



Teacher Education Accreditation Council

TEAC Case Analysis for Georgian Court University Teacher Education Program *Inquiry Brief*

Audit Opinion

Overall the *Brief* earned a clean audit opinion, and each component of the TEAC system received a clean opinion. The auditors also concluded that the evidence supports the view that Georgian Court University is committed to the Teacher Education Program.

Summary of claims and evidence

The faculty make four claims, aligned with TEAC Quality Principle 1 (QP1), about their graduates:

1. Program completers acquire the subject matter knowledge they intend to teach.
2. Program completers are caring practitioners who understand the characteristics of diverse learners, including culturally diverse students and those with disabilities.
3. Program completers apply pedagogical knowledge to create effective learning environments that are responsive to the needs of *all* learners.
4. Program completers are reflective novice professionals.

Evidence in support of the claims:

Claim 1 Subject Matter Knowledge (QP 1.1 Subject matter knowledge)

- Accuplacer or Praxis I Basic Skills for reading, writing, and math
- Praxis II Content Knowledge Exams
- Cumulative GPA
- Ratings of Content Knowledge by Clinical Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers
- Post Program Survey sent to program completers approximately one year after program completion

Claim 2 Focus on Learners (QP 1.3 Caring and effective teaching skill and 1.4.2 Multicultural perspectives and accuracy)

- Pedagogical course grades
- Ratings of Embedded Course Artifacts

- Ratings by Clinical Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers
- Post Program Surveys

Claim 3 Create Effective Learning Environments (QP 1.2 Pedagogical Knowledge and 1.4.3 Technology)

- Ratings of Embedded Course Artifacts
- Ratings by Clinical Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers
- Post Program Surveys
- Instructional Technology Course Grades
- Ratings of Course Embedded Electronic Portfolio
- Post Program Surveys. Results

Claim 4 Becoming a Professional, Learning to Learn (QP 1.4.1)

- Ratings of Embedded Course Artifacts
- Electronic Portfolio
- Ratings by Cooperating Teachers and Clinical Supervisors
- Post Program Surveys

Quality Principle I: Evidence of student learning

Component 1.1: Subject matter knowledge

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with subject matter knowledge

- Accuplacer/Praxis I Basic Skills scores increased from 75% (2007-2008) to 100% (2011-2012)
- Praxis II Content Knowledge Exam pass rates were over 90% (with most licensure areas near or at 100%) in all 5 years, and most areas had pass rates over 90% for 4 of the 5 years
- Cumulative GPA prior to student teaching was 2.75 or above for all sampled completers
- Ratings of Content Knowledge by Clinical Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers met or exceeded 3.34 (on a scale of 1-4) for audit samples from Fall 2007- Spring 2009, and met or exceeded 4.23 (on a scale of 1-5) for Fall 2009 to Spring 2012
- Post Program Survey rating means ranged from 3.86 (on a scale of 1-5) in 2008-09 to 4.22 in 2009-10. Findings indicate alums consistently reported above average content area preparation.
- Audit Tasks A1 and A2 verified reported scores.

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with subject matter knowledge

- Praxis II Content Knowledge Exam pass rates were occasionally below 80% for certain licensure areas: Science 5-8= 78%, n= 9, AY11-12; Physical Science K-

12= 67%, n= 3, AY09-10; Math K-12= 60%, n= 10, AY08-09; Biology K-12= 75%, n= 4, AY 08-09.

