



Brigham Young University
Educator Preparation Program

Educator Disposition Assessment

(EDA)

Academic Year 2019–2020

Developed by

Educational Dispositional Assessment Consultants, LLC
(Gina Almerico, Ph.D., Pattie Johnston, Ph.D., Adrienne Wilson, Ed.D.)

Educator Disposition Assessment

EDA Technical Guide

Gina Almerico, Ph.D., Pattie Johnston, Ph.D., Adrienne Wilson, Ed.D.

2017

Copyright 2017 Almerico, Johnston, Wilson

Educator Disposition Assessment

Contents

Introduction.....	2
<i>Purpose of Assessing Disposition.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Administration.....</i>	<i>3</i>
Suggested Implementation Timeline.....	4
<i>Timeline Example.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Suggested Points of Assessment.....</i>	<i>8</i>
Introducing Dispositions to Students.....	12
<i>Informing Candidates about the EDA.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Suggested Intervention/Remediation</i>	<i>12</i>
Glossary of Terms.....	16
<i>Psychometric terms.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>General Dispositional Terms.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Dispositional Relevant Construct Elaboration.....</i>	<i>18</i>
Description of Psychometric Evaluation.....	23
<i>Validity.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Inter-rater Reliability.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Additional Evidence of Construct Validity.....</i>	<i>26</i>
References.....	27
List of Illustrative Film Examples for Classroom Use.....	29

Introduction

Purpose of Assessing Dispositions

A fundamental task of teacher education programs is that of tracking, monitoring, and assessing candidate performance as they progress through their studies in coursework and clinical experiences. In recent years, in part because of external accreditation requirements, teacher education programs have been charged with the responsibility of assessing more than their candidates knowledge and skills in teaching. The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) accreditation process as well as that of state departments of education and other professional organizations requires teacher preparation programs to develop appropriate assessment devices to measure and document candidate dispositions. Because of this requirement, teacher education programs are exploring what is meant by dispositions and investigating how they can be used and assessed (Almerico, Johnston, Henriott, & Shapiro, 2010).

Borko, Liston, and Whitcomb (2007) explained that dispositions are a person's tendencies to act in a given manner and are predictive of patterns of action. Villegas (2007) concurred with this definition and contended that dispositions are an individual's inclination to act in a particular way under particular circumstances based on personal beliefs. She suggested an inclination or tendency implies a pattern of behavior that is predictive of future actions. Therefore, dispositions that candidates' demonstrate as they perform in either the college classroom or the field are likely to continue into their classrooms when they begin teaching. To gain full depiction of a candidates teaching effectiveness, all aspects of the teaching act must be considered. Not only must teachers possess content and pedagogical knowledge and skills, they must deliver instruction in a manner which results in positive learning impact. Sanders and Rivers (1996) contended that teacher quality, to include the knowledge, skills and dispositions of that individual, is a crucial indicator of a student's performance in school. Taylor and Wasicsko (2000) concluded a strong relationship exists between teacher effectiveness and teacher dispositions. They found that a substantial amount of research showed the attitudes, ideals, and principles teachers held regarding their students, teaching, and themselves, strongly influenced their impact on student learning and development. Wilkerson (2006) suggested that ultimately, dispositions are actually more important than knowledge and skills in the act of teaching.

Notar, Riley, Taylor, Thornburg, and Cargill (2009) suggested that a strong correlation exists between the dispositions of teachers and the quality of their students' learning. It is necessary for future teachers to learn that teachers who care about their students and are willing to exert the effort needed to ensure the classroom is a productive learning environment, have

characteristics that may not be measured as possession of pedagogical knowledge and skills. These teachers, through their actions and demeanor, are demonstrating effective teaching dispositions (Almerico, Johnston, Henriott, & Shapiro, 2010). As the key role model in the classroom, they have a significant chance to affect the positive development of the children they teach. This impact is made through both the content of their instruction and the quality of their social interactions and relationships with their students (Hamre & Pianta, 2001; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Brackett & Rivers 2014).

Administration

The Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA) instrument was designed with careful consideration of the psychometric properties associated with informal assessment so that any inferences made about a teacher's disposition are more likely to be true. Psychometric evaluation efforts were made that far extend expectations associated with informal assessments. The effort was done grounded in a sincere attempt to try to clear any confusion about the expectations so that growth in dispositions may be enhanced during coursework and subsequent clinical experience. The instrument is intended to be used at multiple points in the program to track and monitor candidate dispositions that are associated with positive learning impact of P-12 students. Disposition categories are aligned with InTASC Standards (2013) and the works of Danielson et.al. (2009) and Marzano and Brown (2009).

The suggested checkpoints for when the survey is to be administered during the preparation program are identified in the Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA) Timeline table found below and can be customized to any teacher preparation program. The checkpoints provide systematic review of student dispositions as they progress through the program. At any time, however, the survey is available to faculty, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and other professional educators who feel the need to share professional insight regarding the disposition of the student.

The EDA instrument is used to both raise concerns and identify exemplary dispositional behavior of students as they progress through a program. It can be used initially to inform teacher candidates of a program's dispositional expectations and to assess baseline dispositional data and then used as candidates' progress through programs to document when changes have occurred in dispositions and under what set of circumstances. Candidates are expected to demonstrate the dispositions identified on the EDA in coursework and in the field.

Informal disposition assessment prior to program admission (recommended as a part of the timeline) provides the teacher candidates with the opportunity to reflect on their individual dispositions and a chance to alter behaviors based on the reflection. The EDA can then also

serve as a teaching point for students because they will have a better grasp on expectations once exposed to the assessments.

Assessment before admission to an education program provides the Education department/school/college a chance to respond to any students who have low ratings on one or more dispositions. The department/school/college may elect to implement an intervention/remediation process and plan for those students receiving low ratings in hopes of avoiding larger issues in the future.

Assessment in the final phase of internships allows university education programs to collect data regarding the effectiveness of the assessment and remediation. Scores from an initial assessment could be compared with scores from final internship data to determine effectiveness and dispositional growth.

Suggested Implementation Timeline

It is recommended that education majors’ dispositions are formally rated by education faculty at regular intervals during their studies as detailed in the table below.

