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ABSTRACT

The purposes of this descriptive study were to better describe to the administrators of a Midwestern university the strengths and weaknesses of its physical education program, to furnish a description of the alumni with respect to employment longevity in the field of physical education, employment trends, and attitudes toward the program. The study included alumni of the university’s physical education division and data were collected using a survey instrument. Data analysis revealed four major findings: (1) the alumni felt very positive about their experience at the university, (2) the alumni felt highly prepared in most areas of teaching, (3) the alumni felt the need for preparatory improvement in the area of Technology and (4) the alumni felt the need for additional methods courses required as curricular courses.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background Information

Two of the important governing bodies that set the standards to be met for quality physical education programs are the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AAHPERD) and the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE). The mission of each involves the promotion and support of healthy living, quality physical activity, and education programs, professional development opportunities, and the encouragement of sound professional behavior. The two encourage the dissemination of information, guidelines, and ethical standards regarding strong professional practice, and stand as leaders in the planning of future guidelines for physical educators (http://www.aahperd.org, 2010).

Closely aligned with having sound standards is the assessment of educational outcomes. Assessment provides a specific method of measurement designed to focus on established outcomes. Assessment that coincides with the standards measures the degree to which students can demonstrate, in context, their understanding, and performance relative to identified standards of learning (Lambert, 1999).

Research on assessment in physical education is lacking. Historically, assessment in physical education has not been viewed as a necessary entity. Certain researchers note
that there are a variety of reasons contributing to this belief. James, Griffin, and France (2005) note from other researchers:

1. Many physical education teachers feel that there is a lack of time, overcrowded classes, and/or lack of preparation on how to assess properly (Hensley, 1990; Lund, 1993; Veal, 1988).
2. Teachers are not comfortable with the process of assessment (Barnes, 1985).
4. Teachers base assessment on student behavior and participation rather than performance and acquisition of skills (Matanin and Tannehill, 1994).
5. A trend of non-assessment in physical education or assessment is limited to subjective observation (Matanin and Tannehill, 1994).

Educational research on assessment in general education has been heavily documented. There is strong evidence positively linking assessment and effort. Research in physical education also shows the value of effort in achievement. Researchers have found a correlation between increased effort and refined skill work (Veal and Compagnone, 1995 in James, Griffin, France, 2005). There is an indication that the student views his/her effort with enhanced learning (Spage, 1996 in James, Griffin, France, 2005). Thus, due to the nature of the discipline, effort can be attributed to enhanced learning in physical education.

Teacher preparatory programs require the same attention paid to quality standards, methods of assessment, program accountability, and student preparation. A private, Midwestern university, by way of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)/NASPE Review, upholds the visions of these two national
authorities on Physical Education, and aligns itself with the mission statements. In an effort to assist the physical education program in identifying the preparation needs of the student, the strengths and weaknesses of the program, and employment longevity of its graduates, the alumni of the Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Program were asked to provide firsthand information that could enable the university to describe the effectiveness of the program.

Statement of Problem

In January 2005, the university’s physical education division passed its program review by NCATE/NASPE, achieved accreditation, and became nationally recognized. A nationally recognized program is defined as being approved by NASPE through the semester and year of the institution’s next NCATE review (NASPE Final Report on Program Review Decision, 2005). To retain recognition, another full program report must be submitted at least two semesters before the next NCATE review. The program will be listed as nationally recognized through the semester of the next NCATE review on the websites and/or other publications of NASPE and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NASPE in its published materials through the semester of the next NCATE review (NASPE Final Report on Program Review Decision, 2005).

During the aforementioned review, internal questions arose as to whether the department was achieving its mission statement. There was no concrete evidence specifically stating that it was or was not doing so. The department was passing all reviews but there was limited feedback from graduates as to whether they felt prepared as
professionals and if they felt they were successful at their professional careers. This information is considered to be critical in the success of the educational preparation. The physical education division feels that although the national standards are being met, the graduate’s success beyond the university is of importance and reflects the quality of the program.

Significance of the Study

For the physical education division to continue with confidence, a need to study the program more completely was deemed necessary. This study is intended to better describe to the university’s administrators, and the strengths and weaknesses of the program. It also will furnish a description of the alumni with respect to employment longevity in the field of physical education, employment trends, and attitudes toward the program. Greater knowledge of the alumni can provide a strong framework to support the Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Program. Realizing the factors that current professionals and graduates of the program consider significant will supply the division with motivation to maintain a progressive program or improve in certain areas. This description will benefit the prospective student as he/she enters the program, maintains his/her status as a physical education major, completes the required curricular classes, and seeks licensure in the field.

Research Questions

This is a descriptive study to which there are three research questions:

1. What is employment status in the field for physical education majors?
2. What are the overall perceptions regarding the importance of the NASPE Standards?
   - What is the perception of importance?
   - What is the perception of preparation?

3. What is the reflection of the graduates regarding the Conceptual Framework’s impact in the field as a professional?

Limitations of the Study

The population for this study is limited to alumni of the university’s physical education department from 1977 to present. Therefore, the results are limited to the accessible population of the alumni and may be considered small. The results are also limited to the memory of the alumni who participated in the program and their general feelings toward the university. Finally, the researcher had a previous relationship with the university.

Basic Assumptions

There is a basic assumption that the alumni who participated in the completion of the survey provided honest and truthful responses to the questions. It is also assumed that the participants’ perception of and experiences in the program were provided honestly and truthfully.
Definitions and Operational Terms

The following definitions are provided to enable the reader to better understand terms that are used repeatedly throughout this study.

**American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AAHPERD):** AAHPERD is the largest organization of professionals supporting and assisting professionals involved in physical education, recreation, fitness, sport and coaching, dance, health education and promotion, and all specialties related to achieving a healthy and active lifestyle ([http://www.aahperd.org/about/](http://www.aahperd.org/about/)).

**Employment Longevity:** The length of time the graduate has been employed in the field of physical education or the Allied Health field.

**Exit Survey:** The Exit Survey is a document created by the university’s education department. It requests input from recent graduates in the evaluation of the initial licensure teacher preparation program.

**Grade Point Average (GPA):** GPA is defined as the student’s cumulative GPA, based on a four point scale, at the time of graduation.

**Graduate Record Examination (GRE):** The GRE is a standardized test that is an admissions requirement for many graduate schools. The score is an important factor in the admissions decisions. It measures verbal and quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, and analytical writing skills.

**Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC):** INTASC is a consortium of state education agencies and national educational organizations dedicated to the reform of the preparation, licensing, and on-going professional development of teachers.
Conceptual Framework: The Conceptual Framework is how the university education department’s professional preparation programs have been constructed to prepare educators and allied health professionals to teach, lead, and serve in the state’s schools, community agencies, and allied health programs. The Framework stems from the university’s religious and educational history experience and embraces the religious order’s four important missions of education: religious, personal, social, and action (Chapple, 1993; Ganss, 1954; Harvanek, 1987; McCool, 1986; DEAS Conceptual Framework Document, 2004). The university’s department of education derives their programs from this framework.

Miller Analogies Test (MAT): The MAT is a high-level test of analytical ability that requires the solution of problems stated as analogies. The MAT consists of 120 partial analogies that are to be completed in 60 minutes (http://www.milleranalogies.com).

National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE): NASPE is the preeminent national authority on physical education and a recognized leader in sport and physical activity (NASPE Strategic Plan, 2006–2008).

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE): NCATE is the teaching profession’s organization to help establish high quality teacher, specialist, and administrator preparation.

Performance-Based Assessment (PBA): A PBA asks students to show what they can do given an authentic task which is then judged using a specific set of criteria. It
gives a more complete picture of student achievement, provides teachers with information about how a student understands and how they apply knowledge (Coyle, 2005)

**Post-Baccalaureate Graduate (post-bac):** An individual who has graduated from another collegiate institution and is interested in obtaining a Multi-Age teaching license. This is a non-degree seeking student.

**Praxis II:** Praxis II Tests are subject assessments that measure knowledge of specific subjects that K–12 educators will teach, as well as general and subject specific teaching skills and knowledge. There are Subject Assessments, Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) Tests and Teaching Foundations Tests ([http://www.ets.org/portal/site/ets/menuitem](http://www.ets.org/portal/site/ets/menuitem)).

**School-Based M.Ed.:** A graduate program with all education coursework at the graduate level. Each course parallels professional and pedagogical content knowledge within the undergraduate or post-bac coursework.

**Success:** For the purpose of this dissertation, success will be defined as if 5–10 years post-graduation, the individual has secured and maintained employment in the teaching or allied health field department, YMCA affiliation, etc. Also, additional education and certifications in their field, memberships and activities in professional organizations, research and publications, and speaking engagements indicate success of the graduate.

**University:** This study reviews the practices of a Midwestern private university. Within this university, fields are broken up into colleges, then departments, then divisions
and, finally, programs. The terms college, department, and division will be used in this study with this understood context and hierarchy.

Summary

CHAPTER I introduces the description study of an initial physical education teacher education program. This chapter one also contains information pertinent to this study: introduction to AAHPERD, NASPE, the lack of research on physical education assessment, statement of the problem, significance of the study, the research questions, limitations related to the study, assumptions, and definitions of terms.
Measuring the Effectiveness of Educational Programs

There is considerable variation in measuring the effectiveness of educational programs. Each study investigates unique questions and thus uses a multitude of variables to produce the outcomes of the study. An exhaustive search of the research literature dealing with characteristics similar to this study yielded a limited number of publications of the “descriptive” nature.

For example, Alice Black (2006) from The Ohio State University wrote a dissertation on the evaluation of the effectiveness of an Ohio Statewide Agriculture Leadership Program (Ohio LEAD Program). She employed a descriptive study research design to measure outcomes of the Ohio LEAD Program on various societal levels. Black used focus group interviews and an alumni questionnaire to gather data from those who graduated from the Ohio LEAD Program. The study found that 94% of the respondents believe that the Ohio LEAD Program should be continued and 86% believe that “they experienced a high level of change because of their program participation” (p. 141).

There are similar studies identifying the strengths and weaknesses of current academic programs. Virginia Tech University (2003) created an assessment report of the Undergraduate Program of the Department of Human Nutrition, Foods, and Exercise
(HNFE). The assessment employed the following methods: student feedback, which consisted of exit interviews of 20 graduating seniors, and exit surveys; alumni feedback, which utilized an alumni online survey and telephone interviews of 10 HNFE graduates; employee feedback, where telephone interviews were conducted with 10 employers and professional or graduate programs in which HNFE alumni were currently employed or enrolled; and the review of student performance at the time of graduation. This data gathering was completed by multiple evaluators of student performances in internships, performances on a National Certification Examination, an Examination for Dietitians, field study performances, and a career services post-graduation report. The program found that its graduates were prepared to enter the working field, the graduates were competitive at gaining access to higher education or professional positions, and the research opportunities and courses throughout the program were valuable. Suggestions were made concerning improvement in the students’ writing abilities and the dissemination of information on career choices.

Wright State University’s College of Education and Human Services (2001) conducted an Alumni Survey of Graduates from 1995–2000. The information was used for developing a program and aligning the Wright State University’s College of Education and Human Services’ assessment plan with the NCATE revised standards. The survey yielded positive results from alumni indicating strong satisfaction with the programs in the college. There was concern about how the survey should be analyzed as the data was based on perceptual interpretation of the respondents.

Finally, Utah State University (2002) created a survey as a part of a series of tri-annual alumni surveys designed to obtain opinions of alumni who graduated 2, 5, 15, 25,
and 35 years ago. The survey collected demographic information as well as expressions about college experiences with respect to quality, individual growth and development, employment, and alumni experiences. The executive summary indicated that 92.5% of the alumni were satisfied or very satisfied with the undergraduate programs. The quality of teaching was rated good or very good by 90% of the participants. In addition, 92% of respondents reported feeling a sense of pride in themselves as a result of attending the university.

The development of teacher preparatory programs depends on research involving long-term tenure, job satisfaction, teacher retention, and teacher attrition. The importance of this data effects the development of curricular paths in higher education. Previous research dictates that teacher retention is an important concern in the United States and finds that these four variables are linked to teaching employment longevity.

Wisiniewski and Gargiulo (1997), as cited in Wasburn-Moses (2005), pointed to the first year of teaching as being important to teachers’ futures in the field and recommend that new teachers be given mentors. The idea of mentorship helps beginning teachers deal with questions, issues, and concerns they may routinely experience. Heath-Camp and Camp (1992) stated, “No period is more critical to the success of a beginning teacher than the induction phase” (p. 35). Huling-Austin (1996) found that 15% of all new teachers leave the profession after one year of service, “in excess of two-thirds of those [leaving] will do so in the first four years” (p.3), and by year seven 40 to 50% of a beginning teacher cohort will have left the profession. This pattern continued through the 1990’s (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997). Heller (2004, p. 4) noted “Teachers have one of the highest attrition rates of any profession; in particular, new
teachers are apt to leave our schools.” This identification of teacher attrition has created
the need to understand why teachers choose to leave the field of teaching. Job satisfaction
is found to directly correlate with teacher retention. McNamara (1999) defined job
satisfaction as:

…one’s feelings or state-of-mind regarding the nature of their work. Job
satisfaction can be influenced by a variety of factors, e.g. the quality of one’s
relationship with their supervisor, the quality of the physical environment in
which they work, degree of fulfillment in their work, etc. (par. 1).

Research indicates that working conditions contribute to the deterioration of job
satisfaction for teachers: with increase in favorable conditions, the more satisfaction the
teacher experiences in his/her job (Nickson and Kritsonis, 2006). Salaries and benefits
(such as health insurance and retirement) are found to be important but less so than other
factors. Parental involvement, administrative support, and dangerous and less than
desirable learning conditions are qualities that contribute to teacher turnover. Ingersoll
(2001) in the study, Teacher Turnover, Teacher Shortages, and the Organization of
Schools, stated:

…while it is true teacher retirements are increasing, the overall amount to
turnover accounted for by retirement is relatively minor when compared to that
resulting from other causes such as teacher job dissatisfaction and teachers
pursuing jobs or other careers (p.5).

Teachers under the age of 30 are more likely to leave teaching than teachers who
are further along in their careers. Special education, math, and science had an increased
amount of teacher attrition. More males left the profession than females. School attributes
were contributors to turnover while teachers of non-Caucasian backgrounds were also
found to leave the teaching field at higher rates (Ingersoll, 2001). Viadero (2002) found
that 29% of teachers leave the teaching field within their first three years and 39% during
the first five years of teaching. MetLife (2005) found, in their 2004–2005 survey of
teachers, students, and principals, the following 12 characteristics that predicted reasons why teachers “are likely to leave the profession of teaching and go into a different profession in the next five years” (Transitions and the Role of Supportive Relationships, 2005, p. 91).

1. Not satisfied with teaching as a career
2. Feels as if their job is not valued by their supervisor
3. Feels stress and anxiety related to reviews by their supervisor
4. Feels stress and anxiety related to personnel issues, union, low pay, teacher conflict, discipline, complaints and incompetence
5. Feels stress and anxiety related to unrealistic demands, workload, number of responsibilities
6. Fewer years of experience teaching
7. Minority teacher
8. Feels stress and anxiety related to safety
9. Feels stress and anxiety related to budget or lack of funding or financial constraints
10. Finds making a contribution to society a source of greatest teaching satisfaction
11. Feels stress and anxiety related to lack of resources
12. Finds pay or salary a source of greatest teaching satisfaction

Factors contributing to job dissatisfaction ranged from teaching assignments to low salaries. Norton (1999) noted that if an employee is not satisfied, he/she may seek employment elsewhere. In a study of teaching assignments, Harvey, Heller, McConnell, and Williams (1998) reported that new teachers are routinely assigned classes with
discipline and performance problems. They noted the potential for early burnout because of this trend. The study suggested that new teachers need time to experiment with their teaching methods and utilize their untapped resources (1998). Shann (1998) found reasons for leaving in urban schools as “lack of administrative, collegial, and parent support and insufficient involvement in decision making” (par. 2). The issue of attrition has drawn many to ask questions concerning how to keep teachers in the classrooms and gymnasiums. Teacher job satisfaction is believed “to be a predictor of teacher retention, a determinant of teacher commitment, and in turn, a contributor to school effectiveness” (Shann, 1998, par 1). Thornton (2004) suggested “increased teacher voice and power, and reconfiguring teacher roles to be collegial, based on professional growth within a learning community are elements that may begin to address teacher needs” (par. 3). Job satisfaction and retention of teachers were topics studied in Montana. An examination of faculty at small rural schools revealed that relationships with students ranked higher in teacher satisfaction than safety, parental support, and rural lifestyle (Davis, 2002). Shann (1998) identified additional indicators of job satisfaction as “interaction with students, interactions with colleagues, professional challenges, professional autonomy, working conditions, salary, and opportunities for advancement…student achievement” (par. 5).

Ingersoll as noted by Viadero (2002) suggested that greater support and decision making for teachers, more competitive salaries, and addressing student behaviors will increase teacher retention. He notes that improving the teaching conditions will contribute to job satisfaction and retention. Heller (2004) strongly suggested the importance of teacher preparation while also noting research studies indicating the value of mentorship as a means to retaining teachers. These studies in school systems from
New York, Illinois, Louisiana, California, and Arizona reported reduction in teacher attrition rates as well as increases in first year teachers returning for a second year.

