

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Initial Preparation of Technology Education Teachers

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the International Technology Education Association/Council on Technology Teacher Education (ITEA/CTTE).

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Central Connecticut State University

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

07 / 15 / 2009

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

Technology Education

Program Type

BSED in Technology and Engineering Education

Award or Degree Level

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation **OR** Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

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

- Yes

- jn No
- jn Not applicable
- jn Not able to determine

Comment:

Since 2004-2005, 79 of the 79 candidates who indicated they had studied technology education passed the technology education subject area specialty tests. The program had a 100% pass rate for 2005-2006 (17 out of 17); and 92% pass rate for 2006-2007 (12 out of 13). Test scores within each of the technology education categories were at or above the national averages for all three years.

Summary of Strengths:

The Technology and Engineering Education program at CCSU seems to be comprehensive and offers candidates a wide variety of experiences. The program provides numerous opportunities for field experiences as a requirement in the program. Prior to student teaching, the technology education candidate will have completed 90 hours of field experience. It is likely that these field experiences and comprehensive courses contribute to the high success rates on the PRAXIS I and II.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1. The Nature of Technology. Technology teacher education program candidates develop an understanding of the nature of technology within the context of the Designed World.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The program offered provides experiences in Communication, Energy, Construction, Production, and Transportation. The addition of Technological Systems and Introduction to Engineering Technology provide the necessary assessments and subject matter to meet this standard. Assuming the Technology Education PRAXIS II exam is a valid and reliable assessment tool for measuring this knowledge, it is clear from these aggregated data that Central Connecticut State University technology education teacher candidates have a thorough understanding of this standard. Course grades are also used as an assessment tool to indicate candidate achievement of this standard.

Standard 2. Technology and Society. Technology teacher education program candidates develop an understanding of technology and society within the context of the Designed World.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Candidates have several required experiences to develop an understanding of technology and society within the context of the Designed World. These consist of traditional content courses in technology education to more contemporary courses like Innovation and Invention, and a Senior Design Project. The aggregated data on the PRAXIS II exam shows that Central Connecticut State University technology education teacher candidates have a thorough understanding of this standard. Course grades are also used as an assessment tool to indicate candidate achievement.

Standard 3. Design. Technology teacher education program candidates develop an understanding of design within the context of the Designed World.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The focus on technology and engineering ensures that graduates have an understanding of design within the context of the Designed World. The program provided good data to support this standard. Again, aggregated data from PRAXIS II indicates that Central Connecticut State University technology education teacher candidates have a good understanding of this standard. Course grades are also used as an assessment tool to indicate candidate achievement.

Standard 4. Abilities for a Technological World. Technology teacher education program candidates develop abilities for a technological world within the contexts of the Designed World.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The focus on technology and engineering ensures that graduates have an understanding of design within the context of the Designed World. Within this context, candidates have several opportunities to demonstrate this standard. This is evidenced with courses like Building Design and Construction, Transportation Design, Robot Design, Construction, and Competition, and the Senior Design Project. The data presented illustrates that candidates are successful in these areas. PRAXIS II aggregated data and course grades are used to indicate candidate achievement of this standard.

Standard 5. The Designed World. Technology teacher education program candidates develop an understanding of the Designed World.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The assessments and data provided illustrates that this standard is being met.

Standard 6. Curriculum. Technology teacher education program candidates design, implement, and evaluate curricula based upon Standards for Technological Literacy.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Candidates are meeting this standard based on the assessments and data presented.

Standard 7. Instructional Strategies. Technology teacher education program candidates use a variety of effective teaching practices that enhance and extend learning of technology.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The program provides a comprehensive approach to preparing candidates to utilize effective teaching practices. Three courses - TE 299, 399, and 400 - provide opportunities for candidates to develop a course of study. The data indicates that candidates are successful in these endeavors. Since cumulative averages of grades from the fall of 2005 to the fall of 2007 were used, it would be more appropriate to illustrate the grades earned in TE 299, 399, and 400 separately. This would allow for a more critical analysis of the experiences learned in these classes and would assist the program faculty to identify future trends or issues.