EDUCATOR DISPOSITION ASSESSMENT TIMELINE

Timeframe/Program Point	Task
Freshman Year Semester 1	Introductory Education Course: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce the Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA) instrument to the students. • Conduct discussions about professional dispositions and how they impact school/class climate/culture and P-12 student learning (see references for resources related to this topic). • Use film clips from popular films related to teaching to demonstrate examples and non-examples of dispositions (see suggested list in Table 2 for reference in this document). • Students self-assess using the EDA instrument in class to familiarize themselves with program dispositional expectations – the self-assessment is conducted in the program’s electronic data management system where the data can be reviewed and analyzed programmatically by institutions in relation to their goals for continuous

	<p>improvement. The self-evaluation is essential because it allows teacher candidates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ think about their own views about their dispositions, ○ reflect on factors that have influenced their views and behaviors; ○ consider how prepared they are to embrace what research tells us is needed for success in the profession. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Using the same instrument, the professor evaluates each education major to provide feedback to students on perceived strengths and areas that can be improved upon throughout the program. This first disposition assessment is to be considered a trial form which can be kept in the student’s departmental file/posted to the electronic data management system. An additional purpose of conducting this assessment is to inform education majors of its existence and use in the program (Almerico, 2011). Candidates are expected to demonstrate the dispositions identified on the EDA in coursework and in the field.
Freshman-Sophomore Year	<p>Second Education Course:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Students read, analyze, and reflect on the research related to teacher dispositions (see references for resources related to this topic). More readings specifically suited to this task are found in <i>Evidence-Based Solutions – Strategic Strategies for Developing/Improving Teacher Dispositions</i> developed by the EDA research team). ● In class, students will engage in simulations, student roleplaying, and participating in skits focused on dispositions. Research confirms this type of activity promotes the development of dispositions in teacher candidates (Nixon, Dam & Packard, 2010; Brewer, Lindquist & Altemueller, 2011, Rock & Levin, 2002; Castle, Fox, & Souder, 2006; as cited in Singh, 2006). ● Effective techniques for developing and improving candidate dispositions are found in <i>Evidence-Based Solutions – Strategic Strategies for Developing/Improving Teacher Dispositions</i> developed by the EDA research team and available for institutions to use in their programs.
Admission into the Department of	Applicants are required to read and sign a statement as part of their admission paperwork into the teacher education program acknowledging the use and purpose of the EDA. If students in the

<p>Education Teacher Preparation Programs</p>	<p>education major have participated in formal supervised field experiences, simulations, or peer teaching prior to program admission, it is appropriate to use the EDA as a component of the application process. In this case, supervising faculty would be selected by the EPP to evaluate applicant's dispositions.</p> <p>It is suggested that multiple evaluators (at least 2) complete the EDA at admission – so that the applicant's dispositional competence is seen from different perspectives and that it should be acceptable from those different angles.</p>
<p>Senior Year Semester 1-At the onset of the semester</p>	<p>The Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA) instrument is included for review as part of the intern application. The EDA form must be completed by an Education faculty who taught the candidate in the course selected by the institution in the Junior year. Candidates must earn a rating of "1" or higher to be eligible for the final internship. If a candidate earns a "0" on any disposition/indicator, he/she will meet with an educator review committee for a formal interview with results of that conversation documented in the candidate's file. Based on the interview, the review committee will: 1) deny entry into the final internship, 2) allow the candidate to move into the final internship with conditions where the candidate must participate in intervention and remediation (with a documented intervention/remediation plan), or 3) fully admit the candidate into the final internship. In instances where the internship is denied or conditionally approved, it is recommended the candidate come before the review committee for further discussion of the survey and interview results.</p>
<p>Senior Year Semester 1 – At the completion of the practicum experience prior to the final internship</p>	<p>The practicum professor who oversees the field experience one semester prior to the final internship completes the Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA) instrument at the completion of the practicum experience. Candidates must earn a rating of "1" or higher to move into the final internship. If a candidate earns a "0" on any disposition/indicator, he/she is referred to an educator review committee.</p> <p>Options for the candidate at this point include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dismissal from the program, • Repeating the practicum/enrollment in an intervention and remediation course; • Enrolling in the final internship/enrollment in an intervention/remediation course.

Throughout the student's tenure as an education major

Faculty, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and other professional educators may submit the EDA at any time to the Department Chair/administrator if there are dispositional concerns about a student. If the student/candidate earns a rating of "0" on any disposition/indicator, he/she is referred to an educator review committee.

When this occurs, it is recommended:

- The student/candidate receives written notification of the survey's receipt,
- The student/candidate is offered the option of viewing the survey results,
- The student/candidate is required to meet with an educator review committee where the disposition survey results are discussed (the candidate is permitted to invite an advocate to attend the meeting),
- The student/candidate is required to participate in some form of remediation/intervention which is documented on an appropriate form kept in the student's/candidate's file.

If the student/candidate dispositions fail to improve, the Department Chair/administrator/educator review committee have the option of dismissing the individual from the program.

The EDA data per student/candidate is entered into the electronic data management system by the College/School/Department of Education staff assistant at admission (if appropriate) and with the intern application. The EDA can be used by faculty, adjuncts, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors at any point in the candidate's progression through the program. When this is the case, the candidate is notified, completed EDA is submitted the program administrator and entered into the electronic data management system by the staff assistant.

In the CAEP Evidence Guide, the CAEP Data Task Force recommended teacher training programs consider specific data improvement efforts. Among those recommendations is the use of common assessments. The EDA can be offered as a common disposition assessment to providers who purchase this tool. CAEP acknowledges that the use of a common assessment, such as the EDA can serve as an anchor measure that would permit data to be compared annually across peers, cohorts, institutions, states, regions, and countries. Institutions have the option of working with the EDA developers who will conduct a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) which tests for statistical significance in three or more vectors of means to provide a

comparative analysis of the data. For instance, if on the average University “A” students have a rating of 1.5/2.0 and University “B” students have a rating of 2.0/2.0 per disposition we can:

1. Tell if it is a statistically significant difference, and
2. If it is statistically significant, the institutions will use the data to figure out why.

Institutions also have the option of having a comparative analysis calculated with “like” universities or they can compare how candidates (by cohort) performed from one year to the next. Analyses could extend the statistical investigation by providing overall university means by each of the 9 dispositions.

Another option includes the generation of an annual data report to all EDA users so that institutions can conduct comparisons to external references (which CAEP defines as a responsibility for quality assurance) to use in decision making and informed evidence-based continuous improvement.

The EDA data is easily disaggregated to identify underlying patterns of behavior at the individual and program levels.

Example of How the EDA Can Be Implemented in a Teacher Education Program

Suggested Points of Assessment

The following is an explanation of additional checkpoints across programs in the assessment system used in a mid-size university.

