



# Teacher Education Accreditation Council

## TEAC Case Analysis for The College of St. Scholastica Teacher Education Program *Inquiry Brief*

**Instructions:** This Case Analysis is linked to relevant sections of the Audit Report and the Inquiry Brief Proposal. For this purpose all three documents—the Case Analysis, the Audit Report, and the Brief—must be saved into the same folder.

To follow the link, simply control/[left] click. To return to the main text of the Case Analysis, be sure your Web toolbar (Word 2003) or your Back and Forward buttons (Word 2007) are visible, and click on the Back arrow on the toolbar.

### **Audit Opinion**

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

### **Summary of claims and evidence**

The program makes seven claims about its program completers in that they:

1. demonstrate competence in the subject matter they will teach;
2. use research-based pedagogy to promote student achievement;
3. are caring professionals;
4. have the ability to learn new information and have the skills to support life-long learning;
5. understand diverse and multicultural perspectives;
6. use technology to increase student learning and efficiencies; and
7. Know how to collect and use data to assess the academic achievement of their students.

### **Evidence in support of the claims:**

- College Grade Point Averages (GPA) – Claims 1 & 2
- Program GPA levels – Claims 1 & 2
- State licensure exams (Praxis and MTLE) – Claims 1 & 2
- Portfolios – Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7

- Course assessments aligned to Minnesota Licensure Standards - Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7
- Assessment of professional behaviors – Claims 3 & 4
- Student teacher evaluations – Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7
- Surveys of candidates, alumni and employers - Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7
- Undergraduate focus groups - Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7

The SOE also participates in year two of the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA), now referred to as edTPA field test. The edTPA consists of a videotaped segment of the student teacher in the K-12 classroom over a 3-5 day period of time. Student teachers review their teaching and prepare written reflections regarding four tasks: planning instruction and assessment; instructing and engaging students in learning; assessment of student learning; and analyzing teaching.

## ***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**

- Evidence for Claim 1 (content knowledge) appears in Tables 4.7 and 4.8 (page 35) showing candidates' mean GPAs between 3.52-3.77 and Table 4.9 (page 36) showing comparable GPAs between non-teaching majors and secondary education majors.
- Audit Tasks A16 and A17 verify that both undergraduate and graduate candidates meet the program's GPA requirement of 2.8 (undergraduate) and 3.0 (graduate).
- Tables 4.10 (undergraduates) and 4.11 (graduates) show evidence of candidates' mean scores on the Praxis II licensure tests exceeding the state minimum passing score (page 37).
- Audit Task A10 verified that 24 randomly selected candidates passed both the Praxis II content knowledge test and the PLT pedagogical knowledge test.
- Tables 4.12, 4.13, 4.14, and 4.15 report candidates' scores in subject matter competence from the final student teacher evaluation; 52.8% of undergraduates and 58.8% of graduates "exceed expectations" (pages 38-39).
- Tables 4.16 and 4.17 report survey items measuring subject matter knowledge (page 40).
- Tables 4.18 and 4.19 report evidence from the capstone portfolio of candidate success in meeting the content knowledge claim (pages 40-41).
- Audit Tasks A1 and A2 verified the collaboration of faculty from the arts and sciences and education in assessing candidate content knowledge.
- Surveys of faculty, candidates, graduates, and cooperating teachers corroborate the program's evidence that candidates acquire content knowledge (Audit Task A28).

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

None

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

No rival explanations.

***Component 1.2: Pedagogical knowledge***

**Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with pedagogical knowledge**

- Evidence for candidates' success in meeting Claim 2 (pedagogical knowledge) appears in Tables 4.24 and 4.25 which report Praxis II Principles of Learning scores for both undergraduate and graduate candidates (page 43).
- Audit Task A19 verified that all 34 randomly selected candidates passed both the Praxis II content knowledge test and the PLT pedagogical knowledge test.
- Tables 4.26, 4.27, 4.28, and 4.29 report candidate achievement on 7 items in the student teacher final examination which supports the program's claim that candidates meet Claim 2 (pages 43-45).
- Tables 4.30, 4.31, and 4.35 report candidate achievement on 10 items related to Claim 2 as reported by the candidates themselves, alumni, and employers (pages 45-47; page 49).
- Tables 4.32 and 4.33 report evidence of candidate achievement in meeting Claim 2 through exhibits in the capstone portfolio (pages 47-48).
- Table 4.36 reports course assessment results for M.Ed. candidates meeting Claim 2 (page 50).
- Surveys of faculty, candidates, graduates, and cooperating teachers corroborate the program's evidence of candidates' pedagogical knowledge (Audit Task A29).