Students who enter the field of teaching are measured in a number of areas prior to completion of the academic program. Initially, the student uses his/her high school GPA in conjunction with an SAT or ACT score to become eligible for entrance into a college or university. The student must maintain a certain GPA to secure admission into a college of education and finally, the student must complete a set of national exams prior to receiving a teaching license. One exam measures his/her overall knowledge of the teaching field, while the second exam gauges knowledge associated with the specific content area of teaching. Research suggests the value placed on the tests may or may not be a motivating factor for a district or school to hire the individual. Further research on teacher employment trends indicates broad patterns of teacher attrition and retention. The importance of standardized achievement tests has been placed under a watchful eye as to their effectiveness. The popularity of this form of testing stems from its ease of use, its low cost, and minimal time needed to administer. The results are easily interpreted, can be used individually or as a group and are considered objective in meaning. Although they are considered valid and reliable measures many researchers criticize their ability to accurately assess a student, place him or her in appropriate classes or groups, and assist him or her in academic decision making. The National Commission on Testing and Public Policy (“From Gatekeeper to Gateway,” 1990) noted, “Current testing, predominantly multiple choice in format, is over-relied upon, lacks adequate public accountability, sometimes leads to unfairness in the allocation of opportunities, and too often undermines vital social policies” (p. ix).
Reasons Teachers Stay or Leave the Teaching Field

Individuals who enter and leave the teaching field are motivated to do so for a variety of reasons. Research specific to physical education teachers is lacking in comparison to research concerning classroom educators. A study by Guarino, Santibanez, Daley and Brewer of the Rand Corporation (2004) suggested three approaches to determining characteristics of those individuals.

1. It can compare those who choose teaching with those who do not ascertain the distinguishing characteristics or motivations of teachers;

2. It can simply examine the characteristics of individuals who choose teaching;

or

3. It can examine the characteristics of individuals who choose to teach and are chosen to teach by school districts (p. 17).

The literature was consistent on information regarding gender, race or ethnicity, psychological factors, and ability of teachers in the profession. Women were more likely to enter teaching than men. There has been an increase in minority teachers but with consistently more white teachers employed. There is a lack of solid data on the psychological aspects of teaching due to retrospective responses by participants (Guarino et. al, 2004). The ability factor indicated that college graduates, who measured highest in ability, did not enter into the teaching profession. There are numerous studies noted in the Rand Corporation report that supported this fact.

- “Henke et al (2000), in their study of Baccalaureate and Beyond, found that graduates whose college entrance examination (CEE) scores fell in the top quartile were less likely than those in the bottom quartile (32 versus 41
percent) to enter the teacher pipeline, and 6 percent of graduates in the top quartile had prepared to teach and taught versus 12 percent in the bottom quartile” (p.21).

- “Murnane and Schwinden (1989) found that among individuals who had obtained a teaching certificate in North Carolina between 1975 and 1985, the probability of actual entry into teaching was lower for those with higher National Teacher Examination (NTE) scores” (p. 21).

- “Maniski (1987), using data on working college graduates in the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972 that followed high school seniors until 1979, found that the probability of becoming a teacher was inversely related to academic ability, as measured by SAT scores and class rank. In the case of males in the 400–800 SAT range, 16 percent became teachers and 22 percent entered other professions. In the 1201–1600 SAT range for males 55 percent were non-teaching professional and only 5 percent were teachers. In the case of females in the 400–800 SAT range, 34 percent became teachers and 14 percent entered other professions. In the 1201–1600 SAT range, 9 percent were teachers and 46 percent were non-teaching professions” (p. 21).

Additionally, the Rand Corporation (2004) found discrepancies in research dealing with the relationship between measured ability and teaching.

- “Gitomer, Latham, and Ziomek (1999), in a study that used data on more than 300,000 prospective teachers who took the Praxis I and II between the years 1994 and 1997 and could be matched to earlier SAT or ACT data, found that
the group of individuals who passed the Praxis I test for admission to schools of education had math scores comparable to, and verbal scores higher than, the average scores of all college-bound seniors (an average math score of 514 versus an average math score of 511, and an average verbal score of 525 versus an average verbal score of 505, respectively). Teacher candidates who passed the Praxis II teacher licensure test had SAT scores that were lower than the average for college graduates (507 versus 542 in math, and 522 versus 543 in verbal). After disaggregating their data, the authors found that the elementary education candidates passing the Praxis II had lower SAT scores than college graduates (507 versus 542 in math, and 522 versus 543 in verbal). In contrast, candidates passing the Praxis II for an academic content area had higher verbal SAT scores than college graduates in general, and those pursuing mathematics or science subject-matter licensure had math SAT scores that were higher than college graduates in general. The study reports only mean scores and does not provide significant tests. In addition, it is limited to test takers who also took the SAT or ACT and does not necessarily generalize to the entire population of applicants of teacher education programs or teacher candidates” (p. 22).

The Rand Corporation (2004) study further discussed the implication of hiring practices by public schools as not recognizing high academic ability of the candidate as a priority when contracting the candidate.

- “Wise, Darling-Hammond, and Berry (1987) conducted case studies of six school districts spread throughout the United States and reported that although
academic qualifications were considered in the hiring process, in some
districts, principals and district personnel valued interpersonal skills more
highly. In some cases, administrators believed that the smarter a teacher
candidate was, the worse he/she would perform as a teacher” (p. 23).

- “Berry, Noblitt, and Hare (1985) provided evidence drawn from 107
interviews of public school administrators and 73 interviews of education
officials at universities in the Southeast in the early 1980s that both groups
valued the ability to relate to children or participation in extracurricular
activities as much as or more than intelligence or academic ability” (p. 23).

The findings in these various reports indicated that individuals who enter the
teaching profession possess similar characteristics. Similarities found were being a
female, Caucasian, of average academic ability and having the desire to serve society
(Rand, 2004). These studies need further investigation as to the hiring trends of that time
and how the trend varies from district to district. The data is confined to empirical data
that does not consider teacher personalities, personal situations, and environmental
issues. There is limited information indicating a correlation between high academic
achievement scores and success in teaching. Also, employment longevity indicators stem
from other factors separate from or combined with other factors.

Nature and Scope of Physical Education

Physical education of today has evolved from the traditional program of providing
children and young adults with a quality movement program in a school setting. The first
physical education teacher preparation program was founded in 1861 at Lewis’ Normal
Institute for Physical Education. Dioclesian Lewis created a curriculum that utilized light gymastics in a co-educational environment. The curriculum also entailed topics such as anatomy, physiology, and hygiene (Bucher, 2006). In 1881, Radcliffe College became the third school to offer professional preparation in physical education, after the Turnerbund Normal School was established in 1866. Initially, Radcliffe College was an all-female institution. Upon moving to Boston and undergoing a name change to Sargent School of Physical Education, men were admitted into the program. This program concentrated on the German and Swedish system of gymnastics (Bucher, 2006).

A significant development to physical education was brought about in 1885 with the establishment of the Association for the Advancement of Physical Education (AAPE), the predecessor of AAHPERD (Bucher, 2006). In 1900, the University of Washington became the first state university to offer physical education teacher education which was quickly followed by Oberlin College in that same year. Prior to that, Oberlin College administered A.B. degrees in physical education. The first degree in physical education was granted in 1900. This degree was based on a three year program and came from the Arnold College of Hygiene and Physical Education (Snyder and Scott, 1954).

The early twentieth century marked a point of growth for physical education. Between 1900 and 1940, the philosophy, nature, and scope of physical education evolved. Focus fell on the “new physical education” which involved the total individual, mind and body (Bucher, 2006). Previously, there had been the idea that the mind and body were separate entities. During this period, World War I, the Golden Twenties and the Great Depression, greatly influenced the focus on physical education.
There was great support for physical education due to the need for strong soldiers. One third of the armed service men were found to be unfit or physically incapable to serve in the military. Women became a greater presence in sport and physical activity due to the women’s movement in that time. Women physical educators became more prevalent which influence not only society but movement at home (Bucher, 2006).

Conversely, the Great Depression hindered the progress of health and physical education programs. The lack of funding available decreased the support for sustaining such programs and many were eliminated from school curriculums. This amounted to approximately 40% of existing health and physical education programs dropped from schools altogether (Bucher, 2006).

World War II brought about resurgence for physical education. Again, men who had been drafted for war were found to be unfit for duty. President Franklin Roosevelt took interest in the importance of fitness training and established a Division of Physical Fitness within the US Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services (Bucher, 2006). During this time the dissemination of information became easier with the publishing of the Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. Finally, the increased participation of women and girls in sport influenced attention paid to health and physical education programs.

Now, school physical education programs focus on promotion of lifetime involvement in physical activity (Bucher, 2006). Students develop skills, knowledge, and values that will equip them with the ability to participate in a variety of physical activities throughout their lives. Each level of instruction—elementary, secondary, high school, and college—offers the age-appropriate concepts of learning to aid in this process. These
In the United States, the number of overweight and obese has risen. The U.S. Surgeon General, in 2001, issued *Call to Action to Prevent and Decrease Overweight and Obesity* (2001). The Surgeon General developed action priorities and ensured daily, quality physical education in schools, incorporating more physical activity into daily life, and increasing opportunities for physical activity at worksites (2001). It also called for the American people to begin balancing diet with daily exercise.

Additional studies of trends in physical activity and health in the United States have found that population groups and demographics play an important role in physical activity or inactivity. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services’ Healthy People 2010 program (2000) revealed that age, socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, gender, education, and geographic location influenced physical activity levels. Inactivity is greatest among women, minorities, economically and educationally challenged, and the elderly (2000). This is a result of having limited opportunities for physical activity, less access to public services, and the lack of education on the importance of physical activity.

Involvement in physical activity is recommended to begin at an early age and continue throughout a lifetime. School physical education programs are the primary avenues for helping children learn the skills, developing the values, and equipping the students with the knowledge for success in movement (Bucher, 2006). Daily participation in physical education for the over 52 million students enrolled in public and private elementary and secondary schools can increase the potential for creating healthy
lifestyles at an early age (National Center for Education Statistics, 2001). The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Healthy People 2000 (1990) and Healthy People 2010 (2000) programs declare the importance of physical education and the contribution it can make to health. Each health policy calls for daily, high quality physical education for all students K–12. In contrast to the recommendations of these policies, daily physical education programs for children and adolescents are declining. Participation for high school students had decreased from 42% in 1991 to 32% in 2001 (Centers for Disease Control, 2001). Currently, physical education programs are based on a developmental model that believes physical education, through the use of structured activities, contributes to the whole person (Bucher, 2006). The idea of developing the whole person places and important value on a lifetime of movement and gives strength to the foundational philosophy on which physical education is built. Philosophy is a “system of values by which one lives and works (Bucher, 2006, p. 24). The philosophy by which teachers live guides their decision making and behavior.

John Dewey developed the idea of progressive education. He believed in a child-centered approach to learning and advocated for children taking an active role in learning (Siedentop, 1998). Educational activities were seen as developing both the mind and the body. Physical education, according to Dewey, contributed to developing the physical, intellectual, and social goals of education (Bucher, 2006).

The mind-body relationship is a philosophy that lends itself to physical education. There are discrepancies among philosophers about whether the mind and body are one or the mind and body are separate.
The term *dualism* refers to the idea that the mind and body are separate and independent. In addition, dualism reflects a superiority of the mind and an inferiority of the body (Bucher, 2006). Physical education by nature emphasizes the development of the body. Under the dualistic belief, when the body is emphasized, the term education of the physical is used (Bucher, 2006). Because the body and the mind are considered separate units, there is no effect on one when the other is utilized or developed.

*Monoism* refers to the idea that the mind and body are one entity and therefore equal in importance. Development of the body is deemed as critical as the development of the mind. Thus, physical education is viewed as being as important as classroom education. The concept of education through the physical is a significant component in monoism and becomes the common denominator in the development of the total person (Bucher, 2006). This philosophic approach is of utmost importance to lifelong physical activity. The monoistic belief promotes one’s total development in terms of health and fitness and requires leaders of physical education to support programs that recognize the importance of this concept. School-based physical education programs offer the greatest opportunity to achieve this. The population includes children from various backgrounds and experiences.

This approach provides the opportunity to instill the value of a healthful lifestyle, provide the knowledge and skill necessary to perform physical activities and promote the idea of lifelong participation in physical activity. Educational institutions are responsible for preparing children for employment, additional education, and societal roles. There is a commitment to offer all children, regardless of their race, religion, gender, socioeconomic class, ethnicity, and ability a quality education. Physical and motor
development is an important part of that education. Physical education provides a unique
collection to the daily curricular instruction in that the body is utilized for learning. It
contributes to the physical, emotional, intellectual, and social development of the
individual. AAHPERD (1965) states five major objectives for physical education which
encourage the role of physical education and involvement in physical activity for a
lifetime:

1. To help children move in a skillful and effective manner in all the selected
activities in which they engage in the physical education program, and also in
those situations that they will experience during their lifetime.

2. To develop an understanding and appreciation of movement in children and
youth so that their lives will become more meaningful, purposive, and
productive.

3. To develop an understanding and appreciation of certain scientific principles
concerned with movement that relate to such factors as time, space, force, and
mass-energy relationships.

4. To develop through the medium of games and sports better interpersonal
relationships.

5. To develop the various organ systems of the body so that they will respond in
a healthful way to the increased demands placed upon them.

AAHPERD further developed means for disseminating information on the
importance of lifelong physical activity in the 1971 Physical Education Public
Information Project (PEPI). This project revealed the contributions that physical
education makes to students and adults by listing various beliefs:
- Physical education is health insurance.
- Physical education contributes to academic achievement.
- Physical education provides skills and experiences that can last a lifetime.
- Physical education helps in developing a positive self-image and the ability to compete and cooperate with others (Biles, 53–57).

The teaching of physical education is based primarily on a constructivist philosophy. Constructivism can be explained through the idea that meaning and understanding are accomplished through experiences (Kristinisdottir, 2001). Kim (2005) listed the following differences between constructivist teaching and other teachings:

1. Learning is an active process rather than the process of knowledge acquisition.
2. Teaching is supporting the learner’s constructive processing of understanding rather than delivering the information to the learner.
3. Teaching is a learning-teaching concept rather than a teaching-learning concept (p. 9).

It is an active process where students learn by doing rather than observing (Constructivism Basics, 2007). These experiences serve as building blocks of knowledge where new information can associate itself with older information to achieve a deeper understanding. New information is more fully understood when it can be related to something previously learned. When the individual grows and develops through experiences, their approach to learning grows as well. Thus, learning is an ever changing and evolving process that is dependent upon the individual interpretation of the knowledge. The interpretation is based on previous experiences toward the information (Constructivism Basics, 2007).
This new information is absorbed, analyzed, and transferred according to the student’s background. For total learning to occur, one must display, through action (portfolio, group project, presentation, physical performance, etc.), the skill to be learned.

As a teacher, one must be concerned with not only what the student is learning, but also how he/she approaches learning because what the student learns depends on it. Fosnot (1996) summarized constructivist epistemology as an assumption that learners develop their own knowledge on the foundation of interaction with the environment. In constructivist learning, Gagnon and Collay noted four epistemological assumptions as its basis:

- Knowledge is physically constructed by learners who are involved in active learning;
- Knowledge is symbolically constructed by learners who are making their own representations of action;
- Knowledge is socially constructed by learners who convey their meaning making to others; and
- Knowledge is theoretically constructed by learners who try to explain things they don’t completely understand. (par. 3)

Learning is considered a result of previous experiences and individual interpretation. These interpretations reflect the knowledge of the student and their experiences with learning. This must be addressed when planning a lesson or unit. For example, Kim (2005) noted 13 characteristics of constructivist teaching talked about by Yager (1991):

1. Constructivist teachers invite student questions and ideas.
2. Constructivist teachers accept and encourage student’s invented ideas.
3. Constructivist teachers encourage student’s invented ideas.
4. Constructivist teachers modify their instructional strategies in the process of teaching based upon students’ thought, experience and or interests.
5. Constructivist teachers use printed materials as well as experts to get more information.
6. Constructivist teachers encourage free discussions by way of new ideas inviting student questions and answers.
7. Constructivist teachers encourage or invite students’ predictions of the causes and effects in relation to particular cases and events.
8. Constructivist teachers help students to test their own ideas.
9. Constructivist teachers invite students’ ideas, before the student is presented with the ideas and instructional materials.
10. Constructivist teachers encourage students to challenge the concepts and ideas of others.
11. Constructivist teachers use cooperative teaching strategies through student interactions and respect, sharing ideas, and learning tasks.
12. Constructivist teachers encourage students to respect and use other people’s ideas through reflection and analysis.
13. Constructivist teachers welcome the restructuring of his/her ideas through reflecting on new evidence and experiences (p. 10).

Also, real-world learning must occur. “The instructions should be based on techniques drawn from the constructivist’s epistemological assumptions which are
consistent with that theory of learning, e.g., situated cognition in real world contexts, teaching through cognitive apprenticeship, and construction of multiple perspectives” (Bendar et al, 1995, p.106). That is, learning that can be applied to knowledge outside of the classroom must take place. This can only occur if situations such as these are provided. Again, the student’s level of learning must be considered when using various teaching styles. One must approach the lesson with numerous methods of instruction to ensure total learning by all. In addition, S. Hanckbarth (1996, p. 11) stated that “constructivists have claimed that objectives should be negotiated with students based on their own felt needs, that programmed activities should emerge from within the contexts of their lived worlds, that students should work together with peers in the social construction of personally significant meaning, and that evaluation should be a personalized ongoing, shared analysis of progress.” Thus, self assessment and peer learning add to the enrichment of the topic by having the students take an active approach to the skill being learned. Ultimately, students must take this approach to learning. Rooted in constructivism are the beliefs of Piaget, Vygotsky, Bruner, and Bloom.