Once an applicant is admitted into the teacher preparation program it is recommended that the provider has a planned sequence of assessments for candidate performance on standards-based content and competencies and professional dispositions demonstrated in field/clinical experiences and in coursework which is reported here as part of the assessment system. There are four (4) checkpoints built into the management system used in this example for undergraduate programs. The institution’s education department’s management system consists of advisory committees to the Chair who are charged with making recommendations for program improvement, management, and change. The tasks assigned to the advisory committees reflect departmental needs and State Continued Program Approval Standards. Each committee has a committee chair and consists of 3 to 4 department faculty members. The primary function of the Admission, Retention, and Dismissal /Candidate Performance (ARD/CP) Committee in the checkpoint information below is to discuss and recommend courses of action in cases of candidates who fail to:

- meet program admission requirements,
- progress once in the program at an acceptable level on Critical Performance Assessment Tasks as documented on rubric in the data-based management system and/Practicum Evaluations,

- display acceptable dispositions in the classroom or field settings;
- succeed in the intervention/remediation course EDU 380, Professional Development.

Check Point One

Point in Program: Junior 1 (J1) – Near the end of the first semester of the candidate’s junior year

Assessed by: Admission, Retention, and Dismissal /Candidate Performance (ARD/CP) Committee (a candidate performance review committee) with recommendations made to the Department Chair

Data Assessed: Practicum I Evaluation, Candidate Critical Performance Assessment Tasks uploaded to the electronic data management system, Disposition Assessment (if assessment is submitted)

Assessment Instrument: Candidate Intervention/Remediation Plan

Results of Assessment:

Candidate is recommended to continue in program,

Candidate is referred to the Department Chair for intervention/remediation

The Admission, Retention, and Dismissal/Candidate Performance (ARD/CP) Committee offers recommendations for intervention/remediation

The Admission, Retention, and Dismissal/Candidate Performance (ARD/CP) Committee and the faculty member teaching EDU 380 Professional Development then work on an intervention/remediation plan as documented in the Candidate Intervention/Remediation Plan form; paperwork is filed in departmental file and a copy is sent to the education advisor

Candidates needing intervention/remediation enroll in EDU 380 Professional Development and work one-on one with unit faculty for intervention/remediation the next semester

Check Point Two

Point in Program: Junior 2(J2) – Near the end of the second semester of the candidate’s junior year

Assessed by: Admission, Retention, and Dismissal/Candidate Performance (ARD/CP) Committee with recommendations to the Department Chair

Data Assessed: Practicum II Evaluation, Candidate Critical Performance Assessment Tasks uploaded to the electronic data management system, Disposition Assessment (EDA) (if assessment is submitted)

Assessment Instrument: Candidate Intervention/Remediation Plan

Results of Assessment:

Candidate is recommended to continue in program

Candidate is referred to the Department Chair for intervention/remediation

The Admission, Retention, and Dismissal/Candidate Performance (ARD/CP) Committee offers recommendations for intervention/remediation

The Admission, Retention, and Dismissal/Candidate Performance (ARD/CP) Committee and the faculty member teaching EDU 380 Professional Development then work on an intervention/remediation plan as documented in the Candidate Intervention/Remediation Plan form; paperwork is filed in departmental file and a copy is sent to the education advisor

Candidates needing intervention/remediation enroll in EDU 380 Professional Development and work one-on one with unit faculty for intervention/remediation the next semester

Check Point Three

Point in Program: Senior 1 (S1) – In the week after exam week at the end of the first semester of the senior year

Assessed by: Admission, Retention, and Dismissal/Candidate Performance (ARD/CP) Committee with recommendations made to the Department Chair

Data Assessed: Practicum III Evaluation, Candidate Critical Performance Assessment Tasks uploaded to the electronic data management system, Disposition Assessment (EDA) (assessment is submitted as part of the intern application/Practicum III professor evaluation at semester end including the EDA)

Assessment Instrument: Practicum IV Intern Practicum Document Checklist (completed by the Elementary Education or Secondary/K-12 Intern Coordinator) and the Candidate Intervention/Remediation Plan

Results of Assessment:

Candidate is recommended to continue in program

Candidate is referred to the Department Chair for intervention/remediation or drop

The Admission, Retention, and Dismissal/Candidate Performance (ARD/CP) Committee offers recommendations for intervention/remediation

The Admission, Retention, and Dismissal/Candidate Performance (ARD/CP) Committee and the faculty member teaching EDU 380 Professional Development then work on an intervention/remediation plan as documented in the Candidate Intervention/Remediation Plan form; paperwork is filed in departmental file and a copy is sent to the education advisor

Candidates needing intervention/remediation enroll in EDU 380 Professional Development and work one-on one with unit faculty for intervention/remediation the next semester

Check Point Four "A"

Point in Program: Senior 2 (S2) – Near the mid semester of the candidate's final internship in the second semester of the senior year

Assessed by: Elementary Education or Secondary/K-12 Intern Coordinator, the Clinical Education Committee, the Director of Educator Preparation Programs, and the Chair (If the

candidate demonstrates the need for intervention/assistance, he/she will meet with the/Candidate Performance [ARD/CP] Committee at this time)

Data Assessed: Practicum IV Midterm Evaluation, Disposition Assessment (EDA) (if additional assessment is submitted after the admission requirement/intern application/Practicum III professor evaluation)

Results of Assessment:

Candidate is recommended to continue in program

After seven weeks of the internship, if a student has earned unacceptable ratings on more than 50% of the state/InTASC standard indicators on the midterm evaluation form, the intern will be referred by the Elementary Education or Secondary/K-12 Intern Coordinator to the Clinical Education Committee to consider an intervention/remediation plan. The Clinical Education Committee and the Elementary Education or Secondary/K-12 Intern Coordinator will develop an intervention/remediation plan and then the intern, cooperating teacher, and Elementary Education or Secondary/K-12 Intern Coordinator will meet to review the plan and take the necessary action required. If the intern fails to fulfill the intervention/remediation plan as prescribed by the committee, a grade of "Incomplete" or an "F" will be assigned by the Elementary Education or Secondary/K-12 Intern Coordinator for the final internship.

The internship will be repeated, when appropriate, the following semester. In the case where it is no longer viable to continue the internship (due to any number of circumstances) the intern will be removed from the experience and may be offered the option to repeat the internship in following semester.

Check Point Four "B"

Point in Program: Senior 2 (S2) –At the end of the candidate's final internship in the second semester of the senior year

Assessed by: Elementary Education or Secondary/K-12 Intern Coordinator, the Clinical Education Committee, the Director of Educator Preparation Programs, and the Chair

Data Assessed: Practicum IV Final Evaluation/Danielson Evaluation, Reading Practicum Evaluation, and all other data as documented on the Individual Program Completion Record

Results of Assessment:

Candidate is cleared to graduate from the program, paperwork is filed in departmental file and a copy is sent to the education advisor

Candidates who have failed to meet graduating requirements, such as failing to successfully pass the state teacher licensure exam will earn a grade of "I" or incomplete are will not be eligible to graduate from the institution. Once all requirements are fulfilled, a passing grade will be issued.

