop with colleagues through interactions that enhance practice and support student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX P

EXCERPTS OF ROCKY CREEK COLLEGE
CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS
CHECKLIST
SELF ASSESSMENT- To be given to the Associate Dean of Graduate or Undergraduate Advising

Name of Candidate ___________________ Course: _____ Date: ______________

The School of Education has adopted the following dispositions. The dispositions have been selected from the Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers (INTASC) and are aligned with the dispositions encouraged throughout the curriculum.

PLEASE CHECK THE BOXES THAT MOST CLOSELY REPRESENT YOUR VALUES.

### Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dispositions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I respect students’ differing strengths and needs and am committed to furthering each student’s overall development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I am committed to each student’s mastery of disciplinary content and skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I see myself as a student continuously attempting to broaden, deepen, and integrate his/her own content knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I take responsibility to use short- and long-term planning as a means of assuring student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How I demonstrate these dispositions: _________________________________________

How could I further develop these dispositions: ________________________________

### Professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dispositions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) I fulfill the expectations of the profession including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, professional behavior and presentation, and relevant law and policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) I take initiative to grow and develop with colleagues through interactions that enhance practice and support student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How I demonstrate these dispositions: _________________________________________

How could I further develop these dispositions: ________________________________
APPENDIX Q

ROCKY CREEK COLLEGE EXCERPT FROM RUBRIC USED TO SCORE CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS ASSESSMENT
TO BE COMPLETED BY FACULTY MEMBER

Name of The Candidate: _____________ Date:_________ Course:_________ Faculty:________

The following dispositions have been adopted by the School of Education. The dispositions have been selected from the Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers (INTASC) and are aligned with the dispositions encouraged throughout the curriculum.

This rubric does not attempt to evaluate the candidate’s values. It evaluates only to what extent the disposition assessment has been completed by the candidate.

THE CANDIDATE COMPLETED THE SELF-DISPOSITION ASSESSMENT (DS-SELF-RUBRIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Checkboxes not completed (0 pts.)</th>
<th>Checkboxes completed but neither question completed (1 pt.)</th>
<th>Checkboxes and 1 additional question completed (2pts.)</th>
<th>Checkboxes and both additional question completed (3 pts.)</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.) Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.) Responding to Diverse Student Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.) Learning Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.) Broad Curricular Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.) Student Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.) Technology &amp; Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.) Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (21 Max Points) _____

Grading Scale

APPENDIX R

EXERPT OF SHADY VALLEY UNIVERSITY
CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS
ASSESSMENT
### Professionalism

- Acceptable
- Needs Improvement
- Unknown

If the student needs improvement in this area, please record the number of the item that is problematic as well as any other comments you have:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a commitment to working with children, youth, and their families in developmentally appropriate ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an awareness of community, state, national, and world contexts that have an impact on the teaching profession and the learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Treats university faculty, colleagues, parents, and students fairly, equitably, and respectfully.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Expresses and demonstrates interest in and enthusiasm for teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Adapts to new and diverse learning situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Accepts diverse learners and their needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Adapts to differences among people including differences of SES, gender, age, ability, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Maintains confidentiality about student records unless disclosure serves a professionally compelling purpose or is required by law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Demonstrates discretion when discussing colleagues, faculty, field sites, and personal information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Respects the points of view of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Develops and explains professional judgments using research-based theory and practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Contributes meaningfully and appropriately to discussions by asking questions and giving opinions, and listening to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX S

EXCERPTS OF SHADY VALLEY UNIVERSITY
STUDENT TEACHING ASSESSMENT
**Description:** The assessment is implemented throughout both elementary and secondary physical education placements. TCs in the Physical Education only programs receive a summative evaluation at the end of their eight-week elementary and eight-week secondary experience. The HPE candidates are evaluated in a summative fashion at the end of their six-week elementary experience and at the end of their five weeks of combined Health and Physical Education at the secondary level. Health Education implements a unique set of assessments separate from Physical Education.

