<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Academic Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Troy Roesler</td>
<td>Casselton High School</td>
<td>Mathematics 7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Callahan</td>
<td>Valley City High School</td>
<td>Art 7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Halvorson</td>
<td>Jefferson Elementary (moving to Washington 4th grade)</td>
<td>Title I Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn DeLorme</td>
<td>Valley Partnership (MSUM, NDSU, VCSU)</td>
<td>Bush Grant Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Redfearn</td>
<td>VCSU</td>
<td>Music Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Kvilvang</td>
<td>Jefferson Elementary</td>
<td>2nd grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia Gegelman</td>
<td>VCSU</td>
<td>Elementary Methods - SEGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darin Eller</td>
<td>Northern Cass Elementary</td>
<td>5th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Lueck</td>
<td>Washington Elementary</td>
<td>Principal 4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Ketterling</td>
<td>VCSU</td>
<td>Secondary Science Education Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Boe</td>
<td>Washington Elementary</td>
<td>4th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Lentz</td>
<td>Washington Elementary</td>
<td>5th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Altringer</td>
<td>Jefferson Elementary</td>
<td>1st grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Powers</td>
<td>Jefferson Elementary</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Owen</td>
<td>VCSU</td>
<td>Elementary &amp; Middle School Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee Zachrison</td>
<td>Watertown High School</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Figueroa</td>
<td>VCSU</td>
<td>Elementary Methods - SEGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Rohla</td>
<td>VCSU</td>
<td>Elementary Methods - SEGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Halland</td>
<td>Kindred High School</td>
<td>English 7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristi Shanenko</td>
<td>Valley City High School</td>
<td>English at Middle School level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Williams</td>
<td>VCSU</td>
<td>Health and Physical Education Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Wirth</td>
<td>VCSU</td>
<td>Secondary Mathematics Education Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Westby</td>
<td>VCSU</td>
<td>Elementary Methods - SEGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Horner</td>
<td>Valley City High School</td>
<td>English 7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Nudell</td>
<td>Washington Elementary</td>
<td>5th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Knodel</td>
<td>VCSU</td>
<td>SEGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Courtney</td>
<td>Valley City High School</td>
<td>Physical Education 7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Bass</td>
<td>VCSU</td>
<td>SEGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Jensen</td>
<td>Washington Elementary</td>
<td>5th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Corwin</td>
<td>Valley City High School</td>
<td>Mathematics 7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Midthun</td>
<td>Enderlin Public School</td>
<td>Principal – K-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Nielson</td>
<td>Valley City High School</td>
<td>Science - Chemistry 7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb Sweet</td>
<td>Lisbon High School</td>
<td>Science 7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Toppen</td>
<td>Valley City High School</td>
<td>Science 7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Olson</td>
<td>VCSU</td>
<td>SEGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Thompson</td>
<td>VCSU</td>
<td>SEGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waylan Starr</td>
<td>Valley City High School</td>
<td>Social Studies 7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Creviston</td>
<td>Valley City High School</td>
<td>Special Education 7-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VCSU School of Education and Graduate Studies (SEGS)

Schools/Districts represented:
Enderlin Public School
Kindred Public School
Lisbon Public School
Northern Cass Public Schools (Hunter, ND)
Valley City Public Schools (Jefferson, Washington, and Valley City High School)
Valley City State University
Casselton Public School

Participants:
Kindergarten - 1
Elementary – 7
Middle School – 1
K-12 areas - 2
Secondary – 8
Title I - 1
Special Education - 1
Administration – 3 (Principals: 2* Elementary and 1 Secondary) *One Administrator leads both the Elementary and the Middle School for the district.
Total K-12 Educators attending = 24

Bush Grant representative - Coordinator for Valley Partnership - 1

Valley City State University
Secondary Education Methods Teachers - 2
K-12 Education Methods – 1
K-12 Chair - 1
Elementary Education Methods Teachers – 4
Middle School Methods Teachers – 1 (Teaches both Middle School and Elementary methods courses)
School of Education – Professional Education Sequence Teachers – 2
Director of Field Experiences - 1
Dean of School of Education and Graduate Studies – 1

Total VCSU Educators attending = 13

Additional stakeholder comments:
• The unit’s dean, director of field experiences, assessment coordinator and both Bush Grant Core Team members are included among the 13 VCSU representatives
• Approximately one-third of the participants are VCSU unit representatives
• Just under 25% of the participants are parents who have had children attend VCSU
• Just over 50% are VCSU alumni for at least one of their degrees
Valley City State University
School of Education and Graduate Studies
Teacher Preparation Data Sharing and Discussion
August 12, 2014

VCSU Background
Valley City State University (VCSU) has been known for teacher education preparation since the institution began in 1890. VCSU has been a nationally accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE1) since 1954.