Constructivists

**Piaget**

Piaget’s Theory of Cognitive Development is imperative for a complete understanding of motor development because cognitive and motor development consistently interact. “Cognitive development strongly depends on the movement capabilities the individual has acquired; similarly, motor development depends on
Piaget’s theory consisted of four major stages: sensorimotor, preoperational, concrete operational, and formal operational. These stages are experienced in the same order by each individual, and no stage is ever absent. The obvious difference is in the rate and quality of accomplishment. The building block idea is apparent here because “each stage is increasingly more complex than its predecessor and builds on the cognitive abilities gained in the previous stage” (Issacs, Payne, 2005, p. 30).

The first major stage is sensorimotor. This stage takes place from birth to two years old and deals with the idea that children formulate the abilities to use memory, imitation, and thought. The child begins to realize that once an object is moved out of his/her sight, it does not cease to exist. The second stage is called the pre-operational stage (2–7 years) and is where language development occurs. The child’s thinking is egocentric and he/she has a difficult time viewing the opinion of another child. The third stage, concrete operational (7–11 years), is where the ability to solve problems logically occurs. The child is able to reverse the situation and look at things differently. The final stage is the formal operational stage (11–15 years). It is here that the individual solves abstract problems, thinks scientifically, and becomes concerned with social issues. He/she also formulates an appreciation for personal identity (Payne, Issacs, 2008).

Vygotsky

Another constructivist is Vygotsky. Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory suggested that development stems from social influences (M.M. Haith, S.A. Miller, R. Vasta, 1995) and provided explanations through his belief in private speech and his Zone of Proximal
Development (ZPD). He stated: “Every function in the child’s cultural development appears twice: first, between people (interpsychological) and then inside the child (intrapsychological). This applies equally to voluntary attention, logical memory, and the formation of ideas. All the higher functions originate as actual relationships between individuals” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 57). ZPD refers to the distance between the abilities displayed independently by the student and what is performed with assistance from another, more experienced individual(s) (D. Wood, H. Wood, 1966). In other words, what a child is able to perform with help from someone else at present, they will eventually be able to complete by themselves. Physical education is deeply aligned with this approach in that when learning a new skill, progressing with an old skill or working as a team, the idea of going from assistance to independence is the main goal.

For example, a pre-school child is learning how to perform a forward summersault. The instructor has given the child verbal directions, has shown the student how to physically perform the skill, and has stated that he/she will be spotting the child during the skill performance. This ensures the safety of the child and also eases the anxiety level of the student while accomplishing the skill. There are repeated attempts at the summersault with constructive feedback as to how to achieve the desired goal. As the child continues to gain knowledge of the skill, his/her body in motion, and the feel of a properly performed skill, the student is able to move closer to achieving the goal of independence. This can occur with guided practice.

According to R. Gallimore and R.G. Tharp (1988), Vygotsky mapped this process by using four steps:

1. Where performance is assisted by more capable others;
2. Where performance is assisted by the self;

3. Where performance is developed, automatized, and “fossilized”; and

4. Where de-automatization of performance leads to recursion back through the ZPD.

As previously stated, the instructor must realize the student’s abilities and structure the class accordingly. Challenges must be provided as well as guided learning for new learning to occur.

**Briner**

Jerome Bruner is a constructivist whose spiral curriculum forces the revisiting of topics to achieve a deeper understanding of the subject. He felt that learning could occur at any age, as long as the approach to teaching is age appropriate, and knowledge is based on previously learned material. According to Bruner, “it is seldom something outside the learner that is discovered. Instead, the discovery involves an internal reorganization of previously known ideas to establish a better fit between those ideas and regularities of an encounter to which the learner has had to accommodate” (Kristinsdottir, 2001).

Again, this approach is appropriate for learning within the physical education discipline. New material is introduced on top of old material and together, they lend themselves to more enriched understanding of the topic.

For example, the students are learning how to hit a pitched ball. Before one can successfully accomplish this, it is important that he/she first learn how to hit a stationary ball. This ensures that the students are receiving the information on how to hold a bat, position their body through space while swinging the bat, using eye/hand coordination to
make contact with the ball, safety while hitting, rules of the game of baseball, and what to do when contact has or has not been made.

Taking time to learn the skill properly will also provide positive experiences of making contact with the ball while on the tee instead of causing frustration with consistently missing the pitched ball. This challenge cannot be introduced until the participant is mentally and physically ready. In the meantime, the child is entitled to learn the skill at his/her appropriate level. As challenging material is introduced, the student is forced to rely on previously learned material to formulate their pathway to learning (remembering how to properly swing the bat as it was taught using a tee) and then using this to work toward the new goal (hitting a moving object). This provides a stronger understanding and refinement of the information presented.

Bloom

Bloom formulated his theory around taxonomies. Taxonomies can be defined as guides for professionals when planning for learning outcomes and goal attainment (Bucher, p.56–57). They enable the educator to formulate behavioral objectives ranking from lower-order to higher levels of achievement (Bucher, 2006, p. 57). Bloom separated each taxonomy into a variety of domains. The first domain deals with cognitive thinking. Physical education and activity are focused on the ability to move and understand the reasoning behind the movement. It is unique to the school setting in that it provides the opportunity to learn while moving, and to learn the pathways of the body, organ function within the body, the relationship of fitness, and disease and the importance of health education while increasing cardiovascular strength (Bucher, 2006 p. 57). The cognitive
stage focuses on the knowledge learned, how it is comprehended, how it is applied to movement, the analysis of the movement as to its quality, the synthesis of the movement and its evaluation by giving a value on the quality of the task performed (Bucher, 2006, p. 57). The learner must evaluate the movement produced for learning to occur. For example, if one is attempting to throw a football at a stationary target and misses, there must be an evaluation as to why the target was missed. All students must look at the beginning of their throw, the execution of the throw and the follow-through. Upon reaching a decision, adjustments must be made for the next attempt to be successful. If this is not performed, one’s understanding of the challenge is not fully met.

The second domain deals with the affective level of learning. Ultimately, how does one feel about the movement or goal they are achieving, how do they feel about themselves when performing the skill and how does one feel about others. There is a shift here in that others are taken into consideration when performing a skill and there is a development of values, appreciations, attitudes and character (Bucher, 2006, p. 59). The categories involved with the affective level are receiving information, responding to the information, valuing it and organizing the value placed on it, and then characterizing it as being simple or complex in its make-up (Bucher, 2006, p. 60).

The third level and most important to physical education is the psychomotor domain. This domain was actually developed by A. Harrow and is where the motor development, motor learning, and development of fitness are located. “Motor skill development is a sequential process that occurs throughout one’s lifespan (Bucher, 2006, p. 63).” An example of this is when one considers the progression of a newborn. The child must be able to raise his/her head before being able to roll over. The child must be
able to turn over prior to being able to sit. Further, the child must be able to sit before getting on all fours to creep or crawl. The categories in this domain are reflex movements (newborn), basic fundamental movements, perception, physical ability, skill development, and non-discursive communication.

Researchers Chen, Burry-Stock, and Rovegno (2000)—as a result from their examinations of Cobb (1994a, 1994b), Grennon-Brooks and Brooks (1993), Prawat (1992), and von Glaserfeld (1987, 1989a, 1989b)—stated “the core assertion of constructivism is that learners are active processors and constructors of their own knowledge instead of passive receivers and absorbers of information from others (p. 26). Gagnon and Collay noted Goodland’s (1984) book titled *A place called school.* This piece found that students believed physical education, fine arts, or industrial arts were the most enjoyable because they actually were doing something. Goodland described the traditional classroom learning environment as one in which the teachers talked to the students. The absence of active learning was evident. The primary concern of constructivism is to have the students engaged in active learning and developing knowledge through experience (Gagnor and Collay, 2008).

Physical education has an atmosphere of active learning. Rovegno (1992, 1993a, 1993b, 1998) suggested in physical education, a constructivist approach can provide a basis for revamping teachers’ roles and practices. The National Standards for Physical Education (Chen, 1995) require teachers to (1) provide a meaningful and developmentally appropriate learning environment for students, (2) develop independent thinkers and problem-solving techniques, and (3) promote a positive learning atmosphere complete with cooperative and fair social experiences. This means physical education
teachers must be experts in the field and must know the pedagogy and technique of the
discipline to provide the students with a complete experience.

AAHPERD and NASPE

Education standards have become part of the educational arena. National
standards have been developed for many of the academic disciplines, including physical
education. This development has been done through AAHPERD. This governing body is
comprised of five national associations and six district associations. AAHPERD provides
the opportunity for its members to network with one another; enhance their teaching
skills; broaden their learning arena; and increase their knowledge and appreciation for
physical activity, and all-around support for their discipline.

NASPE is the “preeminent national authority on physical education and a
recognized leader in sport and physical activity” (NASPE Strategic Plan, 2006, p. 1). It is
a non-profit organization that is made up of members who set the standards for physical
education, health, recreation, sport, and dance. NASPE is the largest association that
comprises AAHPERD and believes that every student in our nation’s educational systems
should have the opportunity to participate in quality physical education programs

“Today’s quality physical education programs are important because they provide
learning experiences that meet the developmental needs of youngsters, which help
improve a child’s mental alertness, academic performance, readiness to learn, and
enthusiasm for learning”
The vision of NASPE is to develop all individuals into being physically educated and life-long participants in physical activity. A physically educated person is defined as one who is able to demonstrate competence in movement forms, can apply movement concepts to learning, is physically active, can demonstrate responsibility with his/her social and personal behavior within a physical setting, achieve and maintain physical fitness levels for oneself, understand and respect the various levels of fitness in each person, and view physical activity as something that is fun, productive and for everyone (NASPE/Council on Physical Education for Children [COPEC], 2000). The goals of NASPE, according to their 2006–2008 Strategic Plan, were as follows:

1. Define, promote, and recognize professional excellence in physical education, sport, and physical activity.

2. Promote best practice through professional development in physical education, sport, and physical activity.

3. Encourage and disseminate research contributing to the advancement of knowledge and evidence-based practice in physical education, sport, and physical activity.

4. Facilitate the establishment of public policy that supports physical education, sport, and physical activity.

5. Develop and maintain collaborations that promote and advance physical education, sport, and physical activity.

6. Develop and maintain communications that promote and advance physical education, sport, and physical activity.
7. Develop and maintain an inclusive, effective, and efficient organization.

(Complete sub-points and all are found in Appendix A.)

The NASPE standards are designed to provide physical education teachers with performance and content standards that give structure, direction and a sense of accountability (James, Griffin, France, 2005). The organization of the content enables teachers to disseminate information to the students on what they should know, understand, and perform in physical education (James, Griffin, France, 2005).

NCATE Standards

NASPE, via a five-individual task force, has worked with the NCATE to create and continually modify 10 initial standards for physical education teacher preparation. These standards require teacher education programs to show evidence of proper teacher training by way of outcomes being met. These guidelines serve as indicators that the “beginning physical education teacher who demonstrates acceptable performance in each of the 10 standards will be capable of implementing curriculum and instruction related to the NASPE K–12 Physical Education Content Standards” (NASPE, 2001, p. 3).

The following is a brief synopsis of each standard taken from the fifth edition of the Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards:

Content Knowledge is described as an understanding of the physical education content and how it is related to developing a physically educated individual. This understanding can be achieved by:

- being able to identify the major elements in motor skills
- allowing for the demonstration of motor skill performance in physical activity
• having the ability to apply the physical education or activity experience socially, cognitively, emotionally
• using current and past research to apply the content to learning, using group activity safely and constructively
• knowing the readiness of each student when preparing the activity.

**Growth and Development** is the knowledge of how each individual develops and thus providing the opportunity to grow socially, cognitively, emotionally, and physically. This can be achieved by monitoring each student individually as well as in group settings, while implementing a variety of teaching styles to meet the needs of the different levels of learning within the class.

**Diverse Learners** deals with the variety of students that enter each classroom and their different learning styles. The teacher must use appropriate teaching approaches, use ample technology resources, and implement a well-rounded learning experience for each unique student.

**Management and Motivation** is concerned with understanding the group as well as the individual with their abilities to perform. The opportunity to safely achieve growth and success with the class is mandatory and the instructor must use clear and concise management styles to improve motivation in the class. This can be achieved by having a strong behavior plan, developing behavioral strategies, and adhering to the set standards. Also, using a variety of teaching approaches can decrease boredom, increase motivation, and interest. This, in turn, decreases the potential for behavioral problems and increases learning.
**Communication** focuses on the importance of proper communication to achieve the goal of having an increase in learning. One must familiarize themselves with effective verbal and non-verbal tools to achieve this goal.

**Planning and Instruction** deals with the use of a variety of planning and instructional strategies needed to achieve total learning. These must align themselves with the national strategies set forth by NASPE. This standard is achieved by developing specific goals that are accomplished by using a variety of teaching methods and that are performed in a safe, positive learning atmosphere.

**Student Assessment** deals with the opportunity students have to assess their own learning. This is done cognitively, socially, emotionally, and physically by the students themselves. It provides the chance for students to observe their progress and reflect on their learning or lack thereof. It can involve peer assessment as well, but must also have guidance from the instructor. This allows the students to take ownership of their learning and provides additional feedback to the teacher as to the quality of the individual’s learning.

**Reflection** allows for the development of goals, discovery of organizational challenges, and the opportunity to become a better teacher. This happens because of the variation in students, learning styles, teaching styles, equipment availability, and new knowledge. As a result, lessons are conducted differently each time. Reflection upon the lessons taught is a must because of the importance of discovering the successes or challenges that occurred. It is important for the teacher to reflect upon his/her lesson to make the appropriate changes for an improved lesson.
**Technology** is another approach to teaching and learning. A learner is provided a visual opportunity to see the skill at hand, use a new technique for better understanding of an idea and the chance to use something different in class.

**Collaboration** involves everyone in the student’s learning. The teacher is responsible for reaching out to their colleagues for information; reaching out to the school for more of an active participation from them; involved the community in physical activity and the school community; and extend an invitation to the parents to assist in the success of their child. It gives more of a communal responsibility for being physically active and creates an atmosphere that demands everyone be a role model for the youth of today.

Chen et al (2000), used three aspects to describe constructivist-oriented teaching practices.

- Constructivist-oriented teaching is designed to foster students’ responsibility for their own learning by engaging them in discovery, self-regulation, and problem-solving activities;
- Constructivist-oriented teachers consider students’ prior knowledge and experiences in organizing learning activities and presenting content;
- Constructivist-oriented teaching aims to provide opportunities for students to share ideas and to solve learning problems jointly (p. 28).

The NASPE/NCATE Standards coincide with the three aspects of constructivist-oriented teaching practices thus indicating a strong correlation to one another and connecting the importance of the movement approach as a learning design with constructivism.
Appropriate Practices in Movement Education

NASPE has created a position paper in conjunction with and developed by COPEC. This document addresses appropriate practices in movement programs for young children ages three to five, elementary school physical education, middle school physical education, and high school physical education (2000). There are many appropriate practices to teaching physical education and they vary with each age group. Some of the practices overlap but many are unique to the level of teaching. Each level has premises for teaching physical education.

The premises for appropriate teaching for ages three to five are that teachers serve as guides and facilitators, the children learn through interaction with their environment, and need the opportunity to explore. This is accomplished with proper planning and the time needed to provide these experiences. The premises for elementary age students are that the instructor is responsible for introducing the idea of being physically active, developing an appreciation for physical activity, and instilling the idea that physical activity is separate from physical education. The premises for middle school and high school students are that it is important to be physically active for a lifetime, that each is owed the opportunity to experience physical education that is appropriate for their developmental level, and that physical activity and physical education are both important but separate from each other. Intramurals are also introduced as a method of being physically active.

Appropriate practices for the elementary age student must begin with the curriculum. For the student to have a good experience, he/she must be given the opportunity to work and develop cognitively, in an atmosphere that is culturally diverse,
without fear of being hurt or tested physically through fitness testing. There must also be fair and organized instruction with constructive consequences for poor behavior. It is here that field days, games and rules are introduced. Assessment of performance is made using a variety of techniques including self and peer assessments, and 100% participation in each lesson is highly stressed.

Appropriate practices for the middle school student again focus on the curriculum and the development of the cognitive, social, affective, and psychomotor learning areas. Again, 100% participation in all of the units is of importance and the units must be developed to allow ample time for learning to take place. There is a push for respect of the individual as well as for others, and appropriate feedback is given for further development of the skill. Outside assignments are required to develop an appreciation for activity away from the gymnasium and prior to the onset of any activity, a warm-up is performed. This warm-up can build on prior knowledge from other activities to serve as building blocks to better learning, thus, tying into the constructivist way of thinking. Finally, assessment would come from the variety of teaching techniques used during the unit(s). Utilizing different tools would allow for a complete evaluation of the individual and ensure growth in specific areas of learning.

Appropriate practices for high school students are concerned with certain elements of learning: curriculum, instructional activities, the learning environment, assessment, and professionalism. These make up the specific content areas. In the area of curriculum, focus is on the content and variety of the skills or activities, the use of different teaching styles, the use of practical knowledge, and fitness instruction. When examining instructional activities, there is a push for respecting different learning styles,
having the appropriate amount of time to learn, having the maximum amount of participation available, warm-up time, and outside assignments. The learning environment dedicates itself to the classroom or gymnasium setting and the importance of developing a fair and diverse atmosphere. Goal setting and motivational techniques are used and a positive learning opportunity is established. Assessment comes from the variety of methods used to evaluate the student’s learning. Professionalism is addressed by the teacher being viewed as a role model. There is the responsibility of the instructor to further his/her knowledge in the field and to be an advocate for the school in the community, with the parents, and within the school itself in the name of physical education and activity.