Informing Candidates about the Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA):

Teacher Education majors are informed of the use and purpose of the EDA in coursework prior to admission into the teacher education program, in the student handbook, and in other materials published by the college/school/department. Candidates are aware that the dispositions identified on the EDA are categorized descriptions of teacher behavior that affect positive influence in the professional setting and promote gains in P-12 student learning. They are aware that a score of "0" on any disposition indicates insufficient demonstration of a given dispositional trait. The first exposure to the EDA is in the introductory education course with subsequent discussions and activities regarding dispositions and their importance in the classroom.

The application into the program requires applicants read and sign the following statement:

Application Statement

Applicants are asked to sign this statement indicating they understand and accept the content and purpose of the EDA:

The applicant acknowledges that dispositions identified in The Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA) apply to the university setting, courses, early practicum experiences, and the final internship. The applicant recognizes that a strong correlation exists between the dispositions of teachers and the quality of their students' learning. The applicant knows that teachers who care about their students and are willing to exert the effort needed to ensure the classroom is a productive learning environment, possess the professional dispositions outlined in the EDA. The applicant is aware his/her professional dispositions will be assessed throughout the teacher education program and will have a bearing on decisions made regarding eligibility to complete in a successful manner.

Applicant signature: _____

Candidate Intervention/Remediation

It is recommended candidates who demonstrate insufficient development of professional dispositions participate in intervention/remediation. The following statement may be included in the application and student handbook:

The candidate who fails to meet any state mandated candidate performance assessment benchmark and fails to evidence acceptable mastery of any identified element of the state and national standards or who receives an unacceptable dispositional rating in the EDA is referred to the Department Chair/Administrator and then the educator review committee for intervention/remediation. The committee will recommend specific candidate interventions

intended to help the candidate achieve the expected targets and benchmarks. Intervention/remediation activities may include, but are not limited to, reduced course load, audit of same course, and guided study. Intervention/remediation always requires enrollment in a zero to three (0-3) credit hour course: Professional Development.

The evaluation of dispositions must include performance feedback to students when issues or concerns are raised followed with an intervention/remediation plan for professional development. Implementation of the EDA helps teacher preparation programs identify dispositional strengths and weaknesses of teacher candidates at the individual and aggregate levels and can provide data-based evidence for professional development, curriculum impact, and programmatic change. It is recommended providers implement within their management system, an educator review committee where faculty are charged with the responsibility of reviewing EDA's submitted indicating issues with student dispositions. It is also recommended a formal structure for intervention/remediation is developed as part of the management system. For instance, an intervention/remediation course (offered for 0-3 credits hours) could be required for any candidate in need of dispositional development. An example of a candidate intervention/remediation plan is found below:

Candidate Intervention/Remediation Plan

The form is completed by the professor working with the candidate in the intervention/remediation course (EDU 380 Professional Development). Completed forms are submitted to the Department Chair and are then placed in the candidate's departmental file. A copy is to be sent to the education faculty advisor.

Candidate: _____ Major: _____ Date: _____

Candidate Intervention/Remediation

The candidate who fails to meet any CAEP/state mandated candidate performance assessment benchmark and fails to evidence acceptable mastery of any identified element of the state standards and the associated indicators/InTASC Standards at the accomplished or exemplary level, or fails to demonstrate acceptable performance of dispositions is referred to the Admission, Retention, and Dismissal (ARD) Committee for intervention/remediation. The Department Chair and committee will recommend specific candidate interventions/remediation intended to help the candidate achieve the expected targets and benchmarks. Intervention/remediation always requires enrollment in a zero - three (0-3) credit hour course: EDU 380 Professional Development. The candidate requiring intervention/remediation will receive an Incomplete (I) grade in the course where the weakness is demonstrated and will receive a letter grade once the critical candidate performance assessment task is satisfactorily completed in EDU 380. If the critical task is not satisfactorily completed the candidate will earn a Failing (F) grade in the course and must repeat the course/practicum. Dispositions are assessed throughout the program of

study. If a candidate is referred due to dispositional concerns, he/she is required to participate in some form of intervention/remediation which is documented on this form and kept in the student's/candidate's file. If the student/candidate dispositions fail to improve, the Department Chair/administrator/educator review committee have the option of dismissing the individual from the program.

Reason for Intervention/Remediation (check all that apply):

_____ State/InTASC Standards Not Met:

Comments _____

_____ Academic Progress:

Comments _____

_____ Dispositions:

Comments _____

_____ Other:

Comments _____

Intervention/Remediation Plan:

Please list the State/InTASC Standards not met, if appropriate.

I have read and understand the Candidate Intervention/Remediation Plan and its full implications regarding my continued progress in the Teacher Education Program at the University.

Candidate's Signature: _____ Date: _____

EDU 380 Faculty Signature: _____ Date: _____

Faculty Issuing Rating Leading to Remediation Signature: _____ Date: _____

End of semester outcomes/results of intervention/remediation (check all that apply):

_____ Candidate failed to meet requirements of the State/InTASC Standards at an acceptable level:

Comments

_____ Candidate met requirements of the State/InTASC Standards at an acceptable level:

Comments

____ Candidate failed to fulfill academic/dispositional progress goals:

Comments

____ Candidate fulfilled academic/dispositional progress goals:

Comments

____ Other:

Comments

Faculty Follow Through:

____ Candidate critical task is re-uploaded to data-base system and re-graded to indicate acceptable performance

____ Candidate grade is changed from an "I" in the original course to the earned grade

____ Candidate grade for EDU 380/680 is entered

Plan of Action:

____ Candidate progresses in the Teacher Education Program

____ Candidate is dismissed from the Teacher Education Program

Additional Comments:

EDU 380 Faculty

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Faculty Issuing Rating Leading to Remediation Signature: _____ Date: _____

Glossary of Terms

Psychometric Terms

Q-Sort: The systematic study of participant viewpoints. Q-methodology is used to investigate the perspectives of participants who represent different stances on an issue, by having participants rank and sort a series of statements.

Construct Validity: Validity that refers to the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of test scores entailed by proposed uses of tests. The process of validation involves accumulating evidence to provide a sound basis for the proposed score interpretation. Validation may be viewed as developing a sound argument to support the intended interpretation of test scores (AERA, APA, NCME, 2014).

Inter-rater Reliability: Inter-rater reliability is a statistical measure that determines the level of consistency in rank ordering of ratings across raters. It yields a quantitative score specifying how much consensus exists in the ratings provided by raters. The rater is an individual who is assessing or scoring a particular behavior, performance, or skill. The inter-rater reliability score indicates how similar the data collected by different raters are (AERA, APA, NCME, 2014).