Changes for VCSU since 2008
- Bush Grant initiatives
  VCSU has worked collaboratively with 14 institutions2 as part of a Bush Grant initiative and the Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT). Valley City State University (VCSU) is a member of the Valley Partnership and works collaboratively with North Dakota State University (NDSU) and Minnesota State University Moorhead (MSUM). The goal is improve teacher education preparation in ways that enhance student learning in K-12 classrooms.
  - Co-Teaching
    - Decision was based on research and Bush Grant collaborative efforts
    - VCSU works with K-12 educators in workshops and training sessions
  - Summer Academies
    - Summer workshops for first year teachers
    - Involvement of Valley Partnership and K-12 educators who provide advice and resources at a time when the information is extremely meaningful

Data driven decisions were made to improve VCSU teacher education preparation and curriculum in the following areas:
- GPA for admission to Teacher Education Program raised from 2.50 to 2.75
  - Significant correlation existed between GPA and student teacher evaluations from cooperating teachers
  - Process for decision and follow-up research discussion available upon request
- Curriculum changes
  - Formative Assessment
  - English Language Learner Strategies
  - Differentiated Instruction
  - Technology
    - Work groups of area K-12 educators and VCSU faculty members shared strategies and resources useful in K-12 classrooms.
    - The connection time was valuable.
    - The outcome of the work group meetings was a book of strategies and resources for each of these four areas that is useful to VCSU teacher candidates as they progress through their methods courses, student teaching experience and enter the profession
  - Assessment curriculum change in EDUC 450 course
    - A workgroup of area K-12 educators and VCSU faculty members met to discuss what teachers entering the profession needed to know and do in order be informed about assessments and the use of data in schools
    - The workgroup also viewed multiple textbooks before deciding on The Seven Strategies of Assessment for Learning
    - The outcome of the feedback from the workgroup helped to shape the assessment course
  - Classroom Management curriculum changes
    - The EDUC 351 course on classroom management and additional practicum time was established to enhance classroom management learning opportunities for secondary majors
    - The EDUC 350 practicum course for elementary majors incorporated additional classroom management learning experiences
- Student Teaching Length changed from 10 to 12-weeks in the fall of 2009
  - Decision was based on survey data and feedback from area K-12 educators, VCSU students and VCSU faculty
• Decision was followed up with VCSU student teacher research

• Additional areas of significant change in which K-12 educators have collaborated with VCSU faculty to impact teacher education preparation at VCSU
  
  o Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA, now called edTPA) workshops engaged P-12 educators and VCSU faculty in developing a Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) Unit for VCSU teacher candidates to complete during their student teaching experience
    
    ▪ The TLC Unit adds rigor and consistency to the expectations of student teachers in areas planning, implementing, evaluating, and reflecting on a unit of teaching and student learning
  
  o 20 area K-12 teachers worked with field experience representatives from VCSU, Minnesota State University Moorhead (MSUM) and North Dakota State University (NDSU) to develop a common final evaluation for student teachers from the three institutions

• Additional changes in Assessment
  
  o Bush Grant Common Metrics efforts (designed in collaboration with 14 institutions):
    
    ▪ Entry Survey (Intro to Education teacher candidates)
    ▪ Exit Survey (Student teachers in the final weeks before graduation)
    ▪ Transition to Teaching (1st year teacher/Alumni survey)
    ▪ Supervisor Survey (Employer/Administrator survey)

VCSU Unit and Program Data Sharing
All faculty members who teach methods or professional education sequence courses are part of the unit.

• Unit faculty members receive access to updated unit data every August.
  
  o An example of unit data in a report would include the final evaluation data for all VCSU student teachers.

• Program data are shared in September and February.
  
  o Program reports disaggregate the data by academic area, so faculty (shared through the methods teachers) can see GPA, licensure tests, and student teacher final evaluation data in isolation for their particular content area.