INTASC Standards

INTASC Standards have been created by a cooperative group of individuals from the teaching profession and personnel from 17 state education agencies. They were developed to bring about cohesion with teaching practices, educational requirements and views on licensure across the nation (INTASC, 1992). There are 10 INTASC Standards which the university’s education department has utilized within its Conceptual Framework. The following are the 10 INTASC Standards (1992):

1. **Subject Matter:** The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he/she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.
2. **Student Learning:** The teacher understands how children and youth learn and develop and can provide learning opportunities that support his/her intellectual, social and personal development.

3. **Diverse Learners:** The teacher understands how learners differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to learners from diverse cultural backgrounds and with exceptionalities.

4. **Instructional Strategies:** The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage the students’ development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

5. **Learning Environment:** 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.

6. **Communication:** The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, non-verbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

7. **Planning Instruction:** The teacher plans and manages instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

8. **Assessment:** The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of his/her learners.

9. **Reflection and Professional Development:** The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of her or his choices and
actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

10. Collaboration, Ethics, and Relationships: A teacher communicates and interacts with parents or guardians, families, school colleagues, and the community to support the students’ learning and well-being.

Mission of the University

The mission of the university is “developing women and men with the knowledge and character to lead and to serve” (DEAS NASPE Complete Document, 2005). Contained within the mission of the university is the mission of its education department: “to provide professional education in a liberal arts context; to uphold traditional values, yet be responsive and sensitive to society’s changing needs; to focus on the personal as well as professional development of the individual; and to emphasize teaching that is anchored in a strong research base and the [religious order] ideal of an educator” (DEAS NASPE Complete Document, 2005, p. 5). The mission of the university’s physical education division coincides with these missions. However, it remains separate in that the program focuses on the allied health aspect of the discipline. “As an academic unit, all Physical Education programs strive to fulfill the missions unique to their professional alliances, e.g., NASPE, NATA, as well” (DEAS NASPE Complete Document, p.5).

The university’s Physical Education and Exercise Science Teacher Preparation Program prepares candidates for the state pre-K–12 multi-age license (DEAS NASPE Complete Document, 2005). Currently, it is housed within the education department in the liberal arts college. Students enrolled will follow one of three academic tracks:
The program has been in this location since 1996. Prior to this date, the division stood independently in the liberal arts college. The academic major remains its own as graduates receive a Bachelor of Arts from the division (DEAS NASPE Complete Document, 2005). Students who wish to obtain the multi-age licensure must do so within the education department by additionally applying to that program.

The education department, in which the division is contained, functions under the Conceptual Framework (See Appendix B). There are five ideals within this framework (Harvanek, 1992; McCool, 1986):

1. Formation of the total person
2. Personal influence of the educator
3. Educational settings as communities of influence
4. Education as a vocation
5. Integration of the discipline

The Conceptual Framework is used as a guideline to provide candidates with the opportunity to grow intellectually; discover oneself individually and develop as a whole person; be able to adapt to a variety of situations; and to be willing to accept the challenge of social leadership (DEAS Conceptual Framework, 2004). The four missions
within the framework constitute the core development of the department and are taken from the education departments Conceptual Framework document (2004). They are:

1. **The religious mission:** Members of the [religious order] are committed to working for their own human and religious growth and the human and religious growth of society as a whole (Harvanek, 1987; McCool, 1986). One aspect of the religious mission is the illumination of the results of human reason and insight through the arts and sciences which will inevitably lead to the glory of [deity]. Although the [religious order] mission is [religion], anyone who serves [deity] or humanity in any form has a place in a [religious order] university. [University] is a worshiping university (Gavin, 1985). There is a chapel on campus. Mass is celebrated periodically during the academic year and daily throughout the year. The Religious Studies department provides courses on [religion] as well as other religions. This respect for religions, this attempt to harmonize an individual’s faith and culture is carried out throughout the university.

2. **The personal mission:** The tradition focuses on the growth and development of the whole person (Chapple, 1993; McCool, 1986). “Person” refers to all that is good about the individual. Although an individual’s physical, intellectual, emotional, and social characteristics are developmental and natural, guidance is necessary to bring individuals to their full potential. Thus the university utilizes education to bring the individual’s characteristics to a level of excellence. A second aspect of excellence is derived from the [religious order figure]; he emphasized a striving constantly to improve
(Ganss, 1954; Harvanek, 1987; McCool, 1986). In the context of higher education, this striving pushes the content of instruction toward full incorporation of current and past knowledge, and, from an individual’s perspective, toward a desire for lifelong learning. The end goal of this mission is to develop the character of the individual, which ensures the future of human excellence and continued improvement of humanity as a whole.

3. **The social mission:** Education in the [religious order] tradition has always fostered the development of leaders who embody the character virtues of charity and justice (Chapple, 1993; Ganss, 1954; Harvanek, 1987). An ideal is a “person for others” with a special emphasis on educating the poor to empower them to move beyond the limits of their culture. A curriculum in the ideal has as a long-range goal acknowledging differences among individuals and groups while working to insure that differences do not lead to discrimination. Human dignity must be preserved; racism, sexism, and discrimination are to be overcome.

4. **The action mission:** The ultimate outcome of education is an individual who uses his/her good character and knowledge to produce some good, attempting to transform the individual and society into something more humane or to assist in the development of others and to help them participate more fully in human happiness and wholeness (Chapple, 1993; Harvanek, 1987; McCool, 1986). Service to human-kind is how the action-orientation of [religious order] education is expressed. In sum, it is “knowledge and character for the service of others.”
Identified within this framework and in conjunction with the mission statement, are “strands” to which all courses required for certification form the Initial Licensure Program. These strands have been developed with the intent of coinciding with the INTASC Standards. They are:

- schools as contexts for learning;
- curriculum, instruction, and assessment;
- teacher as a person; and
- child and adolescent development.

Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Program

The division has 12 goals. These goals have been tailored to the program and are utilized within each course throughout the curriculum. The division goals in the quality assurance process are that the student demonstrates:

1. Evidence of content knowledge in the following areas:
   - Philosophy, foundations and history of physical education, and exercise science.
   - Human anatomy and physiology; applied physiology; kinesiology
   - Physical growth and development
   - Basic movement


3. Knowledge and application of Research and Experimental Design.

4. Knowledge and understanding related to the diverse learner and individuals with exceptionalities.
5. The appropriate communication skills: written and oral.

6. The knowledge and ability to effectively implement assessment and assessment systems, as observational, and formal applications.

7. Proficiency in the understanding, and use of appropriate laboratory equipment and healthcare equipment.

8. The ability to function in collaborative relationships to achieve individual, programmatic, or unit goals.

9. The ability to use technology to enhance the learning environment.

10. The ability to use higher order thinking strategies in class, practicum, and professionally.

11. Knowledge of appropriate ethical and moral behavior within the discipline.

12. The effective use of safety measures and health-related procedures for the welfare of everyone


These goals are reflected by each of the assignments given during physical education and education courses and assist the department in providing a step by step process of developing a solid foundation in the philosophical, scientific, psychological, and developmental aspects of human movement. The curriculum offers a broad selection of opportunities to learn both at the undergraduate and graduate levels and implements a well-rounded, organized system of learning.

To further this quality assurance process, NASPE has developed six characteristics of performance-based systems at the initial level. The Department of
Education and Allied Studies utilizes various rubrics to show evidence of the program quality assurance process.

Beginning in fall 2002, The Initial Licensure Program included multi-step policies and procedures for candidate assessment and retention within the program. For physical education majors, this meant continuous content knowledge assessment and application of this knowledge toward the professional and pedagogical requirements for licensure. This process was promoted by INTASC.

There are seven assessment points for each undergraduate candidate. These points come from multiple data sources. The complete process can be found in the “Program and Unit Evaluation Policies and Process” section of the DEAS NASPE Complete Document, 2005 (See Appendix C).

As stated previously, the department contains post-bac and school-based candidates. They complete the same education coursework, the same field experiences, maintain the same GPA requirements, and are assessed in the same manner as identified for the undergraduate. The post-bac track is part-time while the school-based track is an 11 month, full-time program.

The assessment process for these candidates requires that official transcripts must be submitted from all undergraduate and graduate coursework. These are evaluated and a decision is made to entertain their application. Each candidate must pass the Praxis II in physical education to enter the student teaching semester.

The course of study for all candidates is found in Appendix D. Please note that two courses in this set of curriculum content courses (PE 200 and PE 310) replace two courses in the multi-age professional education sequence (PS 216 and ED 337). Each
individual must earn grades of C or higher in all physical education coursework, and
must have a GPA of 2.7 or higher for full admission to teacher education in physical
education. Anyone possessing a GPA of 2.5–2.7 can be granted a conditional admission
to teacher education. This is valid for one semester or one academic year. Candidates
must have a GPA of 2.7 or higher in physical education to enter the student teaching
semester, however.

The basis of moving to learn is the foundation of physical education and a
necessary belief in the total development of the student. The following goals of the
university’s program demonstrate the allegiance to building a program with guidance
from AAHPERD and NASPE:

- The development of well-rounded men and women, physically, emotionally,
  mentally, socially, and spiritually;
- The development of men and women who demonstrate respect for themselves
  as well as others;
- The development of men and women who exhibit social and emotional
tolerance;
- The development of men and women who are leaders in their profession and
  community;
- The development of men and women with viable ethical and moral
  philosophies of life; and
- The development of men and women rich in problem-solving and critical
  thinking processes, capable of avoiding narrow thought processes, and able to

Performance Based Assessment

Another part of the quality assurance process deals with the assessment systems in physical education. This system, organized by the division, entails the creation of a PBA process that demonstrates the sequential, progressive nature of the programs. Performance assessments present a hands-on task requiring students to do an activity that requires applying his/her knowledge and skills from several learning targets (Nitko, 2004). It also uses clearly defined criteria to evaluate how well the students have achieved this application (Nitko, 2004). As talked about by Coyle (2005), PBA provided teachers with information about how a student understands and applies knowledge. He further stated that they can be used to evaluate reasoning, products, and skills that can be observed and judged using specific criteria.

Performance assessment, as defined by the U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) (1992), is “testing methods that require students to create an answer or product that demonstrates their knowledge and skill.” It is a process requiring students to actively participate. It allows the teacher to observe student behavior ranging from simple responses to demonstrations to work collected over time (Rudner and Boston, 2007). Wiggins (1992, p. 20) stated “the purpose of assessment is to find out what each student is able to do, with knowledge, in context.” Further, it is a method of testing that differs from standardized testing by the performance of a task.
Performance assessments can be completed in various formats. There are portfolio development, experiment conduction, essay writing, and oral presentation. All, however, have a clearly defined task assignment and criteria as to how the student will be measured. This may come in the form of a scoring rubric. These well-defined performance criteria will allow for consistent scoring by the teacher and increase interrater reliability. Stiggins (1991) believed that one must both define the characteristics being measured as well as develop a performance continuum. He maintained that if the instructor is lacking in clear understanding of the performance, he/she will be unable to enable the students to reach their full potential during the performance assessment. Stiggins (1991) noted the student will also lack the skills needed to self-evaluate during this process.

Performance assessment is built on four assumptions: “knowledge is constructed,” “the task is worthwhile,” “better assessments improve teaching,” and “meeting criteria improves learning” (Wangsatorntanakhun, 1997–2007).

“Knowledge is constructed” explains the research that suggests that students display an increased interest in learning when required to organize and apply facts around major concepts. This active learning aids in the construction of the student’s own understanding of those concepts. Tannenbaum (1996) noted the main goals of performance assessment are to gather data on students that focus on development over measuring the students together; to focus on what he/she knows rather than on what is not known; and to meet the needs of diverse learning styles, cultural backgrounds, and proficiency levels.
The “task is worthwhile” examines the performance tasks and classifies them as open-ended. As a result, the teacher is able to assess a student’s level of knowledge and a variety of skills related to the curriculum (Sweet, 1993).

The assumption “better assessments improve teaching” requires the teacher to encompass all learning styles in the class. Careful preparation in the relay of information regarding the task and the evaluation benchmarks must be performed in such a way that each individual understands the teacher’s demands. Fuchs (1995) believed that when teachers are enlightened about the student’s learning and the challenges he/she may encounter, they can make better decisions about the content involved and their teaching styles.

Finally, McTighe (1997) discussed how students perform better when they know what goals they are striving to meet. He further believed that students perform better when they are able to understand the goals, have the opportunity to examine the models of excellence, and comprehend how their own performance compares to a set of established criteria. Thus, meeting criteria improves learning.

Michael (1993) isolated three difficulties associated with performance based assessment. First is the problem of obtaining reliable results due to inter-rater reliability. He suggested that raters of these tasks need to be trained to follow the established set of scoring criteria. He also noted that this procedure does not guarantee consistency because of the potential of individual interpretation. The second concerns the range of performance in the knowledge domain. This must be adequately covered to ensure validity of assessment. Finally, the third challenge questions the tasks performed in the assessment and whether they “carry over to other learning experiences or portray what
already has been learned in a different but still important education context” (Michael, p.47).

Elliott (1995) stated “the validity of an assessment depends on the degree to which the interpretations and uses of assessment results are supported by empirical evidence and logical analysis” (p.2). Messick (1996) argued:

“That validity is an overall evaluative judgment of the degree to which empirical evidence and theoretical rationales support the adequacy and appropriateness of interpretations and actions based on test scores or other modes of assessment… Because score meaning is a construction that makes theoretical sense out of both the performance regularities summarized by the score and its pattern of relationships with other variables, the psychometric literature views the fundamental issue as construct validity” (pp. 245, 246).

Baker et al (1993) offered five characteristics that valid performance assessments should possess:

- Display meaning for students and teachers and strive for high performance.
- Require the demonstration of complex cognition that applies to challenging or problem areas.
- Ensure that quality of the subject matter and content standards is upheld.
- Minimize the presence of non-important aspects that may detract from the focus of assessment.
- Maintain the explicit standards set for rating or judgment.

A performance assessment, according to Nitko (2004), must have two components: the performance task itself and a clear rubric for scoring. Performance task is defined as “an assessment activity that requires a student to demonstrate her achievement by producing an extended written or spoken answer by engaging in group or individual activities, or by creating a specific product” (p. 238). A scoring rubric is a
defined set of rules used to assess the individual’s performance. The rubric enables the
instructor to define the different levels of mastery for each criterion (Brualdi, 2000). For
example, Appendix E provides insight as to how the PBA scoring rubric represents the
learning goals and assessment plan.

There are two types of PBA: informal, where the students are unaware that an
assessment is taking place, and formal, where the students know it is occurring (Brualdi,
2000). Nitko (2004) suggested that one can improve his/her teaching by using
performance assessments and performance learning activities. He stated four methods:

1. Require students to complete a well-crafted performance task, giving them the
   opportunity to apply their learning to a new situation.
2. Craft performance tasks to help students make connections between skills and
   abilities they learned in separate subjects.
3. Craft performance tasks to help students realize the connections between
   “schoolhouse” learning and “real-world” activities.
4. Share your scoring rubrics with students to clarify the learning targets for
   them (p. 251).

The real-world application of constructivist philosophies is reflected in Nitko’s
beliefs on using performance assessment. Linn et al. (1991) noted, “the fundamental
purpose of measurement [is] the improvement of instruction and learning (p.20).” A
commitment to this approach serves the purpose of implementing positive, meaningful
assessments where knowledge is built, worthwhile tasks are performed, there is improved
teaching by the instructor and improved learning by the student. Constructivist
philosophies are incorporated throughout the curriculum. Using this method of
assessment provides feedback as to the success or failure of the students’ performances and ultimately, the program.

Summary

The beginning of CHAPTER II documented research on descriptive program reviews. An historical review of issues associated with teacher employment trends, job satisfaction, attrition, and retention followed. Additional related literature provided insight into the nature and scope of physical education and the relation it has to constructivism. The various physical education national organizations, national education standards, and review processes were discussed. Finally, there was a description of the university, the Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Program and the use of PBA.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter focuses on discussing issues related to the purpose of the study, research questions, research design, participants, instrumentation used, data collection, and methods of analysis with employment status in the field of physical education for graduates of a small, private liberal arts university. This chapter also describes the research variables, target population and sample size, final instrumentation, and validity.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to describe the perception of the graduates’ participation in an Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Program and their preparedness in the workplace. Also, it is to understand the perceptions of the graduates as they pertain to the value placed on the Conceptual Framework.

Research Questions

The study specifically focuses on three research questions. Based on the purpose of the study, the research questions are:

1. What is employment status in the field for physical education majors?
2. What are the overall perceptions regarding the importance of the NASPE Standards?
   - What is the perception of importance?
   - What is the perception of preparation?

3. What is the reflection of the graduates regarding the Conceptual Framework’s impact in the field as a professional?

The goals of the studied program align themselves with ideals of an educator, the initial standards of physical education through NASPE, NCATE, and INTASC. The data obtained from these benchmarks provide information about the program and the quality of it through the three research questions guiding this study.

Research Design

The design of this study is descriptive research, using pre-existing, quantitative data gathered from a survey instrument. Open-ended questions often used in qualitative research were used to gather supplementary data.

A descriptive study is defined as quantitative research that involves making careful descriptions of educational phenomena (Borg, et al, 2003). Also referred to as non-experimental research, this method is used when it is considered unethical, impractical or impossible to manipulate the independent variable (Berg, Latin, 2008).