Standard 8. Learning Environments. Technology teacher education program candidates design, create, and manage learning environments that promote technological literacy.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The program faculty have structured the curriculum around the ITEA/CTTE Standards and Standards for Technological Literacy. The program provided good data to illustrate candidate learning and experiences related to this standard. Teacher candidates are well versed in the delivery systems used for technology education.

Standard 9. Students. Technology teacher education program candidates understand students as learners, and how commonality and diversity affect learning.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The curriculum provides these experiences for candidates, and there are numerous data collection points to determine candidate success. The variety of the data presented documents that candidates are acquiring these skills. Evidence: disposition assessment deals with diversity issues, professional conduct, and interpersonal relationships. Candidates are reviewed each semester as faculty members assess program progress. If faculty indicate a concern by recommending review or dismiss, areas of concern must be indicated, which may include content knowledge, pedagogy skills, and dispositions. All completers have been passed through the regular evaluation process.

Standard 10. Professional Growth. Technology teacher education program candidates understand and value the importance of engaging in comprehensive and sustained professional growth to improve the teaching of technology.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The use of an exit portfolio and a very detailed evaluation of student teaching provide evidence that this standard is being met.

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

The program has well-designed experiences for the study of technology and engineering. The assessments and data provided were appropriate and developed to measure candidate learning for Standards 1-5. The average scores of the candidates completing the program at Central Connecticut State University are above the national average on almost all sections of the PRAXIS II Technology Education exam.

Grades are also used as an assessment tool to indicate candidate achievement. However, a compilation of the aggregated data of the grades attained by the candidates was reported as a cumulative GPA for the semesters. There seems to be a problem or some incorrect data presented, as it is reported that candidates had a 2.05 CUM GPA for Fall of 2007. If this is correct, the faculty should reflect on this reported score to determine how to improve candidate performance.

C.2. Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

The data illustrated was relevant and appropriate to these Standards. There appears to be some variability in the data reported. However, this can be a result of the small number of students being evaluated during a given semester.

The student teaching rubric was well developed, and the data clearly shows candidate attainment of the standard with the ability to design, implement, and evaluate curricula. Curriculum is linked to state and national standards for Engineering and Technology Education. Student teaching planning and assessment, portfolio, classroom observations, course of study assignments, and dispositions assessment results provide evidence of candidate attainment of this standard. Technology education teacher candidates are involved in design, creation, and delivery of learning environments.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

The data presented to illustrate candidate success was documented with an electronic portfolio. The portfolio assessment evaluation is reported for each candidate's teaching and learning philosophies. All candidates but one were able to successfully complete this assessment. It should be noted that in the spring of 2006 and 2007, all candidates were successful with the assessment with A or A-grades (two students had B+). During the fall of 2007, there were 3 in the "C" range and one "F" grade. The faculty should reflect on these lower grades to determine if any adjustments need to be made to the curriculum or teaching.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

Program faculty are utilizing various assessment data to reflect and improve candidate performance. The program faculty have included their professional advisory board, members of the School of Education and Professional Studies, teachers and administrators, and a state consultant in the development and review of the program. Program faculty have used this process to identify a revision in the program of study (i.e., the addition of EDTE 314 as a required pre-professional course).

It appears that the program is in the initial stages of using data to drive continuous improvement of the technology teacher education program at Central Connecticut State University. Three years of data were reported with the assessments, with some discussion of adjustments being made in data collection and

rubric development. It should be pointed out that several references were made in the report of rewriting and changing the curriculum to bring it into alignment with state and national standards for Technology Education. It will be important to report on adjustments made to improve the program based upon data findings in the future.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

Need to check accuracy of the data regarding Average CUM GPA for Fall 2007 grades. Also, review and implement changes that may be called for if the GPA was accurate. Need to provide a procedure for regular review of data and the instruments being used, and for recommending and implementing changes to the program.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

This was an excellent report.

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

None.

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- Program is nationally recognized. The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's next NCATE accreditation decision in 5-7 years. To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted before that review. The program will be listed as nationally recognized through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation. *Please note that once a program has been nationally recognized, it may not submit a revised report addressing any unmet standards or other concerns.*

Please click "Next"

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