Predictive Validity: Predictive validity refers to evidence which indicates how accurately task or test data collected at one time predicts criterion scores obtained at a later time (AERA, APA, NCME, 2014).

Other Terms

Candidate: Pre-service teacher in a teacher preparation program.

Dispositions: Attitudes, beliefs, commitments, ethics, and values (Diez & Raths, 2007; INTASC, 1992; Katz & Raths, 1985; NCATE, 2000; Taylor & Wasicsko, 2000; Thompson, Ransdell, & Rousseau, 2005; Thornton, 2006) towards students, families, colleagues and the community (NCATE, 2000). They can be described as innate qualities (Taylor & Wasicsko, 2000) or ways of behaving (Arnstine, 1967; Katz and Raths, 1985; Ritchhart, 2002). Teachers' ways of behaving vary depending on the circumstance. The quality of the behavior may be repeatable, but the response to any given situation is not" (Arnstine, 1967; as cited in Diez & Raths, 2007). Ritchhart attests that these behaviors are not automatic (2002, as cited in Diez & Raths). Katz and Raths label these behaviors as "habits of mind, not mindless habits" (1985, as cited in Diez & Raths, 2007).

EDA: The Educator Disposition Assessment (Almerico, Johnston, & Wilson, 2017) instrument used to measure dispositions in pre-service teachers.

Educator Review Committee: A committee who recommends specific candidate interventions intended to help the candidate achieve an acceptable/satisfactory level of performance on the critical candidate performance assessment tasks. Remediation activities may include, but are not limited to, reduced course load, audit of same course, and guided study. It is recommended that intervention/remediation requires enrollment in a zero (0) to three (3) credit course: Professional Development.

InTASC Standards: The principles set forth by the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (2011) with the purpose of describing the attributes, skills, and competencies needed by teachers for learners in the 21st century. See Appendix A for the specific list of indicators for dispositions.

Internship Experience: Experiences where a teacher candidate participates in student teaching in a classroom setting with a mentor teacher, often referred to as a cooperating teacher. In this study, this definition includes both the practicum experience and student teaching.

Cooperating Teacher: The designated licensed and experienced teacher who works with a teacher candidate. This person mentors, coaches, guides, and evaluates the candidate throughout the internship experience.

Live Text/Taskstream/TK20: A browser-based e-portfolio and assessment management web application. The management system is used to track candidate performance throughout the program.

CAEP: The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation whose mission is to advance outstanding educator preparation through evidence-based accreditation that guarantees excellence and promotes continuous improvement to strengthen P-12 student learning.

Criterion of Measure

Likert Scale: The Likert Scale is used to assess the variable of dispositions from among a range of potential responses as indicated below.

Needs Improvement: A dispositional measure indicating minimal evidence of understanding and commitment to the disposition.

Developing: A dispositional measure indicating some evidence of understanding and commitment to the disposition.

Meets Expectations: A dispositional measure indicating considerable evidence of understanding and commitment to the disposition.

Danielson: *Danielson's Framework for Teaching* (www.teachscape.com/solutions/higher-education/framework-for-teaching.html) was developed in 1996 in conjunction with a project with Educational Testing Services (ETS) focused on the assessment of preservice and beginning teachers. The framework combines research-based best practices and contains four domains that represent effective teacher practice. Each domain consists of multiple components (22 components in all) which are assessed across a four-point scale, from unsatisfactory to distinguished. *Danielson's Frameworks for Teaching* is intended to provide a valid tool for defining effective teaching. The evaluation has been adapted or adopted and is used by school districts across the country as a measure of teacher effectiveness.

Marzano: *Marzano's Observational Protocol* (www.marzanoevaluation.com) is a research-based teacher evaluation tool developed over 40 years of research on teaching and learning that identifies the causal connections between teaching practices and student achievement. Marzano's protocol includes four domains which includes multiple elements (for a total of 60 elements) that are assessed on a five-point scale, from not using to innovating. Marzano's teacher evaluation model is used by school districts across the country as a measure of teacher effectiveness.

Disposition Indicators and Associated Behaviors

Oral Communication:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- **Demonstrates strong professional oral communication skills as evidenced by using appropriate language, grammar, and word choice for the learning environment**
- **Varies oral communication as evidenced by encouraging participatory behaviors**
- **Communicates at an age appropriate level as evidenced by explaining content specific vocabulary**

Communication is a complex process. When it is effective, students and the teacher benefit. Good oral communication can enhance and expand learning, help students accomplish goals, strengthen the student-teacher relationship, and create a generally positive experience. Effective communication entails establishing a classroom climate where all students may hear what is being said and have the opportunity to respond, speaking clearly with modulated intonation and at an appropriate rate, and using words which the students should be able to understand. Effective communication includes sharing information and receiving regular feedback from the listeners. Through optimal discourse teachers can ascertain whether the listeners actually understand what they are trying to convey.

Effective communicators possess the ability to attend to the body language of their students determining when they are bored or confused. The teacher's body language, a type of communication that is usually subconscious, is easily read by students. It is important to express confidence, kindness, and enthusiasm to students.

Written Communication:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- **Communicates respectfully and positively with all stakeholders as evidenced by fostering conventional responses**
- **Demonstrates precise spelling and grammar**

Effective written communication entails possessing the ability to demonstrate command of the English language while engaging in a range of contexts and for a variety of different audiences and purposes.

This includes the ability to tailor writing to a particular audience, using appropriate styles and approaches. Teachers must be able to express themselves in writing in a manner where recipients understand the message in a receptive rather than defensive way. Written correspondence must be delivered clearly and with tact.

Professionalism:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- **Responds promptly to communications and submits all assignments**
- **Consistently exhibits punctuality and attendance**
- **Maintains professional boundaries of ethical standards of practice**
- **Keeps inappropriate personal life issues out of classroom/workplace**
- **Functions as a collaborative group member as evidenced by high levels of participation towards productive outcomes**

Brehm et.al. (2006) suggested that professionalism can be divided into the three categories; 1) professional parameters, 2) professional behaviors, and 3) professional responsibilities. The first category, professional parameters, deals with the legal and ethical rules educators must follow such as the Code of Professional Conduct delineated by state boards of education. Other examples include local, state, and federal laws pertaining to educational and instructional issues. Professional behaviors include observable actions such as, developing and maintaining positive relationships with administrators, colleagues, parents, and students; modeling the appearance and attitudes of a professional educator, and being reliable and dependable.

Professional responsibilities include active involvement of one's professional association, volunteering for school or community functions and attending school events.