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with subject matter knowledge

Component 1.2: Pedagogical knowledge

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with pedagogical knowledge

- Ratings of Embedded Course Artifacts met or exceeded a mean of 3.67 (on a scale of 1-5) on Unit Plan, 3.55 for Content Plans, 3.62 for Differentiated Lesson Plan, and 3.33 for Impact on Student Learning Sample for 2007-2009, and met or exceeded 3.03 for Unit Plan, 3.10 on Content Plans, 3.19 for Differentiated Lesson Plan, and 4.19 for Impact on Student Learning Sample 2009-2012.
- Ratings by Clinical Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers met or exceeded 3.45 (on a scale of 1-4) for Instructional Planning, 3.29 for Assessment of Student Learning, and 3.39 for Special Needs from 2007-2009, and met or exceeded 4.39 (on a scale of 1-5) for Instructional Planning, 4.25 for Assessment of Student Learning, and 4.15 for Special Needs from 2009-2011.
- Post Program Surveys ratings on probes for preparation to plan and differentiate instruction and use multiple assessment strategies for 2007-2011 met or exceeded a mean of 3.75 (on a scale of 1-5).
- Audit Task A3 verified a consistency between sampled and reported unit plan mean scores.

Evidence available to the panel that is not consistent with pedagogical knowledge

None

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with pedagogical knowledge

No rival explanations.

Component 1.3: Caring teaching skills

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with caring teaching skills

- Mean pedagogical course grades on child and adolescent development, educational psychology, and multicultural relations were above 3.0 for the three courses for 2007-2012
- Ratings of Embedded Course Artifacts in Instruction in Literacy in Inclusive Education means met or exceeded 3.0 (on a scale of 1-5) for all years 2009-2012
- Ratings by Clinical Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers on probes which demonstrate candidates' focus on students: *Probe 2-Human Growth and Development*; *3-Diverse Learners* (practices culturally responsive teaching, creates a learning environment where individual differences are respected, and uses strategies to support the learning of diverse students); *4-Classroom*

Motivation and Management Strategies; 5-Caring Practitioner; and 6-Collaborative Partnerships exceeded 3.35 on a 4-point scale from Fall 2007 to Spring 2009 and met or exceeded 4.23 on a 5-point scale from Fall 2009 to Spring 2012

- Post Program Surveys ratings on preparedness to design developmentally appropriate instruction and respectful, culturally responsive learning environments met or exceeded a mean of 3.71 for 2007 to 2011
- Audit Task A4 verified reported student grades
- Audit Task A5 verified reported characterization of accommodations or modifications in lesson plans based on individual differences

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with caring teaching skills
None

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with caring teaching skills

No rival explanations.

1.4 Crosscutting themes for Quality Principle I

Evidence available to the panel for the crosscutting themes

- Ratings of Embedded Course Artifacts on culturally responsive instruction met or exceeded 3.0 (on a 5-point scale) for all years 2009-2012
- Ratings by Clinical Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers on Special Needs means met or exceeded 3.39 (on a scale of 1-4) for Special Needs from 2007-2009, and 4.15 (on a scale of 1-5) from 2009-2011
- Ratings by Clinical Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers on *3-Diverse Learners* and *6-Collaborative Partnerships* mean scores exceeded 3.35 on a 4-point scale from Fall 2007 to Spring 2009 and met or exceeded 4.23 on a 5-point scale from Fall 2009 to Spring 2012
- Post Program Surveys on probes for preparation to plan and differentiate instruction and use multiple assessment strategies for 2007-2011 met or exceeded a mean of 3.75 (on a scale of 1-5)
- Instructional Technology Course Grades met or exceeded 3.0 and in 2011-2012 96.6 % met or exceeded 3.0 in a course dedicated to use of instructional technology in inclusive education
- Ratings of Course Embedded Electronic Portfolio that demonstrates skill in a range of technologies, for 2007-1009 met or exceeded a mean of 3.69 on the 4-point rating scale and 3.19 on the 5-point scale for 2009-2012
- Post Program Survey ratings on probes of preparation in instructional technology for 2007-2011 met or exceeded a mean of 3.75 (on a scale of 1-5)
- Ratings of Embedded Course Artifacts. Evidence of candidates becoming professionals and learning to learn is found in a philosophy of education from ED3110 and EDC5110, which includes articulation of dispositions and skills of reflective practices, and a co-planning lesson from ED4213 and EDC 6313 met or exceeded 3.63 and on the 5-point scale it met or exceeded 3.38 for the

philosophy statement. For the co-planning lesson on the 4-point rating scale the mean met or exceeded 3.48 from 2007-2009 and 3.40 on the 5-point rating scale from 2009-2012.