**Evaluation Index:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptive Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fails to Meet Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Further Development Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument:**

**Student Teaching Assessment Rubric Categories Related to Initial PETE Standard Six**

**Standard 1: Students**
Candidates understand student learning and development and respect the diversity of the students they teach.

1.2 Candidate utilizes knowledge of students' abilities, talents, and prior knowledge to inform instruction in Physical Education.

1.3 Candidate establishes and clearly communicates high expectations and believes in the abilities of all students in Physical Education.

1.4 Candidate conveys knowledge of and respect for the cultural heritage, cultural experiences, and language skills of students in Physical Education.

**Standard 2: Content**
Candidates know and understand the content area in Physical Education.
2.5. Candidate connects content to relevant life experiences of students and career opportunities in Physical Education.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 3: Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates understand and use varied assessment to inform instruction, evaluate, and ensure student learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3.4 | Candidate collaborates and communicates student progress with students, parents, and colleagues. | NASPE 6.2 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 6: Collaboration and Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates collaborate and communicate effectively with others to support student learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6.1 | Candidate communicates clearly and effectively. | NASPE 6.4 |
| 6.2 | Candidate effectively communicates student learning with parents and caregivers. | NASPE 6.2 |
| 6.3 | Candidate collaborates with cooperating candidates and other educators at the school/district/university. | NASPE 6.2 |
| 6.4 | Candidate collaborates effectively with the local community and community agencies, to promote a positive environment for student learning | NASPE 6.2 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 7: Professional Responsibility and Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher candidate assumes responsibility for professional growth, performance, and involvement as an individual and a member of a learning community in Physical Education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7.1 | Candidate understands, upholds, and follows professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct. | NASPE 6.3 |
| 7.2 | Candidate takes responsibility for engaging in continuous, purposeful professional development. | NASPE 6.3 |
| 7.3 | Candidate seeks opportunities to impact the quality of teaching, making school improvements, and increasing student achievement. | NASPE 6.2 & 6.3 |
APPENDIX T

EXCERPTS OF SHADY VALLEY UNIVERSITY
SECONDARYMETHODS PORTFOLIO
RUBRIC
The Secondary Methods Portfolio is to be submitted for partial fulfillment of the course grade in Secondary Physical Education Methods. This electronic portfolio should include evidence (artifacts) to address your competency relative to the State Standards for the Teaching Profession.

Successful completion of the methods portfolio will require that, during the middle school field experience, you capture and edit 3 videos of 5-10 minutes each, and then analyze your teaching in relation to the elements. The videos should come from three separate lessons and should represent the following:

**Video A** related to the learning environment in your classes. This video should show the way in which you establish a safe, equitable, and efficient learning environment (e.g. equitable opportunities for resources, efficient management routines, respectful/inclusive language and equitable interactions).

One page (single spaced) narratives related to evidence provided by the three videos, together with additional artifacts, will be required to demonstrate competency related to the elements. Evidence for each standard should be introduced with a brief written narrative.

**Portfolio Requirements Related to Initial PETE Standard Six**

**Standard 5: Learning Environment (15%)**

Teachers create learning environments that promote high levels of learning and achievement for all students.

Required artifacts:

a) Instructional materials (poster, task/cue cards, supplemental materials)
b) ONE lesson plan with highlighted management routines.
c) Narrative related to Video A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements (NASPE Outcomes)</th>
<th>Unacceptable (0-10.9)</th>
<th>Acceptable (11-13.9)</th>
<th>Target (14-15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive and caring. (4.1, 4.2, 6.4)</td>
<td>Teacher candidates do not demonstrate respect and caring through effective communication skills (e.g. use inappropriate grammar, talk too fast, and use developmentally inappropriate vocabulary or</td>
<td>Teacher candidates demonstrate respect and caring through effective communication skills (e.g., use of language, clarity, conciseness, pacing, giving and receiving feedback, age appropriate language, non-verbal</td>
<td>Teacher candidates consistently demonstrate respect and caring through effective communication skills (e.g., use of language, clarity, conciseness, pacing, giving and receiving feedback, age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standard 6: Collaboration and Communication (10%)

Teachers collaborate and communicate with students, parents, other educators, administrators and the community to support student learning.