Non-experimental design “provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population” (Creswell, 2009, p. 12). It is a method of gathering information that is organized to measure behaviors, attitudes, and other variables such at these (Berg, Latin, 2008). One
characteristic is that there is a lack of observation by the researcher. Rather, the
participant or subject, reports the information (Berg, Latin, 2008). This can be limiting in
that the dependence on self-reporting by the subject, can lead to an absence of valid
assessment of the question(s). Also, there is a responsibility by the participant to answer
in a truthful manner. As a result, there can be a questioning of the validity of each answer
(Berg, Latin, 2008). “The data are collected using an instrument that measures attitudes
and the information is analyzed using statistical procedures and hypothesis testing”
(Creswell, 2009, p.16).

Kerlinger (1973) defined ex post facto research as being systematic empirical
inquiry where, as previously stated, it is not possible for the variable manipulation to
occur or because the events have already happened. It usually stems from data gathered
from questionnaires or interviews of research participants and is primarily concerned
with determining what people or things mean (Borg, et al., 2003). Descriptive statistics
are used to describe the simple features of the data in a study and summarize the sample
involved with the research (social research methods). It also describes the results through
standard deviations, means, and ranges of scores (Creswell, 2009).

Two types of data were used in this study to present the information more
completely. Quantitative data examined the relationship among variables. A survey
instrument was used to collect and measure the similarities or differences (Creswell,
2009). The presentation of the data followed a specific pattern. This consisted of the
introduction, literature and theory, methods, results, and discussion (Creswell, 2009).
This method, also used in non-experimental design, is one of the most commonly used
strategies of inquiry.
Descriptive statistics can be “viewed as understanding what people or things mean (Borg, et.al., 2003, p. 290). It is mainly concerned with “what is (Borg, et.al., 2003, p. 290)” and has the capability to gather important information about opinions, attitudes, and trends. Based on the characteristics described, this design met the needs of the study in a variety of ways.

First, the questions contained in the survey gave an indication of the breakdown of employment status of the alumni. The researcher was able to identify trends of where the individuals were working and for how long. If the individual had left teaching or the allied health field, reasons why they left were identified. This allowed the researcher to describe the alumni in present terms.

Second, the information obtained by the researcher made it possible to discover the participant’s feelings towards the importance of the NASPE Standards and the level of preparation by the university. The possibility of having a disconnect between the opinions of the participants as they are being prepared and the curriculum could lead to miscommunication between the results and the researcher. Merriam (1998) made a connection between the initial stage of data analysis and the researcher by characterizing it as a “conversation.” The data initialized that conversation and enabled the researcher to view the participant’s perceptions of the importance of these standards.

Third, there was a need to identify the impact of the Conceptual Framework on the university’s graduates as professionals in the field. The framework guides the curriculum and provides the student with the opportunity to become leaders in service. The data gathered made it possible to describe the participants in this area.
Qualitative data is distinctive in how the information is collected, analyzed, and presented. The process of collecting the information entails open-ended questions and procedures, data collection which takes place in the participant’s setting, data analysis inductively generating from specific to general themes, and the interpretations made by the researcher about the data (Creswell, 2009). The participants share or have shared similar experiences about the curriculum required at the university, the professors and instructors who were involved with the program, the Conceptual Framework, and other experiences that revolved around the program. The observations or results develop into patterns of behavior and similar responses. Finally, the researcher uses words to discuss the data rather than numbers.

First, the study was conducted by using a survey by mail. Berg and Latin (2008) offer methods in conducting survey studies. There were eight progressive steps implemented as part of a detailed plan for using this survey. These steps were as follows:

- Step 1: Decide on the Objectives of the Study
- Step 2: Select the Sample
- Step 3: Develop the Instrument
- Step 4: Write the Cover Letter
- Step 5: Conduct a Pilot Study
- Step 6: Send the Survey to the Participants
- Step 7: Follow Up
- Step 8: Summarize the Results

Second, open-ended questions were used to gather in-depth responses. These open-ended questions required the participant to personally comment on their private
experiences with the program and post-education accomplishments. The questions addressed the participant’s perception of the strengths and weaknesses of the program. This part of the survey was developed to support and explain the questions in Part I of the instrument. These discussions were organized and coded into categories. The categories described the individuals in the study and further described the program’s strengths and weaknesses. The results were presented using frequency and percentages.

Third, the qualitative data gathered was used to describe the participants’ views of the level of preparation provided by the university and the level of importance attributed by the participants to the NASPE Standards. This data gave indication that this method was the proper choice because of the feedback given by the participants.

The questions were organized into a Likert scale in which the alumni were to respond to statements pertaining to preparation in terms of very well, well, somewhat, poor, and very poor. Participants were to rank responses concerning personally perceived level of importance in terms of high, somewhat high, adequate, poor, and low. This method allowed the researcher to understand and interpret the perceptions of the participants of the study. The responses were reflective of the sample and the accessible population. The results were described using frequency and percentages.

The descriptive study used a survey instrument to collect data as opposed to using survey research as the design. This was because of the many limitations and features required for this method. The most problematic limitation deals with the validity and reliability of responses to questions. Surveys provide only verbal descriptions of what participant says they do or how they feel about something. Responses may not be consistent and accurate in their descriptions of what the participants actually really feel
about something or someone. This is true, specifically for behavior contrary to the generally accepted norms of society. People are potentially unwilling to admit they have engaged in actions not accepted by their group (Badri, 2005). Also, it will be difficult to use this particular survey for a larger population because it is designed for internal program review. It cannot be used for the purpose of generalizing the outcome to another population.

Participants

The accessible population for the study consisted of graduates of the Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Program at a small, private liberal arts university. The physical education department began in 1972. It maintained a separate department until 1995 when it became a division under the education department. The department generated the list of alumni. They update it on a regular basis. This target population included retired as well as employed program graduates. Because of a lack of current information, not all graduates were able to be reached in the studied university. All participants completed the survey which provided data further describing information about employment status.

The data were collected on the population of alumni of the department dating back to 1972. Permission to use secondary data was obtained from the university. The protocol number is 2008091.

The source of data came in the form of a survey (See Appendix F). It was originally collected for internal evaluation purposes. The study used second hand data for
research purposes. The instrument collected self-reported data from the alumni and contained both qualitative and quantitative characteristics.

Instrumentation

This research was carefully scrutinized to render it valid and trustworthy. To ensure content validity of the survey, a pilot study was conducted using all graduates of the education department, including physical education majors from 2002 to 2005. Results of this study led the department to add questions specific to physical education majors and delete questions that pertained to other education graduates. The revised survey instrument was examined prior to its official release by one expert in the statistical research field and one reviewer with additional certifications and a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Physical Education. This second reviewer was also the chair of the department.

The department developed the instrument used in the study in conjunction with efforts by the researcher to tailor the instrument towards physical education alumni. This included the addition of questions regarding the participant’s current employment for the purpose of describing the employment status in the field for physical education majors.

A survey that did not include the said questions had previously been used to examine alumni attitudes about their preparation. This instrument, designed by the department, had been issued to all existing graduates of the Initial Licensure Program and was not successful in gathering information pertaining to the physical education program. None of that pre-existing data was used in the study. The steps taken to develop the final survey instrument began, however, using this instrument. By issuing this instrument to
only Physical Education graduates, the necessary data needed to describe the program was able to be collected.

The instrument was separated into two parts. Part I requested feedback from the participant on the Initial Licensure Teacher Preparation Program based on the NASPE/AAHPERD Standards for Initial Physical Education. The 10 standards represent the focus of the university’s curriculum and are based on the performance of the teacher candidate. Within each NASPE standard are expected outcomes for which the teacher candidate is required to meet. These standards were clearly defined and placed in a Likert-type questionnaire for the participant to answer.

The 10 Likert-type scale questions were designed to measure the extent of participant agreement. Questions were structured such that the participant stated how well each standard was addressed within the physical education program. Based on the participants’ teaching experiences since graduation, they were to respond to the 10 questions of how well the curriculum prepared them. The responses were to be either: (1) Very Well, (3) Somewhat, or (5) Very Poorly. In addition to the participants’ perception of the degree of preparation from the university, there was a section that required them to rank their perceived level of importance of the standards. For this section, the responses were (1) High, (3) Adequate, or (5) Low. Two open-ended questions were included after the summated scale questions to further determine the individual’s feeling about the program. Finally, there were two short answer questions asked in regard to the strengths and weaknesses of the initial licensure program.

Part II entailed 10 questions included with demographic information about the participant as well as prompts dealing with his/her experiences with teaching. This
provided the researcher with information concerning the alumni’s engagement in the field of physical education. There were requests to report information regarding their past and present employment, number of years at his/her particular place of employment, and, if the participant had left teaching, when and why they left. The second section of this part requested that the participant provide a brief response to five prompts. Again, these questions revolved around the alumni and identified a potential impact on their students learning. This section also indicated whether or not the individual had pursued additional education and to what extent.

The instrument offered the participant the opportunity to provide demographic information. This was self-reported and divided into different categories. They are as follows: level of education, gender, licensure received, currently teaching, years teaching, school level, school location, school type, school size, and, if no longer teaching, current employment and reason for leaving the field. These variables and categories are summarized in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Level of Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1. Undergraduate</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Post – baccalaureate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. School-Based M.Ed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1. Male</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License Received</td>
<td>1. K-12 Initial License P.E.</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Teaching</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>1. 0–3</td>
<td>Collected as Ordinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 4–6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 7–9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 10–12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Level of Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level</td>
<td>1. Early Childhood</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Collegiate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Location</td>
<td>1. Urban</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Suburban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Type</td>
<td>1. Public</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Private or Independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Parochial or Religious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>1. 0–200</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 200–400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 400–600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 600+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no longer teaching,</td>
<td>1. Within the Allied Health Field</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current employment.</td>
<td>2. Outside the Allied Health Field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for leaving the</td>
<td>1. Financial</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field.</td>
<td>2. Lack of Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Lack of Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Relocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Lack of employment availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Family Interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

Participants for this study became available after receiving permission from the university to conduct research in their education department. Using the list of alumni, the department sent a survey to each potential participant via US mail. Along with the survey, a personal note from the department and division chairs was sent to greet each of
the potential participants and to explain the purpose of the survey. There were also words of encouragement to complete the survey contained in the letter. The completed survey was returned to the department. All data remained anonymous.

Survey Return Rate

Volunteers for this study were obtained through letters of introduction and requests for participation by the department chair, the department director, and an emeritus professor. A total of 59 surveys were sent out in the initial mailing. Initial alumni response was 10. A second mailing of the survey took place resulting in an additional 12 responses which brought the total to 22. Contact was made by phone and e-mail in the attempt to secure more returns. The results from these efforts were two additional responses. The final result from the alumni returns was 24 completed surveys. In addition to the total survey responses, four alumni chose to write personal letters in lieu of completing the survey. The information found in the written response contained some information that the survey requested and it is described in a separate area of discussion. The combined return was 28 returned surveys plus four written responses used as additional data. To ensure confidentiality of the participants, names were not identified. Each of the alumni was assigned a number that was used in the organization of the data.

Data Analysis

Department faculty and staff members organized the survey results. The results were arranged according to the participants’ assigned numbers and their answers. The
information was presented in the form of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, removing the researcher from any contact with the original survey forms.

The alumni survey was analyzed using descriptive statistics on SPSS software. Descriptive tables created by SPSS contained measures of central tendency (averages of mean, median, and mode) percentages and standard deviation. Measures of variability reflected how scores were unique and the range was computed to describe the distance between each score. The variance was noted by squaring the standard deviation.

Qualitative data is primarily used to provide some explanation as to the participants' perceptions of preparedness and importance. Qualitative survey data generated from the instrument were coded into domains, factors, and variables. These procedures organized the information and assisted in discovering associations between them. The use of multiple data collection techniques contributed to the validity of the study. Integrating quantitative and qualitative information into one data set finalized the method of analysis.

Limitations

The population for this study is limited to alumni of the university’s Physical Education Department from 1972 to present. Therefore, the results are limited to the accessible population of the alumni and may be considered small. The results are also limited by the memory of the alumni who participated in the program and their general feelings toward the university. This could pose a threat to the validity of the study. Although, the instrument is based on the NASPE Standards and expert’s view, it lacks the ability to be used in other situations. In addition, there was no study performed to support
the reliability and validity of the final instrument used. A pilot instrument was reviewed by two experts and revised to meet the needs of this study. There was no further testing after the revision of the final instrument.

Other limitations deal with the sample size and error. This study dealt with a small population where not all of those asked to participate, did. Failure to collect responses from the entire population could lead to a sample bias and affect the survey results (Fowler, 2002). Also, responses coming from different years could impact the strength of the study. There is potential in having different programs offered.

Skaggs (2005) made note that most literature on small-sample equating focuses on the minimum sample size needed to ensure the accuracy of the test. Further, there is a lack of literature on how to proceed when samples are small. The small sample does not mean that the study is not of value, however. Experts in the field continue to advocate for the need to analyze small sample research. Parshall et al (1995) states that “a critical aspect of equating with very small samples is that equating error might become very large. However, need of equating does not become unimportant in such specialized programs” (p.38).

Summary

Chapter three provided the design for this descriptive study. It included the research variables, research questions, trustworthiness of the study using the survey instrument, and the description of the participants. The research participants, survey questions, and survey data employed in the study were noted in this chapter. The
collection of data, its analysis as it pertains to the participants and the limitations of the study, completed the chapter.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

The study describes to the university’s administrators the strengths and weaknesses of the Initial Physical Education program. It also provides a description of the graduates of the program in terms of employment longevity in the field of physical education, employment trends, and attitudes toward the program.

The sample for this study came from graduates of the physical education program at a small, private liberal arts university. The program is housed in the education department and operates within the Conceptual Framework. The liberal arts academic core, the NASPE Standards, and the Conceptual Framework all contribute to the formation of the curriculum and guide the preparation of the participants.

Thirteen faculty members managed the program in physical education during the years covered by the study. Four members were tenured and two members were on a tenure track. There were two visiting professors and five part-time faculty members. Three of these faculty members were full time and held academic rank within the university. This was in addition to full-time education faculty. Certain individuals were members of the athletic department on administrative contracts and all members held advanced degrees in their content areas. The majority of the faculty had terminal degrees to support their expertise.
Chapter IV presents the results of the study addressing three research questions. The questions are as follows:

1. What is employment status in the field for physical education majors?
2. What are the graduates’ perceptions regarding the importance of the NASPE Standards?
   - What is the perception of the ability to help prepare the graduates in the field of physical education made by the NASPE Standards?
3. What is the reflection of the graduates regarding the Conceptual Framework’s impact in the field as a professional?

Results from the survey are organized according to each research question. These questions will be addressed separately to provide clarity with the description of the program. Data gathered from the instrument are summarized, analyzed, and discussed using descriptive research.

Research Questions

**Research Question One:** What is the employment status in the field for Physical Education majors?

The significance of this question in describing the program is derived from the idea that if one is adequately prepared, his/her employment longevity will be lengthy. Viadero (2002) found the greatest amount of teacher attrition occurs in the first five years of teaching. The reasons offered are a lack of preparation and a lack of mentoring from veteran teachers within the building or district. Examining the status of employment for physical education majors, length of time teaching, and reasons behind attrition, or lack
thereof, will add to the description of the program, and assist in identifying strengths and problem areas in the program.

The participants in this survey graduated between 1980 and 2006. The greatest number of responses came from the graduating class of 2005. Of the graduates, 18 completed the teacher preparation program as undergraduates, two completed the post-bac program and two completed the school-based M.Ed program. Two individuals did not provide this information. Males outnumbered females with 60.7% males responding to 35.7% females. Of the participants, seven taught high school, six taught elementary school children and four taught middle school. Eleven of the respondents left question four, section one, Part II blank.

There is great importance in knowing the employment characteristics of the respondents if there is to be an accurate description of the program. There needs to be information about where the graduates are employed and for what length of time. If the majority of the alumni are now working in other fields, is it due to the preparation process or are there other outlying reasons for the mass departure?

The participants were asked to identify their total years of teaching since graduation. Also, they were to identify their current positions held and the number of years employed at those positions. These responses were given in the form of a checkmark next to the appropriate answer and written text to identify years of employment. The answer “other” was left with a space to describe a reason for leaving that was not offered. Histograms are used to demonstrate the frequency responses to the questions and indicate the mean and standard deviation of the data.
Years of teaching experience for the 24 participants ranged from less than one year to 21 years. The average number of years teaching for the 24 participants was 7.04, with three years being the mode. One individual ranked the highest in teaching experience with 21 years, one individual followed closely with 20 years of experience while three fell into the category of less than one year of teaching experience. The full group response to current teaching status found 15 of the individuals were presently teaching and 13 were not teaching. The longest amount of time one individual taught at one location was 15 years. The shortest amount of time was less than one year. The responses to the number of teaching since graduation indicated that 50% fell into the zero to five years teaching category. The mean was 7.04 and the standard deviation was 6.78. Figure 4.1 reflects the descriptive statistics.

**Figure 4.1:** Years of Teaching since Graduation

Mean = 7.04  
Standard Deviation = 6.78  
Missing = 4
There is a good indication that the majority of the graduates have maintained employment in physical education. Also, the status of many of the individuals continuing employment at the same school reflects the success of the teacher in the professional arena. These results give meaning to the idea that the alumni are well respected by school administrators because of their ability to teach and are trusted to provide leadership in the gymnasium for multiple years. With 50% of those surveyed, having completed zero to five years of teaching since graduation, there would have been a limited amount of opportunity to gain teaching experience having recently graduated from college.

Figure 4.2 reflects the descriptive statistics.

Figure 4.2: Currently Teaching

The participants were asked to identify how long they had been employed in their current school. Again, there is valuable information reflected in the results. Having most of the participants maintaining employment in the same school for multiple years may represent the quality of the teacher preparation at the university. There is evidence of respect and trust that the graduates of the program are providing learning experiences for the district or building. This can be noted because of the continuing employment status of
the graduates. Table 4.1 represents the number of years teaching at the participants’ current schools.