Often the data indicate areas of strength in which VCSU teacher candidate and graduates have performed well. The intention of the data sharing sessions is to provide awareness and hopefully useful information in the decision-making process for improvement.

Unit faculty members are involved in the preparation and assessment of our students. VCSU provides release time for an assessment coordinator and has three division assistants in the SEGS area.

VCSU has a Central Assessment System and regular calendar for gathering data on teacher candidates for admission to the program, GPA, Praxis tests for licensure, field experiences (student teaching the most), dispositions, portfolios, and surveys at the entry and exit level while at VCSU, and then gather data as the transition to becoming first year teachers (alumni) and their supervisors (administrators/employers).

---

1 NCATE has merged with another organization and is in the process of transforming into the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). The next national accreditation visit for VCSU will be in the fall of 2015.

2 The 14 member institutions of the NEXt initiative include the Valley Partnership (VCSU, NDSU, MSU-Moorhead), University of South Dakota, St. Cloud State, University of Minnesota – Twin Cities, Winona State, Minnesota State Mankato, and a consortium of six private universities in the Twin Cities (Augsburg, Bethel, Concordia St Paul, St. Catherine’s, Hamline, and St. Thomas).

3 Valley City State University, North Dakota State University, and Minnesota State University Moorhead are teamed together in the Bush Grant to form the Valley Partnership.
InTASC Standards – the data assessment instruments were aligned with these standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Learner and Learning</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard #1: Learner Development.</strong> The teacher understands how children learn and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard #2: Learning Differences.</strong> The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that allow each learner to meet high standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard #3: Learning Environments.</strong> The teacher works with learners to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Content</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard #4: Content Knowledge.</strong> The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard #5: Applications of Content.</strong> The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical/creative thinking and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instructional Practice</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard #6: Assessment.</strong> The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teachers’ and learner’s decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard #7: Planning for Instruction.</strong> The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard #8: Instructional Strategies.</strong> The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Professional Responsibility</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice.</strong> The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, and other professionals, and the learning community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration.</strong> The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback from the August 12 work session

EXIT SURVEY DATA

The data shared in this portion of the session was completed by 336 student teachers surveyed within two weeks of their graduation. The survey instrument was a common metric utilized by all 14 Bush Grant institutions and administered between the spring semester of 2011 and the spring semester of 2014.

A group of 24 K-12 educators and administrators partnered with 12 VCSU faculty members, the Dean of the VCSU School of Education, and the Valley Partnership Bush Grant Coordinator to combine their experiences and with a review of VCSU Exit Survey data while engaging in small group discussions. (August 12, 2014)

Discussion comments were bulleted under three headings:

1. Based on data and your experiences, what areas do you see as teacher preparation strengths?
   - InTASC Standard 3 – student teachers agreed that they were well prepared in learning environment (classroom management)
   - InTASC Standard 3 – student engagement was rated high
   - InTASC Standard 4 – content knowledge appeared to be rated as strength
   - Student teachers felt good about their content knowledge and ability to work with assessment
   - InTASC Standard 7 planning instruction with clear learning objectives/goals
   - Planning lessons with clear objectives was viewed as a strength

2. Based on data and your experiences, what areas do you see as potential concerns for improvement?
   - InTASC 1 – “account for students’ prior knowledge” – perhaps communication between the supervisor/cooperating teacher/student teacher needs to be increased so the context for learning form has greater meaning and value in terms of planning for and meeting student needs.
   - InTASC 2 – Learner Differences – more preparation for IEPs & 504, mental health.
   - InTASC 2 – Learner Differences – more preparation for IEPs & 504, mental health, autism, hearing and sight impairment
   - Perhaps the Educating Exceptional Students course could be moved later into the professional education sequence.
   - Diversity of all kinds happens in all classrooms and future teachers need to be ready to address learner differences.
   - A recommendation was made for the students to have experience (10-20 hours) in a special education classroom. The experience could perhaps be part of a special education classroom.
   - Special education – what else could be done and which classes could more be done to prepare students for the needs of diverse learners.
   - Designing instruction for students with special needs.
   - Differentiated instruction
   - InTASC 8 – instructional strategies for teaching culturally and ethnically diverse students
   - Application of assessment concerns
   - Review the wording of survey items. Some students may have varied interpretations of the survey questions.