Required artifacts:

a) Evidence of communication with parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements (NASPE Outcomes)</th>
<th>Unacceptable (0-6.9)</th>
<th>Acceptable (7-8.9)</th>
<th>Target (9-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers share responsibility with parents and caregivers to support student learning, emotional and physical development and mental health. (6.2)</td>
<td>Teacher candidates do not communicate program content or student progress to parents and caregivers.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates communicate program content to parents and caregivers.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates communicate program content and student progress to parents and caregivers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 7: Professional Responsibility and Growth (10%)

Teachers assume responsibility for professional growth, performance, and involvement as an individual and as a member of a learning community.

Required artifacts:

a) Evidence of involvement in professional organizations.

b) A satisfactory Dispositions assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements (NASPE Outcomes)</th>
<th>Unacceptable (0-6.9)</th>
<th>Acceptable (7-8.9)</th>
<th>Target (9-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers take responsibility for engaging in continuous, purposeful professional development. (6.2)</td>
<td>Teacher candidates do not participate in the professional physical education community.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates participate in the professional physical education community.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates participate in the professional physical education community at different levels (local/state/national).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers understand, uphold and follow professional ethics, policies and legal codes of professional conduct. (6.3)</td>
<td>Candidate does not score ‘Acceptable’ on Candidate Dispositions assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate scores ‘Acceptable’ on Candidate Dispositions assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX U

RIDGEVIEW HEIGHTS UNIVERSITY
PETE DISPOSITIONS RUBRIC
Please rate the PETE majors in your course for each of the following areas. If your course is not designed to allow for observation of one of the categories, please write NA or 0 in the section. This assessment will help the PETE faculty document the performance of the future teachers throughout their program. As content faculty, your perceptions are very important to us.

**KEY**
1 = Unsatisfactory  
2 = Marginal  
3 = Acceptable  
4 = Proficient  
5 = Distinguished  
0 or NA = Not Applicable or Not Observed

Please provide comments specific to individual students in the space below to clarify ratings as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V

RIDGEVIEW HEIGHTS UNIVERSITY
SAMPLE REMEDIATION LETTER
Hello xxxxx,

One of the core goals of the PETE program at RHU is to graduate teacher candidates who demonstrate high levels of professional and ethical behavior. Without these traits, regardless of subject matter expertise and pedagogical skills, candidates are unlikely to develop into quality PETE teachers who enhance the lives of their students.

The formal assessment of PETE majors’ dispositions is completed by departmental faculty every semester in all required PETE courses. The minimal acceptable level on the PETE Disposition rubric is “L3 – Acceptable.” If a PETE major or candidate is rated as a “L2 – Marginal” on any component of the Disposition Rubric in a course, the program coordinator notifies the academic advisor and major/candidate. The academic advisor then meets with the major/candidate to determine how to improve performance in future courses. If a PETE major or candidate is rated as a “L1 – Unsatisfactory,” a formal remediation plan is developed in consultation with the PETE faculty member, PETE program coordinator, PETE academic advisor and major/candidate for the following semester. Candidates cannot progress in the program until the remediation plan is completed and disposition concerns are effectively addressed.

According to our records, you were assessed as “L1 – Unsatisfactory” in PETE xxx in the areas of Attendance, In-class participation, and Preparation. You will not be able to take additional courses in the program until a formal remediation plan is on file. You will need to schedule a meeting with me to develop this remediation plan.

You were also assessed at “L2 – Marginal” in the areas of Respect for school rules and norms, and Communication.