Positive Attitude:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- **Demonstrates an appropriately positive affect with students as evidenced by verbal and non-verbal cues**
- **Actively seeks solutions to problems without prompting or complaining**
- **Tries new ideas/activities that are suggested**

An attitude is regarded as a positive or negative point of view that shapes one's perspectives, thought processes, and behaviors. According to Souza and Marcos (2010), attitude determines what each individual will see, hear, think and do and can be positive or negative. It is very clear that a teacher's way of thinking guides his or her actions inside and outside the classroom. While teachers should be competent in their knowledge of content and pedagogy, it is also equally important that teachers understand the impact of possessing a positive attitude within the constructs of teaching and learning. Research suggests that the positivity of a classroom teacher can have a significant impact on the academic success of students. In the words of noted scholar, philosopher, and educator, Haim Ginnot (1993):

"I've come to a frightening conclusion that I am the decisive element in the classroom. It's my personal approach that creates the climate. It's my daily mood that makes the weather. As a teacher, I possess a tremendous power to make a child's life miserable or joyous. I can be a tool of torture or an instrument of inspiration. I can humiliate or heal. In all situations, it is my response that decides whether a crisis will be escalated or de-escalated and a child humanized or dehumanized."

Preparedness:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- **Accepts constructive feedback as evidenced by implementation of feedback as needed**
- **Learns and adjusts from experience and reflection as evidenced by improvements in performance**
- **Comes to class planned and with all needed materials**
- **Alters lessons in progress when needed as evidenced by ability to change plan mid-lesson to overcome the deficits**

Effective teaching begins with effective planning. Such planning involves thinking about how students will engage in the learning process. Prepared teachers consider the details in their planning and make necessary adjustments along the way, therefore requiring flexibility and responsiveness throughout each teaching and learning experience. Positive dispositional characteristics in the area of preparedness also include thinking with the end in mind or “backward design”. Effective teachers are those who prepare for instruction based on desired goals and outcomes.

Appreciation of and value for cultural and academic diversity:

- **Embraces all diversities as evidenced by implementing inclusive activities and behaviors with goals of transcendence**
- **Creates a safe classroom with zero tolerance of negativity to others as evidenced by correcting negative student behaviors**

Possessing an appreciation and value for cultural and academic diversity requires a mindset of inclusivity. Culturally aware educators consider the differences of others and do not allow such diversity to dictate their actions adversely. Inclusion permeates in all areas of teaching and learning, such as instructional activities, the classroom community, and interactions with others. Additionally, the classroom environment is one in which students feel safe because the teacher has created a positive and respectful environment. In essence, teachers are to be culturally aware and responsive, which entails recognizing the importance of including students' cultural references in all aspects of learning (Ladson-Billings, 1994).

Collaboration:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- **Demonstrates flexibility as evidenced by providing considered responses and accepts majority consensus**
- **Maintains a respectful tone at all times, even during dissent as evidenced by not interrupting or talking over others**
- **Proactively shares teaching strategies as evidenced by productive collaboration**

A professional culture requires teachers who are willing to share, support, and explore together. Developing a collaborative culture will result in reducing teacher attrition, improving student learning, and creating the type of school that everyone searches for when they decide to become an educator. Studies show that when teachers collaborate, students perform better. However successful collaboration begins with possessing certain dispositional qualities and behaviors. Collaboration requires an openness to give and receive feedback coupled with a

willingness to grow professionally. True collaboration also involves mutual respect in order to work towards a common goal.

Self-Regulation:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- **Recognizes own weaknesses as evidenced by seeking solutions before asking for support**
- **Researches and implements most effective teaching styles as evidenced by citing works submitted**

Also referred to as self-management is the ability to effectively regulate one's thoughts, emotions and behaviors in a variety of situations. This includes the ability to manage stress, control impulses, self-motivate, and establish, pursue, and achieve personal and academic goals.

Social Emotional Learning:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- **Demonstrates appropriate maturity and self-regulation as evidenced by remaining calm when discussing sensitive issues**
- **Demonstrates perseverance and resilience (grit) as evidenced by tenacious and determined ability to persist through tough situations**
- **Demonstrates sensitivity to feelings of others as evidenced by compassionate and empathetic social awareness**

Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) skills are those abilities that promote creativity, problem solving and communication and have at their heart social interactions. The Collaborative for Academic and Social Emotional Learning (CASEL) defined SEL as the process of implementing policies and practices to teach individuals competencies and skills to assist in the development of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, making reasoned choices and developing and maintaining healthy relationships. Persons who embrace the constructs of Social Emotional Learning possess Social Emotional Competence (SEC). Research indicates teachers with SEC are better able to create nurturing, safe, and healthy classroom environments which lead to higher academic achievement (Durlak et.al. 2011).

Individuals who are aware of their emotions possess the trait of self-awareness and are better able to manage their emotions. They understand how their words and actions affect others, are able to develop and sustain good healthy relationships, and can make good, ethical decisions.

Individuals who are self-aware are more likely to have greater success in the classroom in all areas of the teaching domain.

Teachers who possess Social Emotional Competence set the tone of the classroom by creating supportive, nurturing, and caring relationships with their students. Their lessons: build on their student's strengths, promote intrinsic motivation, effectively coach students through conflict; encourage collaborative and cooperative learning. They are exemplary role models of prosocial behavior.

Prosocial behavior is a social behavior that benefit(s) other people or society as a whole, such as helping, sharing, donating, co-operating, and volunteering. Prosocial behaviors are those intended to help other people. It is behavior characterized by a concern about the rights, feelings and welfare of other people. Behaviors that can be described as prosocial include feeling empathy and concern for others and behaving in ways to help or benefit other people.

Teachers who have SEL skills are able to manage their classrooms more effectively, to teach their students better, and to cope successfully with students who are challenging. Additionally, these skills will most likely help teachers manage their own stress more effectively and to engage in problem solving more skillfully in their own lives.

Teachers who exhibit social emotional competence, have a strong sense of self and social awareness, can self-manage, know how to develop meaningful relationships, and make good, ethical decisions. Because of this, they tend to be more efficient at creating pleasant classroom learning environments. They may also be more proficient at facilitating positive interactions with peers, students, and supervisors, thus contributing to a more positive school climate and culture. Teachers possessing social emotional competence may be more unlikely to lose control, and instead be more conscious of displaying appropriate emotions. Because of this, these teachers forge better, more satisfying relationships with peers, colleagues, their principals, parents, and their students.

Finally, the classroom environment created by teachers with SEL skills is characterized by: low levels of conflict, smooth transitions, appropriate expressions of emotions, respect, and interest and focus on task (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009).

Survey Content

The EDA consists of dispositions and related indicators identified through the research and are explicitly aligned with the InTASC Standards. It is recommended institutions align their respective state standards with the InTASC standards identified in the instrument.