Table 4.1: Years Teaching at Current School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Teaching at Current School</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–5 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine of the participants taught in a suburban setting, eight in an urban setting and two taught in a rural atmosphere. Nine of the participants chose not to answer question four, section two in Part II. Thirteen of the teachers who responded taught in a school with more than 600 students. Five respondents taught in a school with 200–400 students, four taught in a school with 400–600 students, and one taught in a school with 0–200 students. Of the schools, 13 were public schools, five were private or independent and two were parochial or religious.

Those who were not teaching had left the school in years ranging from nine months to 21 years. Two of those individuals had left teaching but remained in the health and allied health field. Eight had left the field entirely. There were a variety of reasons stated for leaving. The most frequent answer was lack of employment with two individuals so indicating. “Other” was marked three times with the reasons being: “stronger interest in other field,” “high school assistant principal”, and “athletic director.” It is important to note that the athletic director position falls into employment within the allied health area. One individual remarked that he/she was unsuccessful at securing a position because of a lack of a school health license. This is not indicative of a weakness
in the program, as there is no school health licensure program available to the program’s students. Health is considered a separate major and has no bearing on the physical education major. The remaining reasons of, “financial,” “lack of preparation,” “lack of interest,” “relocation,” “family interests,” and “additional education” each occurred once as an answer. The information is contained in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Reason for Leaving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Leaving</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from this question reflect the idea that the individuals generally felt positive about their preparation. Only one individual marked that they did not feel adequately prepared to teach. The 17 “missing” responses represent the 16 who were currently teaching, leaving one response missing.

The participants were also asked to identify if their current position outside of teaching was within or outside the allied health field. If the answer was that he/she had left the field, the individual was asked to specify the reason for leaving. There were 10 who had left the teaching field. Of the 10, eight were employed outside the allied health field and two were employed within. Eighteen were reported as missing. This rate was
due to those who were currently teaching. Table 4.3 and Figure 4.3 reflect the descriptive statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Employment Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside Allied Health</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Allied Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment longevity is operationally defined as the length of time the graduate has been employed in the field of physical education or the allied health field. Success, for the purpose of this dissertation, is defined as 5–10 years post-graduation, the individual has secured and maintained employment in the allied health field, teaching, athletic training, physical therapy, recreation and parks department, YMCA affiliation, or other similar organizations. Also, additional education and certifications in their field, memberships and activities in professional organizations, research and publications, and speaking engagements indicate success of the graduate.
The 14 participants who responded to these survey questions indicated that they were currently teaching physical education in the schools. Those who did not respond (n=14), answered a later question indicating their current employment. Two responded that they were working within the allied health field. The total (16 participants) indicated that they were currently employed within the physical education and allied health field. This leaves 12 participants not working within the field or working at all. This is a positive reflection of the program in that the individuals who responded had found professional success. The preparation received, enabled the graduates to maintain employment within the field of physical education as well as further their desire to maintain employment in the field.

In summary, there is strong indication that the majority of participants are employed within physical education or the allied health field. The evidence, due to data on multiple years of teaching at one school by many of the graduates, perhaps indicates that the university’s program is producing strong physical education teachers who are a value to the school and school administrators. This is apparent when one looks at the multiple years of continuous employment at one school. There is little evidence, however, that any of the respondents left the field because of a lack of preparation. This may show the strength of the program.

Research Question Two: What are the graduates’ perceptions regarding the importance of the NASPE Standards? What is the perception of the NASPE Standards’ ability to help prepare the graduates in the field of Physical Education?

To adequately describe the physical education program, it is important to examine the perceived importance of the graduates with respect to the NASPE Standards. These
standards are, in fact, one of the guiding forces of the program. It is imperative that those who are receiving the information, experiencing the curriculum format, and buying into the mission statement (the alumni), are questioned on what they actually view as important. The possibility of there being a disconnect between the governing bodies and the consumers is great. This potential disconnect can lead to dissatisfaction with the program and skew the results of the survey. Thus, an inaccurate description of the program could result.

The participants were asked to report on their perceptions of the importance of the NASPE Standards and the contribution of the standards toward career preparation. Each of the 10 standards were listed and defined. Following the explanations, the graduates were asked to rank their perceived level of preparation on a scale from one to five. One indicated very well prepared, three indicated somewhat prepared, and five indicated very poorly prepared. The level of importance indicators were defined as one being highly important, three as adequately important, and five as low importance. There were 28 respondents. The number of missing reported varied from three to seven, depending on the standard concerned.

NASPE/AAHPERD Standards

The survey was divided into two parts. Part I of the instrument was designed to measure the 10 NASPE Standards which represent the university’s approach to physical education teacher education with a focus on the performance of the student in relation to the outcomes incorporated within each standard. The participants were asked to rank,
using a Likert-type scale, the 10 standards dealing with their feelings of degree of preparation and level of importance.

In general, Technology is in need of improvement. The highest mean of 2.96 indicates that most of the participants (35.7%) agree that they were somewhat prepared while 7.1% agree that they were very well prepared in this area. At the other end of the scale, 17.9% felt that they were poorly prepared and 3.6% felt that they were very poorly prepared. With Content Knowledge, 46% felt that they were very well prepared. None felt that they were very poorly prepared. The mean for this data was 1.67. The lowest mean, which correlates with alumni who were very well prepared, was in the area of Planning and Instruction. The mean was 1.33, 60.7% felt very prepared in this category.

The general perception responses to degree of preparation are summarized in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: General Perception for Degree of Preparation by Descending Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Some what</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Student</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assessment</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generally, with the participants’ perception of level of importance, the higher mean score indicates that they did not attach high priority for this category for use in the program. Technology, with a mean score of 2.14, ranks first in lacking a major contribution to the strength of the program. The survey showed that 67.9% of the participants indicated they felt that it is of high importance to have strong preparation in working with Diverse Students. Also, 67.9% of participants felt that having the ability to manage and motivate one’s gymnasium or classroom was of high importance. The mean score for Diverse Students was 1.22 and the mean score for Management and Motivation was 1.17. The responses to level of importance are summarized in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: General Perceptions for Level of Importance by Descending Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Some what</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>-X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and Motivation</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and Development</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Instruction</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, with the participants’ perception of level of importance, the higher mean score indicates that they did not attach high priority for this category for use in the program. Technology, with a mean score of 2.14, ranks first in lacking a major contribution to the strength of the program. The survey showed that 67.9% of the participants indicated they felt that it is of high importance to have strong preparation in working with Diverse Students. Also, 67.9% of participants felt that having the ability to manage and motivate one’s gymnasium or classroom was of high importance. The mean score for Diverse Students was 1.22 and the mean score for Management and Motivation was 1.17. The responses to level of importance are summarized in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: General Perceptions for Level of Importance by Descending Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Somewhat High</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>-X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assessment</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Somewhat High</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Instruction</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and Development</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Students</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Motivation</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses for each standard and the individual responses are compared in Table 4.5 while Figure 4.4 provides a summary for the compared responses of degree of preparation and level of importance. This was performed to identify the perceptions of importance by the participant and the degree of preparation by the university. This indicates differences in perceptions from each one. In terms of degree of preparation, the standard most in need of improvement was Technology. The perceived level of importance in practice, however, was not ranked high. Planning and Instruction ranked almost equal in terms of degree of preparation and level of importance in practice while Growth and Development was equal in terms of perceived degree of preparation and level of importance. Also, Diverse Students, reflected disagreement between the participant’s degree of preparation and the perceived level of importance.
Figure 4.4: Responses for Degree of Importance and Preparation
Table 4.6 shows the two responses of Degree of Preparation and Level of Importance contained in the survey. The answers explain the perceptions of the participants in terms of the NASPE Standards which guide the curriculum. The number indicated, reveals the number of responses given by the graduates who fall into the very well and well categories for degree of preparation. The number indicated for the level of importance, reflects responses of high and somewhat high. There are two columns marked with a # (number of responses) and % (percentage). The percentage was calculated to show what percentage of responses occurred.
Table 4.6: Compared Responses of Degree of Preparation and Level of Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NASPE Standards</th>
<th>Degree of Preparation</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assessment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Instruction</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and Development</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Student</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Motivation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data indicates that the level of perceived importance does not always coincide with the perceived degree of preparation by the participants. The views on Technology show the difference in perception; 53% of the participants felt that using Technology was important yet only 25% felt that they were adequately prepared to do so. This was the greatest difference found between perceived importance and level of preparation for any of the 10 NASPE Standards. Similarly, but with not as large a difference, 66.7% believed Collaboration was important but only 60% felt they were adequately prepared. The survey showed 75% of the participants found Content Knowledge important; 67.7% felt prepared with this knowledge. Communication (82.1% and 71.4% respectively), Diverse Student (78.6% and 64.3% respectively), and Management and Motivation (82.2% and 78.6% respectively) all had data that showed the alumni perceiving a level of importance higher than they perceived they were prepared by the university. This could leave the graduate frustrated with the experience they had at the institution.
Reflection had a different outcome with the level of importance (75%) being lower than the degree of preparation (82.2%). This occurs again with Student Assessment (71.4% level of importance, 78.6% degree of preparation), Planning and Instruction (75% and 82.1% respectively), and Growth and Development (72% and 78.6% respectively). This could result in the graduate feeling that their time was wasted and could have been spent completing more important course content.

The responses to the 10 NASPE Standards overall, were positive. The respondents felt that they were adequately prepared in all areas other than Technology. Each of the categories, other than Technology, had a response rate of over 60% feeling very well or well prepared. This data reflected positively in terms of how the graduate was professionally prepared on the national level as well as how they are equipped to be successful in the work environment.

Two questions that required individual responses were also contained in Part I. These questions requested the participant to identify the aspects of their initial licensure program that best prepared them or were less helpful in preparing them for work as a teacher.

Individual Response: Areas of Strength

Individual responses dealing with areas of strength found in the program were described by the participants. The responses varied according to the individual. The researcher first arranged the information into individual responses. Second, the results were labeled according to exact or similar terms used in the answer. Third, the responses were organized into new categories, each containing one or more individual responses.
Conclusions made by the researcher were audited by a peer de-briefer to determine if the themes and patterns were identified correctly. The highest rated strength was that of the program having a strong curriculum base in content knowledge followed by the participant’s feeling of preparation with developing lesson or unit plans. Finally, there was a belief that the student teaching experience was valuable. Table 4.7 identifies the number of mentions by the participants in the areas of strength.

Table 4.7: Individual Concepts of Participants Area of Strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Strength</th>
<th>Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong Curriculum</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Units or Lessons</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching Experience</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Teach</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Work With Others</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands on Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Student or Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following are excerpts from various participants regarding their opinions about the strengths of the program. They are presented in the exact form of how the responses were written.

A female from the class of 1991 described: “I was prepared in terms of organization, planning and instruction. Also, working together and sharing ideas with others enhanced my learning.”
A female from the class of 2003 listed how to deal with people and conflict, overall planning units and lessons, and implementing those units and lessons as strength of the program.

A female from the class of 1986 stated: “My educational experience was very comprehensive and prepared me.”

Individual Response: Area In Need of Improvement or Change

The participants were also asked to answer the question of what areas are in need of improvement. Again the responses varied according to each individual. The highest rated weakness was that of not having enough activity classes offered to the students. There was a strong desire to have more methods in teaching a variety of sport specific activities available as a course. Following this area was a need for greater use of technology. Table 4.8 identifies the number of mentions by the participants in the areas in need of improvement or change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas In Need of Improvement or Change</th>
<th>Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Methods Courses for Additional Sports</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Certification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Student Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Diversity Exposure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Changes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Professor Instruction Style</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Class</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following are excerpts from various participants regarding their opinion on areas in need of improvement or change. Mirroring the statements from the areas of strength, the comments are presented in their exact written form.

A male from the class of 2005 stated: “more classes to cover sports. The only required class was swimming. What about dance, basketball, baseball, tennis, etc. Cover more large group, small group space games. I have 60-plus first graders in a double classroom. There are no gyms in elementary schools in Las Vegas. More outside field activities.”

One female from the class of 1987, indicated that for her, the student teaching experience was not challenging enough:

“All of my teaching experiences, including my student teaching were done at suburban, affluent and well-performing districts. It was a “rude awakening” and somewhat of a struggle when I began teaching in Cleveland Public Schools where “urban economical issues,” district money problems and emphasis on “core subjects” often made teaching Health and Physical Education difficult.”

A male from the class of 1992, noted that his desire was to see more preparation with using a variety of assessment tools available to the students: “No true preparation for assessment. There are many variables for assessment procedures that were not covered throughout the program. Quality rubrics were not in place and/or not adequately available to the students.”

The responses generated from the area of strength and the area of weakness, do not consistently align with the previous data mentioned.

For example, when examining the area of strengths, the perceived level of importance and the degree of preparation do not match. The top strengths of the program were: a strong curriculum, planning units or lessons and the student teaching experience. In looking at the perceived levels of importance in the areas of Content Knowledge and
Planning and Instruction, one will find that 75% the participants in both categories found this to be of high importance. However, in the perceived degree of preparation, 67.4% believed that they were very well or well prepared. This was lower than how the graduates viewed the importance but did indicate that more than one half of the participants believed they were prepared. The degree of preparation in Planning and Instruction was 82.1% and does match the views of the participants.

The general picture of the program is strong, given that the overall percentages in each category are above 50% in the very well, well, and somewhat areas combined. This is also true in the high and somewhat high areas. The small data set can be easily swayed due to one response. A larger response rate, in addition to adding more alumni to the survey list by using future graduating classes, will help create a better description for the university.

The data gathered from the weaknesses of the program; do align with portions of the other information mentioned. For instance, the most frequently mentioned weakness is that the program needs to have more methods courses offered. This was mentioned six times. Also, the use of technology was mentioned three times. The data gathered from the NASPE Standards coincides with the additional information gathered in the written section.

Additional Data

Three alumni chose to respond in the form of a written letter. Each of these replies generated some information that would have come from the survey. Not all information contained in the communication could apply to the survey, however. The first letter
credits the university with providing a great foundation for his/her current position. It stated:

“Even though I did not use my physical education courses in a way that culminated in teaching as a physical education instructor, I feel it was a great foundation for what I do today. Every experience and every bit of education is valuable and I wouldn’t be who I am today without it.”

The second letter stated:

“I can tell you that I always have positive comments for my educational program at [university]. You especially had an impact on my teaching methods. Thank you for all your kind and professional help.”

The third letter noted that he/she is no longer working in the education field but credits the university for helping him or her succeed in life. There was no other explanation or information.

The final question in Part II that dealt with background information asked the participant to identify the reason for leaving. The response to this question indicated that the 11 individuals who had left teaching, did so for a variety of reasons. Table 4.9 reflects the descriptive statistics.

Table 4.9: Reason for Leaving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Leaving</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The focus of the second research question revolved around the graduate’s perception regarding the importance of the NASPE Standards and the ability of the standards to professionally assist him or her. The major findings indicate that there is a consistency with the perceived level of importance and the degree of preparation in nine of the 10 standards. Technology was found to have the largest gap between the two areas.

The strength identified most by the participants was that the program had a strong curriculum. The second most frequently identified was that preparation in the area of developing lesson or unit plans. The weakness identified most by the respondents was that there is a need for additional methods courses for teaching a variety of sports. Also, the use of technology was a desired topic for improvement.

There is no real indication that the strength of the physical education program is at risk with the stated weaknesses. The fact that there is a desire by six of the graduates to have had more methods courses offered, has not been shown to affect the success of the individuals as teachers. This conclusion is based on the employment longevity of the graduates and the ability to maintain a teaching contract for multiple years at the same school. Additionally, with the data gathered from the NASPE Standards, the graduates felt very prepared as professionals.

Conversely, the strengths of the program would have an impact on the success of the graduates as teachers, because the strengths deal directly with the preparation of the teacher (Content Knowledge and Planning and Instruction). Perhaps if those two areas fell in the weakness category, the university should begin worrying about what the curriculum is lacking.
Research Question Three: What is the reflection of the graduates’ regarding the Conceptual Framework’s impact to be in the field as a professional?

As previously stated, the Conceptual Framework is used as a guideline to provide each student with the opportunity to grow intellectually, discover oneself individually, develop as a whole person, be able to adapt to a variety of situations, and be willing to accept the challenge of social leadership (DEAS Conceptual Framework, 2004). The five ideals within this framework: “formation of the total person,” “personal influence of the educator,” “educational settings as communities of influence,” “education as a vocation,” and “integration of the discipline” serve as guideline for goal attainment by the division.

The last section of Part II required the respondents to provide a brief response to five prompts which reflect the concepts contained in the Conceptual Framework. They were asked to consider either their current position or a previous teaching position. As stated before, the researcher first arranged the information into individual responses. The results were labeled according to exact or similar terms used in the answer. Finally, the responses were organized into new categories, each containing one or more individual responses. Conclusions made by the researcher were audited by a peer de-briefer to determine if the themes and patterns were identified correctly. Following are the results for each question asked.

Prompt One: To what extent have you impacted your students’ learning? Please provide a specific example or two (i.e. proficiency test performance, behavior changes, etc.).

This question generated 18 responses. Table 4.10 describes the information and provides a solid indication that the graduates have strong personal influence as educators.
Nine of the responses mention that the respondents felt they had a positive impact on student learning. This directly aligns with the university’s ideal of personal influence of the educator and education as a vocation. Also, five responses under the development of leadership characteristics identify with the willingness to accept the challenge of social leadership within the parameters of the Conceptual Framework.