I don’t know the specifics of these assessments but I’m willing to hear your side of the story. Please contact me soon to discuss these results in person and complete a remediation plan.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.
APPENDIX W

EXCERPTS OF RIDGEVIEW HEIGHTS UNIVERSITY
STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
ASSESSMENT
This form, based on the state performance assessment, is to be completed by supervisors using evidence from the pre-conference, the lesson plan, the observation, the post-conference, and other sources.

Candidate Name
Observation #
School/Grade/Subject
Teacher

Person completing form
☐ Cooperating Teacher  ☐ Supervisor  ☐
Candidate

**Standards Portfolio Requirements Related to Initial PETE Standard Six**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rankings:</th>
<th>1=Ineffective Development</th>
<th>N/E = No Evidence*</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2=Needs</td>
<td>Level 3=Proficient</td>
<td>Level 4=Exemplary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicators for which there is “no evidence” should become goals for subsequent observations.

Standard 4: Differentiated Instruction - The teacher candidate challenges and supports each student’s learning by providing appropriate content and developing skills which address individual learning differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Indicators for this Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 4.1 Differentiates instructional content, process, product, &amp; learning environment to meet individual developmental needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4.2 Provides remediation, enrichment, and acceleration to further student understanding of material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4.3 Uses flexible learning strategies to encourage appropriate peer interactions and to accommodate learning needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4.4 Uses diagnostic, formative, &amp; summative assessment data to inform instructional modifications for individual students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4.5 Develops critical and creative thinking by providing activities at the appropriate level of challenge for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4.6 Develops high learning expectations for all students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence/Documentation
(List evidence used to evaluate this standard here.)
Standard 9: Professionalism -
The teacher candidate exhibits a commitment to professional ethics and the school’s mission, participates in professional growth opportunities to support student learning, and contributes to the profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence/Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(List evidence used to evaluate this standard here.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relevant Indicators for this Standard

- 9.1 Carries out duties in accordance with federal & state laws, Code of Ethics, and established state & local school board policies, regulations, & practices.
- 9.2 Maintains professional demeanor and behavior.
- 9.3 Respects and maintains confidentiality.
- 9.4 Evaluates & identifies areas of personal strengths & weaknesses related to professional skills & impact on learning and sets goals for improvement.
- 9.5 Participates in ongoing professional growth activities based on identified areas for improvement.
- 9.6 Demonstrates flexibility in adapting to school change.
- 9.7 Engages in activities outside the classroom intended for school and student enhancement.
- 9.8 Maintains appropriate interactions with students, parents, faculty, and staff.
- 9.9 Engages in self-reflection about the success of the lesson after teaching; seeks feedback from mentor teacher about teaching and impact on student learning.
## Standard 10: Professionalism - The teacher candidate communicates effectively with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, and other stakeholders in ways that enhance student learning.

**Relevant Indicators for this Standard**

- 10.1 Uses verbal and non-verbal communication techniques to foster positive interactions and promote learning in the classroom and school environment.
- 10.2 Uses precise language, correct vocabulary, and grammar, and appropriate forms of oral and written communication.
- 10.3 Explains directions, concepts, and lesson content to students in a logical, sequential, and age-appropriate manner.
- 10.4 Adheres to school and district policies regarding communication of student information.
- 10.5 In partnership with the classroom teacher, creates a climate of openness for parents, students, and other school professionals by demonstrating a collaborative and approachable style.
- 10.6 Listens and responds with cultural awareness, empathy, and understanding to the voice of students.
- 10.7 Uses modes of communication that are appropriate for a given situation.
- 10.8 Listens and responds with cultural awareness, empathy, and understanding to the voice and opinions of stakeholders (parents, community, students, and colleagues).
- 10.9 Engages in appropriate conversations and maintains confidentiality of information related to students, parents, faculty, and staff. Such conversations include text messaging, social media, emails, etc.

**Evidence/Documentation**

(List evidence used to evaluate this standard here.)