- Electronic Portfolio. Evidence of candidates becoming professionals, including learning to learn, reflective practice, and working independently as well as part of a team is also found in candidates' electronic portfolios, with ratings on the 4-point scale meeting or exceeding 3.69, and 4.11 on a 5-point scale
- Ratings by Cooperating Teachers and Clinical Supervisors. Cooperating teachers and clinical supervisors rate candidates' proficiency on: Communication Skills, Reflective Practitioner, and Developing as a Professional. Results, with mean ratings on the 4-point rating scale the meeting or exceeding 3.45 for Communication skills, and 3.52 for Reflective Practitioner during 2007-2009, and on the 5-point scale the meeting or exceeding 4.25 for Communication Skills, and 4.35 for Reflective Practitioner 2009-2012. During 2009-2012 the probe for Professional Responsibility was added using the 5-point rating scale. The means met or exceeded 4.49
- Post Program Surveys. Results from program alums on probes for communication and information literacy to foster inquiry, collaboration, and communications; working collaboratively with colleagues, parents, and others; develop professional dispositions and interpersonal skills; engage in constructivist reflective practice; general preparation as a teacher in 2007-2011 had means the met or exceeded 3.58
- Audit Tasks A6 and A9 verified reported characterization of technology use and integration
- Audit Task A8 verified reported survey results
- Audit Task A7 verified that lesson plans in most sampled portfolios addressed technology and inclusion

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the acquisition of the cross-cutting themes

- Audit Task A7 indicated that a 3 of 10 sampled lesson plans did not address technology and 1 did not address inclusion

Component 1.5: Evidence of valid assessment

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with reliable and valid assessment of student learning

- The faculty describe the reliability and validity of the assessments in Section III. Methods of Assessment
- Audit Tasks A10 and A11 verified the reported training procedures and reliability statistics

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the reliable and valid assessment of student learning

None

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with reliable and valid assessment of student learning

No rival explanations

Quality Principle II: Institutional learning

Component 2.1: A rationale for the assessments

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the rationale for the program's assessments

- The faculty describe their rationale for the assessments in Section III. Methods of Assessment
- Audit Task B1 indicates that faculty were engaged in assessment practices directed at the improvement of teaching and learning

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with a rationale for the program's assessments

None

Component 2.2: Program decisions based on evidence

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the program's decisions based on evidence

- The faculty described decisions to improve the program based on evidence in Section V: Discussion and Plan
- Audit Tasks B2, B3, B4, B5, B6, and B7 verify examples of program changes based on evidence

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the program's decisions based on evidence

None

Rival explanations for the evidence about the program's decisions based on evidence

No rival explanations

Component 2.3: An influential quality control system

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with an influential quality control system

- The faculty probed their quality control system and found that it was essentially working as designed, as reported in Appendix A
- Audit Tasks B8, B9, B10, and B11 verified that elements of the quality control system were working as designed

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with an influential quality control system

None

Rival explanations for the evidence about an influential quality control system

No rival explanations

Quality Principle III: Capacity for Program Quality

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the capacity for program quality

- See *Brief*, Appendix B, and Table C.1, Table C.2, and Table C.3 in the audit report.

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with capacity for program quality

None

Suggested Recommendations

Suggested Weaknesses and Stipulations

None

Suggested Accreditation Recommendation (shaded)

<u><i>Quality Principle I</i></u> Candidate Learning	<u><i>Quality Principle II</i></u> Faculty Learning	<u><i>Quality Principle III</i></u> Capacity & Commitment	Accreditation status designations
Above standard	Above standard	Above standard	Accreditation (7 years)
Above standard	Below standard	Above standard	Accreditation (2 years)
Below standard	Above standard	Above standard	Accreditation (2 years)
Above standard	Above standard	Below standard	Accreditation (2 years)
Below standard	Below standard	Above standard	Deny
Below standard	Above standard	Below standard	Deny