Psychometric Features of Sound Measures of Teacher Dispositions

A sound assessment of “teacher disposition” requires evidence of construct validity and estimates of inter-rater reliability. Specifically, the identification of the behaviors representing good dispositions and the level of agreement as to the representativeness of these behaviors by experts provides evidence of the construct validity of the measure (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014). Evidence of construct validity suggests that all appropriate dispositional behaviors are included in the measure so that the measure is actually assessing what it is reporting to assess. In the case of disposition assessment, the measure should include all indicators that represent teacher disposition and no indicators that do not represent disposition. This assurance may be evidenced by efforts made towards getting a collective agreement as to what dispositions to include. Specifically, a common method is compiling a list of all possible research-based indicators and asking experts to rate the representativeness of each one. Highly rated indicators are retained and turned into Likert items on the measure or assessment.

Once agreed upon dispositional behaviors have been identified, the indicators may still be open to subjectivity when rating. Raters/experts may agree to the factors but disagree upon or understand what is meant by each indicator. For example, what “professionalism” is to one rater may not be the same to another evaluator. Further refinement of each behavior may help raters better understand exactly what is meant by each one. In fact, professional standards suggest assessment makers estimate the likelihood of separate evaluators having similar ratings of the same teacher (AERA APA, & NCME, 2014). The level of agreement or inter-rater reliability by evaluators is estimated by calculating the correlation between ratings of the same persons between two evaluators.

Initial Development of the Educator Disposition Assessment

Informal assessment of dispositions may be particularly helpful for pre-service teachers to expedite the course of change needed to address problems associated with inappropriate attitudes and actions before and during clinical experiences (Dee & Henkin, 2002). In 2011 a team of researchers began the process of developing a disposition assessment tool to use in their teacher preparation program. The tools developed at that time have been used with much success in tracking and monitoring candidate dispositions in the programs provided (Johnston, Almerico, Henriott, & Shapiro, 2011). In 2014, a reconstructed team began the work of revisiting the original tools. The result of this effort is the creation of the Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA). The EDA is an informal assessment used prior to formal assessment to inform and clarify the implied expectations of teachers. The intent of the EDA construction was to extend typical psychometric expectations associated with informal assessments. A “light” psychometric evaluation was conducted approximating review needed for standardized tests because of the importance of providing a useful instrument for this increasingly important but amorphous construct.

Construct Validity of the EDA

Understanding the meaning of dispositions was of primary interest because of the amorphous nature of this construct. That is, it is important to get a collective understanding of dispositional meaning to provide evidence of the construct validity. The first step in providing evidence of the construct validity is asking experts to rate the level of representativeness of possible research based indicators compiled. Seventeen indicators of disposition from teacher evaluation studies were compiled to enhance the likelihood of incorporating all possible behaviors (Taylor & Wasicsko, 2000; Rike & Sharp, 2008; Notar, Riley & Taylor, 2009; Stewart & Davis, 2009). Subject Matter Experts including principals, professors, students and cooperating teachers were asked to rate the degree each possible indicator represented disposition on a five point Likert scale (N=27). A rating of one indicated the behavior did not represent disposition at all and a rating of five indicated the behavior was very representative of disposition. Mean ratings were calculated for each indicator. The result of the ratings included nine indicators of disposition with average ratings of 4.00 or higher. Eight indicators were dropped because of low mean ratings of less than 4.00.

To further assure that the descriptions/indicators were aligned with each disposition we asked SMEs from across the nation at a CAEP Conference to rate them on a 5 point Likert Scale. Results suggested all behaviors rated highly on the scale were retained and serve as the basis for verbiage in the cells.

EDA Racial Bias, Gender and Ambiguity Examination

The EDA team conducted a check for racial bias, gender and ambiguity within the measure. A group of experts (N=125) was gathered and broken into nine teams of 2 to 3 participants. They were tasked with rating the perceived bias, gender and ambiguity present in the indicator descriptions. There were two areas of concern identified. Seventy seven percent of the experts reported racial bias evident in "Oral Communication". Specifically, they noted that the use of the phrase "Standard English" in the oral communication rubric did not allow for a wider use of Ebonics or dialects. The resulting descriptor now reads "Demonstrates strong professional oral communication skills as evidenced by using appropriate language, grammar, and word choice for the learning environment". The second concern was the use of the word "cordial" to describe written communication. Cordial was rated to be ambiguous by 68% of the experts so it was changed to "conventional".

Inter-rater Reliability of the EDA

Current authors responded to the growing need for a sound measure of dispositions and extended the psychometric examination of the EDA by estimating the inter-rater reliability or

examination of agreement between different raters of the same person. Enhancing the understanding of each indicator serves to increase the agreement between raters. Raters may be more likely to agree on a teacher’s “professionalism” if there is a collective understanding of what “professionalism” is. To advance the collective understanding, researchers interviewed a panel of stakeholders and asked them to provide specific behaviors associated with each indicator (N=22). The resulting measure included the nine indicators with clarifying behaviors associated with each indicator. Two indicators were dropped because their associated behaviors were too similar. The nine indicators were then turned into an assessment instrument for evaluators to use. For example, “being professional” was highly rated as a behavioral indicator of good disposition. There is a question on the assessment tool rating the degree to which the intern is professional as evidenced by the behaviors associated with professionalism including maintaining professional boundaries and being prompt.

Pearson Product Moment correlational coefficients were calculated using ratings between two separate raters of the same group of students on the nine indicators. These coefficients were generally high which indicates that the raters did agree upon their ratings of the same students ($r = .60$ to $.26$). Table 1 lists the nine dispositions and the inter-rater reliability coefficients of retained items.

Table 1
Inter-rater reliability coefficients of retained indicators

Indicator	Correlation Coefficient
Oral Communication	.32
Written Communication	.30
Professionalism	.57
Positive Attitude	.42
Preparedness	.48
Diversity	.26
Collaboration	.55
Self-Regulation	.60
Social Emotional Learning	.42

The diversity, oral and written communication dispositions have the lowest associated inter-rater reliability although each are indicative of a highly moderate relationship. Rater training prior to first administration of the assessment using further clarifications of each indicator could serve to enhance the collective understanding of the disposition and therefore, increase the degree of agreement between raters. The clarifications are provided below and are to be reviewed by evaluators before any ratings are given.