3. Additional comments:
   - A general comment that was positive - The student teachers leaving the program feel they have been well trained.
   - A general comment that was a concern – Some candidates come into a teacher education program after having multiple years of K-12 IEP support, but try college without that support
Feedback from the August 12 work session

STUDENT TEACHER FINAL EVALUATION DATA

The data reviewed in this section involved cooperating teacher final evaluations of 484 student teacher placements. A student teacher may co-teach with more than one teacher and thus have more than one placement. The final evaluation instrument was a common metric administered by all three Valley Partnership institutions (VCSU, NDSU, and MSUM). The data was gathered between the fall semester of 2011 and the spring semester of 2014.

A group of 24 K-12 educators and administrators partnered with 12 VCSU faculty members, the Dean of the VCSU School of Education, and the Valley Partnership Bush Grant Coordinator to combine their experiences and with a review of VCSU Exit Survey data while engaging in small group discussions. (August 12, 2014)

Discussion comments were bulleted under three headings:

1. Based on data and your experiences, what areas do you see as teacher preparation strengths?
   - Student teacher ratings were very high in “character” standards and standards that lead to self-improvement. (InTASC Standards 9 and 10 - Professional Responsibility) If teachers have character and want to improve – everything else will eventually come.
   - Commitment to the profession
   - Willingness to reflect and learn from experiences
   - High expectation for all students
   - Belief that all student can learn
   - Standard 9 – positive example of how the growth of students will continue with a positive attitude
   - Professional commitment/belief in students
   - It is encouraging to see cooperating teacher proficiency ratings of student teachers in the 90% range and higher. These scores are a testament to a strong program.
   - Overall, very good scores – general feeling that quality of student teachers has improved. Feeling that student teachers are shifting from observation into more practice earlier in the experience.

2. Based on data and your experiences, what areas do you see as potential concerns for improvement?
   - Differentiating instruction – tough even for veteran teachers
   - Differentiating instruction (3 groups)
   - Differentiated instruction – teacher candidates need practice
   - Engaging in higher level thinking skills
   - Managing behavior/classroom management
   - Classroom management (2 groups)
   - Higher order thinking skills (3 groups)
   - Using assessment data – tough even for veteran teachers
   - Uses a variety of assessments (2 groups)
   - Use of data to inform instruction
   - Standard 5 – how the change from formulas, procedure, etc. to more upper level thinking will bring about changes in assessment and may pose difficult challenges for students to adjust

3. Additional comments:
   - Cooperating teachers can use the evaluation tool to help open the eyes of the student teachers to all the areas and give students teachers an opportunity to think, incorporate and reflect on these standards.
   - Classroom management/facilitating higher order engagement skills come with experience
   - Reflecting content area needs in differing ways, e.g. music education needs a lot more “hands-on” experience.
   - Is there a concern about how cooperating teachers are rating student teachers (too high)? Is there bias in the
Discussion comments were bulleted under three headings:

1. Based on data and your experiences, what areas do you see as teacher preparation strengths?
   • Leadership and collaboration with peers and grade level teachers
   • Technology – working with, knowing, implementing
   • Standard 3 – learning environments – respect, management, expectations, active learning environment
   • Classroom management
   • Standard 4 – content knowledge
   • Communication with students
   • Technology – infusing it into instruction and learning goals
   • Standard 4 – confident in content knowledge preparation
   • Confident in what they are teaching and the environment they create

2. Based on data and your experiences, what areas do you see as potential concerns for improvement?
   • Students should have more practice with modifying lessons for ELL, IEP/504 learners, gifted/talented
   • Equipping teacher candidates to know how to modify lessons for the needs of diverse learners can help teacher candidates be mindful of meeting the learning needs of all K-12 students.
   • Standard 5 – teaching problem solving skills
   • Designing instruction for English language learners
   • Planning instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans
   • Using assessment data to modify instruction
   • Teaching diverse learners
   • Gifted and talented, IEP and 504, ELLs, assessment data
   • Teaching critical thinking and problem solving
   • Understanding the role of standardized testing

Feedback from the August 12 work session

1st YEAR TEACHER/TRANSITION TO TEACHING SURVEY DATA
(Completed by VCSU alumni in their 1st year of teaching)

The data reviewed in this section involved survey feedback from 34 first-year teachers during the 2011-2012 school year. The survey instrument was a common metric (titled Transition to Teaching Survey) used by all 14 Bush Grant institutions.