Table 4.10: Impact on Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Impact</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Learning</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Leadership Characteristics</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Work With Others</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a Tracking Tool</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit Work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Content Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prompt Two:** Have you ever received any awards or other types of recognition from your school or district?

This question generated 21 responses. Table 4.11 describes the responses to the question. A total of 16 awards have been presented to graduates of the program and reflect the ideal of educational settings as communities of influence and a formation of the total person. The public recognition of these awards leads one to believe that there is a strong work ethic involved with the recipients of these awards, a desire to be actively involved with the students or community and a willingness to accept responsibility of leading by example. The framework upholds the idea that one must be willing to accept the challenge of social leadership and be an influence as an educator. It is viewed by
those who decide on the award winner that the graduates of this program meet these
standards and that the framework guides those in the field.

Table 4.11: Awards or Type of Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awards or Type of Recognition</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Award</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of the Year</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations or Verbal Praise</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Board Certification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Year Teacher of the Year Finalist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10 Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Award for Online HPE Content and Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach of the Year</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of the Year – county</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Recipient</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prompt Three:** Have you taken on any leadership roles in your school district
(i.e. team leader, committee work, etc.)? Please briefly explain.

This question generated 22 responses. Table 4.12 describes the responses to the
question and the results contribute to the value of integration of the discipline. The
participants identified 38 total leadership roles. There were multiple responses by many
of the graduates as to different roles they have had. This large number of obtained
leadership roles, indicates the strength of the individuals graduating from the university,
and the respect gained from the administrators involved with the promotion process. The
Conceptual Framework’s mission of having the graduates willing to accept the challenge
of social leadership and the ideals of educational settings as communities of influence, is reflected in the high number of leadership roles held by the participants.

Table 4.12: Leadership Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Roles</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Coach</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairperson</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Representative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic League Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prompt Four: Have you been involved in any service activities? If so, please provide a brief explanation.

This question generated 20 responses. Table 4.13 describes the information and provides feedback about the graduate’s belief in educational settings as communities of influence and the importance of education as vocation. The graduates performed 16 total service activities. The Conceptual Framework views education as a vocation and contributes to the formation of the total person. Also, integration of the discipline serves as a guideline by the university. Service learning and community outreach play a large role in the development of the total person. Working with others in community efforts assists in developing well-rounded individuals and works to bring groups together. The
results of the participation in service activities greatly reflect the influence of the
Conceptual Framework in the graduates of the university.

Table 4.13: Type of Service Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service Activity</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Design and Implementation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Fundraising</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Coaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Olympics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Club</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald McDonald House</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prompt Five: Have you pursued graduate coursework or a graduate degree? If so, please provide information about where you are studying and your program of study.

This question generated 22 responses. Table 4.14 describes the information dealing with post-graduate course work. The table reflects alumni attaining 21 additional degrees, certifications or licenses. Three individuals indicated that a variety of post-graduate classes were taken but no degree was obtained. Two participants did not go on to participate in any additional course work. These figures contribute to the conceptual framework in the formation of the total person. The continued educational work by the graduates reflects a strong interest in growing personally and professionally in the field of health and physical education. Also, as mentioned in the definition of success for the purpose of this dissertation, additional education and certifications in the allied health field, memberships and activities in professional organizations, research and publications,
and speaking engagements indicate success of the graduate. Twenty-one additional
degrees and one response that indicated taking additional coursework can be positively
viewed as showing a strong desire to continue developing in the area of physical
education. This reflection aligns with the program’s desire of developing the total person.

Table 4.14: Graduate Coursework or Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Coursework or Degree</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters of Education</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters of Science</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recertification or Continuing Education Unit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Certification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters of Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Classes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Chapter Four provided the information gathered from the survey instrument. It
included discussions about the selection of participants, the survey return rate, and the
statistical analysis for this descriptive study. Tables, charts, and figures were used to
organize and describe the results as pertain to the study.

The information gathered indicates that generally, the participants felt very good
about their experience at the university and that this experience had contributed to their
success in the workplace. Of the participants, 57.1% were currently teaching; 39.3% were
not. Of those not currently teaching, 28.6% have remained in the allied health field and
7.1% have left the field completely. Of those who have left the Allied Health field, 3.6%
indicated that they felt the university did not prepare them. The graduates felt very
prepared in terms of Growth and Development as well as Planning and Instruction.

Finally, the information gathered indicates that there was a wide variety of faculty awards earned, service endeavors performed, leadership roles obtained and additional coursework or degrees achieved by the participants. This suggests that the total curriculum of the university and the work of its graduates align themselves with each other.

The employment status in the field for physical education majors reveals that the graduates of the program are gainfully employed. Of those currently employed, 57% are within the physical education and allied health field. Those who are not teaching, have either relocated, changed fields altogether or left for family reasons. There is no indication that the graduates left the field because of lack of preparation. There was, however, one individual who left because of lack of employment. This participant stated that there he/she was unable to find employment because of the absence of a health license. This statement does not reflect poorly on the physical education licensure preparation because the two tracks are completely separate. This university offers only the physical education track.

The data gathered with regard to the graduates’ perception of the NASPE Standards indicates that they are very well or well prepared in terms of the content. There is a belief that the participants place a high level of importance on the standards and that these standards contribute to their success in the field. Also, there is a reflection of perceived importance to have this preparation. With the exception of Technology, the participants feel an overall sense of preparedness in the field of physical education.
Finally, the reflection of the graduates regarding the Conceptual Framework’s impact as professionals was positive. Each of the five prompts in this section of the survey, provided ample feedback as to the contribution of the framework to the graduates continued employment. Each category generated responses that align with the framework as well as the five ideals within the framework. It appears that the Conceptual Framework greatly contributes to how the participants structure their working environment, their community outreach, their ability to secure leadership roles and receive public recognition in these roles. The success of the graduates of the program, based on the data, reflects a strong preparatory curriculum provided by the university.
CHAPTER V

RESULTS

Chapter five is divided into six major sections. The summary of the study includes a review of the statement of the problem and a brief discussion of the procedures used in the study. The conclusion focuses on the results of the investigation and provides a justification for the results presented. The discussion portion further details the conclusions and analyzes the findings. The fourth section looks at the implications of the study. Finally, recommendations for further research and a chapter summary are also presented.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study is to describe to the university’s administrators the strengths and weaknesses of the physical education program. It also furnishes a description of the alumni as it applies to employment longevity in the field of physical education, employment trends, and attitudes toward the program. This description will benefit prospective students as they enter the program, maintain their status in the major, complete the required classes, and receive licensure in the field.

The study implemented the use of secondary data. The utilization of ex post facto information was employed to provide the foundation for examination. The instrument
used to collect the data was designed with three research questions to be answered. The questions look at the employment status in the field for Physical Education majors, the perception of the NASPE Standards’ ability to prepare the graduates in the field of Physical Education, and the reflection of the graduates regarding the Conceptual Framework’s impact in the field as professionals.

Descriptive statistics are presented to summarize the responses and the variables of NASPE Standards for Initial Physical Education and are discussed along the lines of Level of Importance by the participant and Degree of Preparation given by the university. Also discussed are the strengths and weaknesses of the program, socio-demographic factors of gender, graduation year, employment status, and reasons for leaving the discipline. Prompts were given to generate information which aligned with the Conceptual Framework.

Conclusions

The results of the study provide support for the conclusions offered:

**Research Question One:** What is employment status in the field for Physical Education majors?

Employment longevity is defined in the text as the length of time the graduate has been employed in the field of physical education or the allied health field. Success is defined as if 5–10 years post-graduation, the individual has secured and maintained employment in the allied health field, teaching, athletic training, physical therapy, recreation and parks department, YMCA affiliation, or similar opportunities or fields. Additional education and certifications in their field, memberships and activities in
professional organizations, research and publications, and speaking engagements indicate success of the graduate.

The survey rendered a total of 28 responses. Of those participants, 24 offered information about employment longevity. The results of the survey identified 15 currently teaching and 13 not teaching. The averages for these figures are 62% and 54% respectively. The longest time teaching at one location by any participant was 16 years, with 15 of those teaching years at the same school. The average number of years teaching was seven and the most frequently occurring number of years teaching was three. One individual ranked highest in teaching experience with 21 years while another stated a 20 year experience.

The participants were also asked to identify if their current position outside of the teaching field was within or outside the allied health field. There was a 35.7% ($n=10$) response rate with 64.3% missing. This rate is due to those who are currently teaching. The responses to the questions indicate that 28% are employed outside of the allied health field while 7.1% are employed within the field.

Additionally, 22 respondents indicated that additional coursework had been completed since graduation. There were 21 post-graduate degrees, certifications, and licenses attained and three individuals stated that although no degree was earned, a variety of courses were taken. Two participants did not go on to participate in any additional course work. The act of participating in professional development indicates a sustained interest in the discipline by the participants. Also, it is a reflection of the success of the alumni in the field and the desire to professionally advance.
**Research Question Two:** What are the graduates' perceptions regarding the importance of the NASPE Standards? What is the perception of the NASPE Standard’s ability to help prepare the graduates in the field of Physical Education?

Generally, the area of Technology is in need of improvement in terms of how well prepared the graduates felt prepared (35.7%) agreed that they were somewhat prepared while only 7.1% agree that they were very well prepared in this area. At the opposite end of the scale, 17.9% felt that they were poorly prepared and 3.6% felt that they were very poorly prepared. In the category of the perception of level of importance however, Technology ranks as least important. Of the participants, 46% felt that they were very well prepared in terms of Content Knowledge and none felt they were very poorly prepared. In the category of Diverse Students, 67.9% of the respondents feel that it is of high importance to have strong preparation in this area. Also, having the ability to manage and motivate one’s gymnasium or classroom has a 67.9% response rate in the area of high importance.

The percentages in Table 5.1 reveal the number of responses that fall into the very well and well categories for degree of preparation. The percentage indicated for the level of importance, reflects responses of high and somewhat high. The difference in percentage of perception indicates that there is a slightly higher value placed on the level of importance by the graduates than the university places on these categories. The results reveal that Technology ranks the highest in miscommunication between the two, while Management and Motivation appear to reflect a similar importance perceived by the university and the graduate. Planning and Instruction, Reflection and Student Assessments have a small percentage difference. Thus, it seems the students feel that the
level of importance and the degree of preparation are perceived similarly. However, the
majority of the standards were viewed to be of more importance to the graduate than the
degree of preparation. This does not reflect the level of how prepared in the field the
participants felt.

Table 5.1: Difference in Percentage of Perception of Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NASPE Standards</th>
<th>Percentage of Degree of Preparation</th>
<th>Percentage Level of Importance</th>
<th>Difference in Percentage of Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and Motivation</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and Development</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Instruction</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assessment</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Students</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question Three:** What is the reflection of the graduates regarding the
Conceptual Framework’s impact to be in the field as a professional?

The five ideals within the Conceptual Framework guide the student along the
lines of discovering oneself individually, providing each student with the opportunity to
grow intellectually and develop as a whole person, enabling the student to adapt to a
variety of situations, and being willing to accept the challenge of social leadership
(DEAS Conceptual Framework, 2004). These ideals, which serve as a guideline for goal
attainment by the division, are: “formation of the total person,” “personal influence of the
educator,” “educational settings as communities of influence,” “education as a vocation,” and “integration of the discipline.”

Part II of the survey required the participants to provide a brief response to five prompts. These prompts reflect the concepts within the Conceptual Framework and focus on the following ideals: impact on student learning, awards or type of recognition, leadership roles, type of involvement in service activities, and additional graduate coursework or degrees held. Table 5.2 summarizes the results of the information gathered and how it reflects the integration of the ideals and the questions.

Table 5.2: Conceptual Framework Ideals and Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompts Within Survey</th>
<th>Formation of the Total Person</th>
<th>Personal Influence of the Educator</th>
<th>Educational Settings as Communities of Influence</th>
<th>Education as a Vocation</th>
<th>Integration of the Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Student Learning (methods)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards or Type of Recognition</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Roles held</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Involvement in Service Activities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Graduate Coursework or Degrees Held</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on alumni survey participants’ responses, it can be concluded that Conceptual Framework had a positive impact on their professional careers. The information gathered from each prompt indicates that there is a strong ability to apply the
ideals as an expert in the field of physical education and there is evidence that the participants do so.

Implications

The relationship between the Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Program and employment longevity

The results of this survey indicate that the division received a positive response as to whether the individuals felt prepared as teachers in the field. A lesser impact is detected on employment longevity. The indicators of employment longevity stemmed from the examination of years teaching in the field and reasons for leaving. There were 14 participants who indicated that they were currently teaching in the schools. Those who did not respond (n=14), answered a later question indicating their current employment. That question generated two responses stating that they were working within the allied health field. The total of 16 participants (57%) signified that they were currently employed within the physical education and allied health fields. That left eight participants not working within the field and four unemployed.

Those who had left the field were asked to identify reasons for leaving. The most frequently identified reason was lack of employment, with two individuals marking that response. “Other,” was marked three times with the reasons being: “stronger interest in other field,” “high school assistant principal,” and “became athletic director.” One individual remarked that he/she could not get hired because of lacking health certification. The remaining reasons: “financial,” “lack of preparation,” “lack of interest,”
“relocation,” “family interests,” and “additional education” each occurred once as an answer. There was no indication that the participants left because they were not prepared.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program

The instrument rendered information regarding strengths and areas in need of improvement within the program. The highest rated strength of the program was that of having a strong curriculum. There were nine comments made on this topic. The second highest rated comment was the confidence the graduates had in creating and implementing unit or lesson plans. The third highest ranking strength was the student teaching experience. There was no indication that the respondents felt ill-prepared to teach in the field.

In terms of weaknesses, the respondents expressed the need for more methods courses dealing with teaching a wide variety of sports. One might be able to interpret this as the graduates’ feeling as if they were not prepared in this area. There is no indication of this, however, throughout the remainder of the survey. In fact, 67.4% of the participants indicated that they felt very prepared or well prepared in terms of Content Knowledge. Only 17.9% felt somewhat prepared and no one felt poorly or very poorly prepared. Also, more than 80% of the respondents felt very well or well prepared in terms of Planning and Instruction. Very few (3.6%) felt somewhat prepared and none felt poorly or very poorly prepared.

The use of technology was the second most frequently expressed weakness and the absence of an opportunity to secure a health license while becoming licensed in physical education was third. As stated previously, the desire to secure a health license
has little to do with the strength or weakness of the physical education program. Health is a separate major and does not directly influence the current program. Finally, there were three participants who believe there were no weaknesses.

Importance of the NASPE Standards

Based on the results of the study, the participants have a high regard for the importance of the standards. Nine of the 10 standards had results of over 60% in the categories of high or somewhat high in terms of importance. The area of Technology, however, received 53.6% as having high or somewhat high level of importance. When the two areas are combined, there does not seem to be a huge difference from the other nine categories. However, when the two categories are separated, the area of high importance had only a 25% response rate. When compared to Diverse Students or Management and Motivation, which both had a 67.9% high importance response rate, there is a large difference. This is also evident when looking at the category of Reflection. There was also a 25% response rate in the area of high importance. When combined with the Somewhat High area (50%), however, the total percentage of responses jumps to 75%. In the area of Collaboration, a similar finding occurs. The high importance response rate was 32.1%. When it is combined with the area of somewhat high (35.7%), the total percentage becomes much higher than that of Technology. Overall, however, there is an indication that the general perception for the level of importance with the standards is high by the participants.
Preparation of the NASPE Standards

Based on the data gathered, the respondents felt that there is a need for increased preparation in the area of Technology. The largest response rate by the graduates occurred in the area of somewhat prepared with 35.7% marking that area. Also, 17.9% felt that they were poorly prepared in Technology. Only 25% felt that they were either very well or well prepared in this area. The area of Collaboration received 17.9% of a response rate in the somewhat prepared column while also receiving 7.1% in the poorly prepared section. Again, when organizing the data, Collaboration received feedback in the areas of very well or well with 55% of the respondents reflecting a high perceived level of preparation by the university in terms of the NASPE standards.

Variance between the Levels of Perceptions

Examining the levels of perceived preparation and the importance with the 10 NASPE Standards gave sound information on the communication between the program and the participant. Three of the 10 areas received similar levels of feedback in terms of the two perceptions. These areas are Growth and Development, Planning and Instruction and Reflection and they closely align themselves in the areas of preparation and importance. Interestingly, the other seven areas received higher perceived levels of preparation than the levels of importance. This result leads to idea that the university places a greater value on the NASPE Standards than the respondents.
Further implications are based on the study of perceived level of importance in the area of Technology and the perceived level of preparation. There is an indicated need for the purchasing of additional technological equipment and training for the program. Examples of equipment in terms of Physical Education are: pedometers, heart rate monitors, calipers, bod pod, and equipment used in a gross anatomy lab. Training on such items will increase the knowledge needed to gather data on elementary, middle and secondary physical education students. This, in turn, will assist the graduate of the university in becoming a more prepared physical education teacher.

In addition, it is important to note the difference of the means in terms of Management and Motivation. In the level of preparation, the mean was 1.63. The mean in the level of importance was 1.17. This result indicates that the respondents do not feel that this area is as important as the university feels. Management and Motivation, in the field of Physical Education is of utmost importance. The safety issues involved in this area are astounding and having an absence of gymnasium management could have devastating injuries. Also, lack of management will lead to an unsuccessful ability by the graduates to organize a unit plan, implement the lessons and provide a positive, safe, learning environment for the participating students.

Further, minimizing the importance of being a motivating teacher will lead to a decrease in the quality of the lesson. This also violates the mission of the governing bodies. AAPHERD states: “NASPE's mission is to enhance knowledge, improve professional practice, and increase support for high quality physical education, sport, and physical activity programs (AAHPERD, 2010). The decline of professional practice due
to having no management or motivation in the gymnasium goes against the will of the profession and impacts the student’s ability to learn through participation.