Additional evidence of construct validity

Another step conducted by the current research team was to provide additional evidence of construct validity by checking the alignment of their nine research based dispositional indicators with CAEP/InTASC standards and major evaluation measures. Each of these sources has identified indicators of disposition. The multiple source indicators should be aligned if they are all suggesting behaviors of the same construct. This alignment may be seen as evidence of construct validity because there is agreement of dispositional indicators and therefore, more assurance that the instrument is actually measuring what it reports to be measuring. Lack of alignment is a threat to the construct validity of any tool designed to assess dispositions because standards suggest the importance of assessments capturing all indicators of the construct (AERA APA, & NCME, 2014).

A Q-Sort procedure was conducted to determine the alignment of the varying indicators. A group of stakeholders including principals, cooperating teachers, education students, professors and supervising teachers were gathered (N=16). The stakeholders were given dispositional standards from CAEP (2015)/InTASC (2013), Danielson et.al. (2009) and Marzano and Brown (2009) evaluation instruments and asked to align them with our nine research based indicators. Alignment agreement was generally high but there were three indicators with mixed alignment agreement. A five point Likert scale was then created that asked raters to rate the level of alignment each of the three indicators had with the research based indicators. Results from this survey suggested strong indications of alignment.

The final instrument includes nine indicators of teacher disposition with associated behaviors for disposition clarity. They have the additional evidence of construct validity because they are aligned with standards from InTASC, CAEP, Danielson and Marzano. The nine indicators were turned into an informal assessment consisting of nine Likert items with associated behaviors. The final list of nine indicators is provided for use.

References

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Almerico, G.M. (2011). Pre-service teacher dispositions at work. *Research in Higher Education Journal*

Almerico, G.M., Johnston, Henriott, D., & Shapiro, M. (2010). Dispositions Assessment in Teacher Education. *Research in Higher Education Journal*

Borko, H., Liston, D., & Whitcomb, J. (2007). Apples and fishes: The debate over dispositions in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58, 359-364.

Brackett, M. A. & Rivers, S.E. (2014) Transforming Students' Lives with Social and Emotional Learning In the *International Handbook of Emotions in Education*, R. Pekrun& L. Linnenbrink-Garcia (Eds.). New York: Routledge.

Brehm, B., Breen, P., Brown, B., Long, L., Smith, R., Wall, A., & Warren, N.S. (2006). Instructional design and assessment. An interdisciplinary approach to introducing professionalism. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 70(4), 1-5.

Brewer, R., Lindquist, C. & Altemueller, L. (2011). The disposition improvement process. *International Journal of Instruction*, 4, 206-216.

CAEP Commission Recommendations to the CAEP Board of Directors (2015). CAEP Accreditation Standards. Washington, DC: CAEP

Castle, S., Fox, R., & Souder, K. (2006). Do professional development schools (PDSs) make a difference? A comparative study of PDS and non PDS teacher candidates. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65-80.

Council of Chief State School Officers (2013) InTASC: Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progression for Teachers 1.0. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Creasy, (2015) Defining Professionalism in Teacher Education Programs. *Journal of Education & Social Policy*. Vol. 2, No. 2, 23-25.

Danielson, C., Axtell, D., & McKay, C. (2009). Implementing the framework for teaching in enhancing professional practice. ASCD.

Dee, J. & Henkin, A. (2002). Assessing dispositions toward cultural diversity among pre-service teachers. *Urban Education*, 37, 22-39.

Ginott, H.G. (1993) *Teacher and child: A book for parents and teachers*. New York: Scribner Paper Fiction.

Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development*, 72, 625-638.

Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 79, 491-525.

Johnston, P., Almerico, G.M., Henriott, D. & Shapiro, M. (2011). Expanding Descriptions of Dispositions for Assessment in Pre-Service Teacher Education Field Experiences. *Education*.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing Co.

Marzano, R. & Brown, J. (2009). A handbook for the art and science of teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Nixon, A., Dam, M. & Packard, A. (2010). Teacher disposition and contract non-renewal. *Planning and Changing*, 41, 210-219.

Notar, C., Riley, G. & Taylor, P. (2009). Dispositions: Ability and assessment. *International Journal of Education*, 1, 2-14.

Rike, C. & Sharp, L. (2008). Assessing preservice teachers' dispositions: A critical dimension of professional preparation. *Childhood Education*, 84, 150-155.

Rock, T. C., & Levin, B. B. (2002). Collaborative action research projects: Enhancing preservice teacher development in professional development schools. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(1), 7-21.

Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Student Academic Achievement. University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.

Singh, D. K. (2006). What do teacher candidates have to say about their clinical experiences? *Association of Teacher Educators*, (pp. 1-15). Atlanta.

Souza Barros .S. de and Marcos F. E. (2010). Physics: How do they affect the reality of the classroom and models for change. <http://www.physics.ohio-state.edu/Jossen/ICPE/02.html>.

Stewart, P. & Davis, S. (2009). Developing dispositions of preservice teachers through membership in professional organizations. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Education, Arkansas State University Mountain Home. Mountain Home, Arkansas.

Taylor, R., & Wasicsko, M. (2000). The dispositions to teach. Southern Region Association of Teacher Educators Conference. Lexington.

Villegas, A.M. Dispositions in teacher education: A look at social justice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 370-380.

Wilkerson, J. R. (2006). Measuring teacher dispositions: Standards-based or morality-based? *Teachers College Record*. Available from <http://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentID=12493>

Table 2

List of films illustrating the nine dispositional indicators

Disposition	Movie	Example/Non-example
-------------	-------	---------------------

Effective oral communication skills	<i>Stand and Deliver</i>	Example
Effective written communication skills	<i>Bad Teacher</i> Clip: Grading papers	Non-example
Professionalism	<i>Bad Teacher</i> Clip: First Day	Non-example
	<i>School of Rock</i> Clip: Trailer	Non-example
Positive and enthusiastic attitude	<i>Dead Poet's Society</i>	Example
	<i>School of Rock</i> Clip: Classroom leadership	Non-example
	<i>Pay it Forward</i>	Example
Preparedness in teaching and learning	<i>Stand and Deliver</i>	Example
	<i>Bad Teacher</i>	Non-example
Appreciation and value for diversity	<i>Freedom Writers</i>	Example
	<i>Precious</i>	Example
	<i>The Breakfast Club</i>	Example
	<i>Remember the Titans</i>	Example
Collaborates effectively with stakeholders	<i>School of Rock</i> Clip: Trailer	Non-example
	<i>Ferris Bueller's Day Off</i> Clip: Mr. Rooney's phone call	Non-example
Self-regulated learner behaviors/ takes initiative	<i>Good Will Hunting</i>	Example
	<i>Dangerous Minds</i>	Example
Social/Emotional intelligence to promote personal and educational goals/stability	<i>Music of the Heart</i>	Example
	<i>The Great Debaters</i>	Example
	<i>Monsieur Lazhar</i>	Example