A group of 24 K-12 educators and administrators partnered with 12 VCSU faculty members, the Dean of the VCSU School of Education, and the Valley Partnership Bush Grant Coordinator to combine their experiences and with a review of VCSU Exit Survey data while engaging in small group discussions. (August 12, 2014)
• Sense of entitlement
• Classroom management
• Engagement in higher level thinking skills
• Less confident in teaching ELL students
• Standardizing testing uses – candidates learn more about formative assessment in preparation.

3. Additional comments:
• Student teachers seemed more confident at the time of the Exit Survey (graduation) than at the end of their first-year of teaching. (This is not uncommon and was noted by examples in the work session)
• Many 2014 scores are lower than 2012 and 2013 (sample size, class variance, and the change of wording in some assessment items may be factors – an example of a wording change was given in the work session)
• Standard 9 – change in language from attending professional development to requiring that the first-year teacher looks for workshops
• Standard 7 – objectives and goals – planning lessons – teachers need to adjust with the implementation of the Common Core

Feedback from the August 12 work session

SUPERVISOR SURVEY DATA
(Completed by employers/administrators who supervise 1st year teachers)

The data reviewed in this section involved survey feedback from 20 administrators of first-year teachers (VCSU alumni) during the 2011-2012 school year. The survey instrument was a common metric (titled Supervisor Survey) used by all 14 Bush Grant institutions.

A group of 24 K-12 educators and administrators partnered with 12 VCSU faculty members, the Dean of the VCSU School of Education, and the Valley Partnership Bush Grant Coordinator to combine their experiences and with a review of VCSU Exit Survey data while engaging in small group discussions. (August 12, 2014)

Discussion comments were bulleted under three headings:

1. Based on data and your experiences, what areas do you see as teacher preparation strengths?
• Supervisors see first-year teachers as collaborative (team players)
• Content knowledge (2 groups)
• Supervisors and first-year teachers rated classroom management about the same
• Planning is good, except for differentiated instruction
• Standard 1 is positive – learner development
• Overall data is very positive.
• Standard 8 – Instructional Practices – VCSU students are well prepared. Engaging students in a range of technology tools to access and evaluate information.
• Standard 8 – Instructional Strategies, also teaching content, good communication skills, and team players
• Content knowledge is a strength
• Great background in developing collaboration skills

2. Based on data and your experiences, what areas do you see as potential concerns for improvement?
• Differentiated instruction (2 groups)
• ELL, gifted and talented
• Assessment
• Teaching critical thinking skills (2 groups)
• Classroom management
• VCSU can continue to structure experiences for learners in the area of classroom management
• Supervisor and teacher in alignment on instruction and alignment to standards
• Variance in the fact that first-year teachers believe their management skills are high or confident where their administrator is saying he or she needs a little work. Same for student engagement.
• First-year teachers may slip into “survival mode” and might let up on some details in planning
• VCSU must continue to keep up with changes – moving targets of iPads, Smartboards, etc.
• Standard 10 – Leadership and Collaboration – communicating with parents – this can take years to feel comfortable doing this. Elementary teachers may have more opportunities than high school - PowerSchool for access to student grades and classroom websites.
• Learning environment – classroom management
• Application of Content – teaching critical thinking skills
• Assessment – engage students in self-assessment strategies

3. Additional comments:
• First-year teachers are often asked to take on too many preps
• First-year teachers are asked to lead extra-curricular activities that can lead to burnout and dissatisfaction
• Be more diligent with getting responses back to have a higher number for this survey (VCSU has been among the leaders in response rates among the fourteen Bush Grant institutions. It is a challenge to secure high response rates. A solution to raise the response rates is possible, but “diligence” might not the proper word choice for gaining more responses.)
• Classroom management was rated lower by supervisors than first-year teachers
• First-year teachers focus differently from teachers with more experience. (Development comes with time and experience)
• First-year teachers need to learn how to ask open ended questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you recommend your teacher education program to other prospective teachers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 331

An Exit Survey item that was not shared at the work session:
331 student teachers responded to this question. The results are extremely positive for VCSU.