The data suggests that the university should increase the message of how important the areas of Management and Motivation are. Based on the feedback in the area most in need of improvement, an increase in activity courses would assist in improving this indication. Also, more peer teaching opportunities in these activity courses will provide the student with additional chances to practice gymnasium management, consider safety issues with the activities, and create a motivating environment for the peer students.

Judith Fink, president of Impact Communications Inc. (2009) in her article titled, “If You Rest, You Rust,” stated, “As speakers, we can’t assume our communication skills are good enough. Miscommunication is too costly to our organization and to our career. We must continue to practice.” She also credits actress, Helen Hayes for the title of the article. This idea holds true in teaching. The increased amount of time spent practicing the skill and art of teaching, the greater the chance to improve as a teacher. Also, additional time spent communicating with the students, will sharpen the pre-service teacher’s ability to teach appropriately.

Conceptual Framework

The participants had favorable responses to the framework and the ideals contained in the framework. Their participation in opportunities to impact student learning, secure leadership roles, and become involved in service activities indicate the belief in the framework. Also, the multiple degrees and certifications earned post-
graduation reflect the value felt by the graduates to further themselves academically and professionally. For these participants, the framework appears to have shaped how they view their roles as teachers and how they operate professionally.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study provides a description of the alumni with respect to employment longevity in the field of Physical Education, employment trends and attitudes toward the program. The study also intends to better describe to the university’s administrators, the strengths and weaknesses of the program. This study provides direction for future research on the Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Program.

The design of the study included all graduates of the program. Research is needed which focuses on higher education teacher preparatory programs, the value of periodically examining a Physical Education Initial Licensure program and research on Physical Education programs in general.

As more graduates enter the field, the study should be replicated. A five year time period will allow for an increase in the sample size and provide a greater opportunity to describe the program. Having a larger sample size will allow the program to determine correlation between perceptions of the program and success over and above GPA, SAT scores and Praxis scores. Future studies will provide information to further describe the program and contribute to the historical foundation of the division.
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APPENDIX A.

NASPE GOALS 2006–2008

GOAL 1: Define, promote and recognize professional excellence in physical education, sport, and physical activity

Objective 1.1: Continue to develop, revise, and promote NASPE national standards, guidelines, and position statements.

Objective 1.2: Increase participation of individuals and institutions in accreditation programs (i.e., SMPRC, NASPE/NCATE, NCACE).

Objective 1.3: Increase participation of individuals and institutions in NASPE recognition programs (e.g. Athletic Director of the Year, Teacher of the Year, STARS).

Objective 1.4: Utilize individuals and institutions recognized by NASPE recognition and accreditation programs to educate professionals and the public about the importance and characteristics of outstanding programs and professionals.

Objective 1.5: Create standardized performance assessments to measure student achievement of the national standards for K-12 physical education.

GOAL 2: Promote best practice through professional development in physical education, sport, and physical activity

Objective 2.1: Increase awareness and usage of NASPE national standards, guidelines, and position statements.
Objective 2.2: Develop and disseminate high-quality publications.

Objective 2.3: Provide high-quality professional services.

Objective 2.4: Expand the NASPE internship and sabbatical programs.

GOAL 3: **Encourage and disseminate research contributing to the advancement of knowledge and evidence-based practice in physical education, sport, and physical activity**

Objective 3.1: Disseminate knowledge and evidence-based practice in physical education, sport, and physical activity.

Objective 3.2: Expand financial support for applied research and promote grant opportunities.

Objective 3.3: Disseminate and fully utilize findings from the NASPE Research Grant Program.

Objective 3.4: Enhance communication and collaboration with the AAHPERD Research Consortium.

Objective 3.5: Identify the needs of research members and potential members and align accordingly the missions and activities of the NASPE research academies.

GOAL 4: **Facilitate the establishment of public policy that supports physical education, sport, and physical activity**

Objective 4.1: Develop and implement a public policy agenda.

Objective 4.2: Provide public policy and advocacy information and tools.

Objective 4.3: Support state AHPERDs in their public policy and advocacy efforts.

Objective 4.4: Secure federal legislation that supports physical education.
Objective 4.5: Advocate for federal and state legislation that supports quality sport experiences.

GOAL 5: Develop and maintain collaborations that promote and advance physical education, sport, and physical activity

Objective 5.1: fully utilize partnerships and coalition memberships to advance the NASPE priorities.

Objective 5.2: Educate and involve NASPE members in the association’s partnerships.

Objective 5.3: Increase collaborations with the national district AAHPERD associations.

Objective 5.4: Increase collaborations with the state AHPERD associations.

GOAL 6: Develop and maintain communications that promote and advance physical education, sport, and physical activity

Objective 6.1: Expand information dissemination and professional sharing through electronic mediums (e.g., website, listserv, and Internet forum).

Objective 6.2: Initiate and/or be included in media articles related to NASPE mission and activities.

Objective 6.3: Submit articles and conference proposals on high quality physical education, sport, and youth physical activity programs to journals and conferences of key target audiences (e.g., principals, school boards).

Objective 6.4: Develop and implement a major annual initiative for National Physical Education and Sport Week.

GOAL 7: Develop and maintain an inclusive, effective, and efficient organization
Objective 7.1: Pursue an increase in organizational membership and leadership reflecting ethnic and racial diversity.

Objective 7.2: Involve a variety of members in NSAPE leadership opportunities.

Objective 7.3: Promote and support international activities for physical education, sport, and physical activity.

Objective 7.4: Increase membership.

Objective 7.5: Enhance the structure and function of the organization.

Objective 7.6: Recruit and retain highly qualified staff.

Objective 7.7: Identify and prioritize association projects.

Objective 7.8: Increase external funding for NASPE priority projects.
Figure B.1: Formation of the Total Person

This model illustrates that professional education in the department is organic. Development of the total person as an educator expands through interactions with the program curricula and communities of educational practice. These interactions are both cumulative and progressive, resulting in an educator reflective of the [religious order] ideal.
APPENDIX C.
PROGRAM & UNIT EVALUATION POLICIES & PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of Review</th>
<th>Multiple Data Sources</th>
<th>Candidate Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Assessment Point 1: ADMISSION TO THE UNIVERSITY | Based on the admission process, and evaluation of a candidates’ grades, ACT/SAT scores, interviews, and so on, they are admitted to the University and given the right to register for course work. | • Liberal Arts Core (Appendix F)  
• Education Pre-Admission requirements (Appendix F)  
• Physical Education Coursework (Appendix F)  
• In ED 100, the candidates are placed within a Physical Education setting for the semester. Through observations, class interactions, reflections, and class discussions, the candidate is challenged to examine themselves in the role of an educator.  
• The Physical Education coursework, specifically PE 205/205L, Anatomy and Physiology I emphasizes academic ability within the content knowledge.  
Pre-Candidacy Academic Requirements  
• Candidates must maintain a |
<p>| Assessment Point 2: PRE-ADMISSION STAGE       | Candidates complete academic requirements across three tracks prior to admission into the Initial Licensure Program, and the Physical Education and Exercise Science major. |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of Review</th>
<th>Multiple Data Sources</th>
<th>Candidate Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                 | 2.7 GPA in the following:  
|                 | • Overall GPA  
|                 | • Education GPA  
|                 | • Physical Education GPA  
|                 | • Grades in Education and in Physical Education and supporting content area coursework must be a C or higher.  
|                 | • Courses must be repeated if a grade of C is not earned.  |
| Assessment Point 3: ADMISSION STAGE | Candidates apply into the Initial Licensure Program in Fall, or Spring of the second year. | Multiple measures will be used for evaluation:  
|                                | • Formal application for admission to the Coordinator of the Physical Education major.  
|                                | • Formal essay stating professional goals and expectations  
|                                | • GPA’s: 2.7 or higher  
|                                | • Portfolio with PBA  |
| Assessment Point 4: METHODS STAGE | Candidates continue in Physical Education & Exercise Science coursework, Initial Licensure coursework, and the Liberal Arts Core. Candidates participate in simulated teaching episodes within the academic courses. | Initial Licensure candidates are evaluated at the conclusion of each semester  |
| Assessment Point 5 METHODS STAGE (cont.) | Application to begin the Professional Year is made usually in Spring of the third year: Pre-Student Teaching. Candidates formally apply to be admitted to the Pre-Student Teaching semester. Multiple measures are used to assess admission to this semester:  
|                                | • GPA  
|                                | • Submission of Vita | Candidates are assessed regarding the coursework completed, field experiences that have been completed, and dispositions for the teaching profession in Physical Education. |
## Multiple Data Sources
- Faculty course evaluations (Appendix 5)
- Formal interview with faculty

### Assessment Point 6
**STUDENT TEACHING**

- Application to Student Teaching is submitted at the beginning of the Pre-Student Teaching semester

### Candidate Assessment
Multiple measures are used to assess admission:
- GPA
- Recommendations
  - Candidate Assessment:
  - 7 week Student Teaching at both the elementary and secondary levels
  - Student Teaching evaluation
  - Supervisor evaluation
  - Supervisor and Cooperating teacher recommendations

### Assessment 7
**LICENSURE**

- Pass Praxis 2: Content Area Principles of Learning and Teaching
APPENDIX D.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM

46 Semester Hours Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE 120</td>
<td>Introductory Swimming</td>
<td>1 credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 200</td>
<td>Current Health Issues</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 202</td>
<td>Advanced First Aid and Emergency Care</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 205-205L</td>
<td>Anatomy &amp; Physiology I/Lab</td>
<td>4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 206-206L</td>
<td>Anatomy &amp; Physiology II/Lab</td>
<td>4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 207</td>
<td>Foundations of Physical Education</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 208</td>
<td>Physical Growth &amp; Development</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 310</td>
<td>Methods, Materials &amp; Resources in Physical Education</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 407</td>
<td>Exercise Physiology</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 408</td>
<td>Organization &amp; Administration in Physical Education</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 409</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 411</td>
<td>Physical Education in Early Childhood</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 420</td>
<td>Physical Education for Special Populations</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 430</td>
<td>Research &amp; Measurements in Physical Education</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 432</td>
<td>Motor Learning</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 435</td>
<td>Ethical Problems in Athletics &amp; Physical Education</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E.
### PBA SCORING RUBRIC LEARNING GOALS AND ASSESSMENT PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Goals reflect only one type or level of learning</em></td>
<td><em>Goals reflect several types or levels of learning but lack significance or challenge</em></td>
<td><em>Goals reflect several types or levels of learning and are significant and</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Goals are not stated clearly and are activities rather than learning outcomes</em></td>
<td><em>Some of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes.</em></td>
<td><em>Most of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Goals are not appropriate for the student population; prerequisite knowledge, skills, experiences or other student needs.</em></td>
<td><em>Some goals are appropriate for the student population; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences or their</em></td>
<td><em>Most of the goals are appropriate for the student population; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences or other student needs.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Goals are not aligned with national state or local standards.</em></td>
<td><em>Some goals are aligned with national, state or local standards</em></td>
<td><em>Most of the goals are aligned with national, state or local standards.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Content and methods of assessment lack congruence with learning goals or lack cognitive complexity.</em></td>
<td><em>Some of the learning goals are assessed through the assessment plan but many are not congruent with learning goals in content and cognitive complexity.</em></td>
<td><em>Each of the learning goals is assessed through the assessment plan; assessment are congruent with the learning goals in content and cognitive complexity.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The assessments contain no clear criteria for measuring student performance relative to the learning goals</em></td>
<td><em>Assessment criteria have been developed but they are not clear or are not explicitly linked to the learning goals.</em></td>
<td><em>Assessment criteria are clear and are explicitly linked to the learning goals.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The assessment plan includes only one assessment mode and does not assess students before, during and after instruction.</em></td>
<td><em>The assessment plan includes multiple modes but all are either pencil/paper based and/or do not require the integration of knowledge</em></td>
<td><em>The assessment plan includes multiple assessment modes and assesses student performance throughout the instructional sequence.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skills and reasoning ability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Candidate does not adapt assessments to meet the</td>
<td>*Candidate makes adaptations to assessments</td>
<td>*Candidate makes adaptations to assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual needs of students or these assessments</td>
<td>that are appropriate to meet the individual</td>
<td>that are appropriate to meet the individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are inappropriate.</td>
<td>needs of some students.</td>
<td>needs of most students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Candidate Performance Assessment

Name:                     Date:  Spring 2004

Activity: Learning goal and Assessment Plan  Grade:

Performance Level (U / A / T)

Acceptable
APPENDIX F.

ALUMNI SURVEY

Dear

We hope that this letter finds you well both within your personal and professional life. We hope that we hear from you and find out exactly what is going on with you.

Our Physical Education and Exercise Science major has been in existence since 1977 and we thought it would be a good idea to develop a 30 historical perspective on our graduates as well as begin a process of program evaluation from your perspective as graduates of the program. Like most educational institutions, [university] continuously evaluates its programs in an effort to maintain high quality initial licensure programs.

Our Physical Education and Exercise Science Initial Licensure program is a Nationally Recognized Program by the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE). We are proud of this recognition and would like to maintain it for the benefit of our future students and for the benefit of the P-12 children they will educate. Therefore your input is critical to accomplishing our goals.

We humbly request that you complete the enclosed survey regarding your preparation for the teaching profession. The survey has been prepared according to the NASPE Standards for teacher preparation in Physical Education and Exercise Science and aligned with the department’s Conceptual Framework. Although some received your teaching license a while ago, the NASPE Standards have always been used as the foundation for our teacher preparation program. Once we have your completed questionnaires we will be able:

1. To create an historical database that details the growth of the major over time;
2. To create an up-to-date database of program graduates;
3. To prepare a document for incoming students and present majors with information about the career paths of program graduates;

Please complete the enclosed survey and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope that has been provided. We are looking forward to hearing from you and finding out what you are doing and what you have been doing.
Sincerely,

Kathleen Manning, Ph.D.                        Jerry Schweickert, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Chair                 Associate Professor, Emeritus
Department of Education & Allied Studies      Department of Education & Allied Studies
PART I

The NASPE/AAHPERD Standards for Initial Physical Education represent an integrated approach to physical education teacher education with a focus on the performance of teacher candidates in relation to the outcomes incorporated within each standard. NASPE anticipates that beginning physical education teachers who demonstrate acceptable performance in each of the ten standards will be sufficiently able to implement curriculum and instruction related to the NASPE K-12 Physical Education Content Standards.

Listed below are the NASPE Standards. As we evaluate our program, we are requesting your input in two areas: in the first column please let us know how well the University prepared you, and in the second column please provide your impression of the importance of this standard in your profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NASPE Standards</th>
<th>Degree of preparation from Univ.</th>
<th>Level of Importance in Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1= Very well; 3= Somewhat; 5= Very poorly</td>
<td>1= High; 3= Adequate; 5= Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5

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.

1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5

Standard 3: Diverse Students – Physical education teachers understand how individuals differ in their approaches to learning and create appropriate instruction adapted to these differences.

1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5

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.

1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 7: Student Assessment – Physical education teachers understand and use assessment to foster physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development of students in physical activity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 8: Reflection – Physical education teachers are reflective practitioners who evaluate the effects of their actions on others (e.g., students, parents/guardians, and fellow professionals) and seek opportunities to grow professionally.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 9: Technology – Physical education teachers use information technology to enhance learning and to enhance personal and professional productivity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 10: Collaboration – Physical education teachers foster relationships with colleagues, parents/guardians, and community agencies to support students’ growth and well-being.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Strength: (What were the aspects of your initial licensure program at the University that best prepared you for your work as a teacher?)

Areas in need of improvement and/or change: (What aspects of your initial licensure program were less helpful (or missing) in preparing you for your work as a teacher?)

**PART 2**

146
Background Information

Your answers will be combined with the answers of other graduates. Your specific answers are confidential and will not be shared with anyone else.

1. What teacher preparation program did you complete at the University and in what semester/year?
   - Undergraduate
   - Post-baccalaureate semester:______________ year:_______________
   - School-Based M.ED

2. How many total years have you taught since graduation? _____________

3. Gender: ____ Female  ____ Male

4. Please check the terms that best describe your current school or most recent past school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>School Location</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>School Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Child</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0–200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Private / Independent</td>
<td>200–400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Parochial / Religious</td>
<td>400–600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Are you currently teaching?
   - YES, you are currently teaching:
     Current School: ________________________
     Years teaching at this school: _____________
   - NO, you are NOT currently teaching:
     How many years have it been since you last taught: _____________
     Are you currently employed?
     - Yes, outside the Allied Health Field
     - Yes, Within the Allied Health Field
     - No
     What is your primary reason for leaving the teaching field?
     - Financial
     - Lack of Preparation
     - Lack of Interest
☐ Relocation
☐ Lack of employment
☐ Family Interests
☐ Additional education
☐ Lack of Administrator’s support
☐ Other ________________________________

Please provide a brief response to the following prompts. Use the back of this sheet if necessary. Consider either your current position or a previous teaching position.

6. To what extent have you impacted your students’ learning? Please provide a specific example or two. (i.e. proficiency test performance, behavior changes, etc.)

7. Have you received any awards or other types of recognition from your school or district?

8. Have you taken on any leadership roles in your school or district (i.e. team leader, committee work, etc.)? Please briefly explain.

9. Have you been involved in any service activities? If so, please provide a brief explanation.

10. Have you pursued graduate coursework or a graduate degree? If so, please provide information about where you are studying and your program of study.
OPTIONAL INFORMATION

Name: ______________________________________________________________

Address: ______________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your responses!