**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**

- The *IB* describes the program's expectations in terms of candidate dispositions and response to diversity on pages 7-8, the influence of Benedictine values on page 11, and the Native Teacher Program Collaboration with the Fond du Lac Tribal Community College on page 11.

- Audit Tasks A6 and A7 verify program elements that strengthen candidates' knowledge and skills in working with diverse students and developing multicultural perspectives.
- Tables 4.39 and 4.40 report evidence on 13 items in the student teacher final examination which supports the program's claim that candidates meet Claim 3 (pages 51-52).
- Audit Task A25 showed that an on-site survey ranked candidates as "more than adequate" or "excellent" relative to Claim 3.
- Surveys of faculty, candidates, graduates, and cooperating teachers corroborate the program's evidence of candidates' pedagogical knowledge (Audit Task A30).

**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**

- Audit Tasks A12 and A13 verify that candidates are placed in school settings that enable them to work with a wide range of students.
- Tables 4.55 and 4.56 report evidence on 3 items in the student teacher final examination which supports the program's claim that candidates meet Claim 5 (diversity and multicultural perspectives) (pages 61-62).
- Tables 4.57 and 4.58 report candidate achievement on 4 items related to crosscutting themes (ELL, multicultural perspectives, respect for diversity, and students with special needs) Claim 5 as reported by the candidates themselves, alumni, and employers (pages 62-64).
- Tables 4.60 and 4.61 report evidence of candidate achievement in meeting Claim 5 through exhibits in the capstone portfolio (pages 64-66).
- Table 4.62 reports course assessment results for M.Ed. candidates meeting Claim 5 (page 66).
- TEAC surveys of faculty, candidates, graduates, and cooperating teachers corroborate the program's evidence of candidates' ability to teach all students (Audit Task A31).
- Audit Tasks A18, A20, A21, A22, and A23 verify program strategies to ensure candidate success in using technology.
- Table 4.68 reports course assessment results for M.Ed. candidates meeting Claim 6, technology, (pages 69-70) includes results from assignments to "examine the Internet for web sites to enhance student learning, analyze digital apps for learning, and research a digital media project."
- Tables 4.63, 4.64, and 4.65 report candidate achievement on 4 items related to Claim 6 as reported by the candidates themselves, alumni, and employers (pages 67-68).

- Table 4.66 reports evidence of candidate achievement in meeting Claim 6 through exhibits in the capstone portfolio (pages 67-68).
- Table 4.47 reports evidence of candidate achievement in meeting Claim 4 (life-long learning) through responses to 1 item of the Professional Behaviors Form (pages 57).
- Tables 4.48 and 4.49 report evidence on 2 items in the student teacher final examination which supports the program's claim that candidates meet Claim 4 (page 58).
- Tables 4.50, 4.51, and 4.53 report candidate achievement on 3 items related to Claim 4 as reported by the candidates themselves, alumni, and employers (pages 58-59; page 61).

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

None

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

No rival explanations.

***Component 1.5: Evidence of valid assessment***

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

- Appendices G1 and G2 report correlations between Praxis I scores and GPA for undergraduate completers (page 175) and GTL completers (page 176).
- Appendices G3 and G4 report correlations between Praxis II scores and GPA for undergraduate completers (page 177) and GTL completers (page 178).
- Appendices G5 and G7 report t-test analysis of the significance of program completer means scores with state passing scores for undergraduate completers (page 179) and GTL completers (page 180).
- Appendices G8-G13 report results on the Minnesota basic skills, content, and principles of learning tests in terms of undergraduate and GTL completers. The number of failed attempts, Minnesota passing score, state mean, and St. Scholastica mean are reported.
- TEAC survey of cooperating teachers corroborate the validity of teachers' ratings (Audit Task A32).
- Audit Tasks A3, A7, A8, and A9 corroborate that the instruments used are understood and found to be reliable by program faculty.
- Audit Task A23 demonstrated that course syllabi are aligned to the Minnesota Licensure Test.
- Audit Task A26 showed that the mean ratings of 3.5 to 4.0 are determined using a rubric that is understood by faculty and students.

**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**

- Audit Tasks B3 and B15 verified the development and use of assessments as reported in the *IB*.
- The *IB* describes the program's rationale for assessments on pages 13-21.
- Audit Task B7 provided evidence for purposeful use of field placements and assessments of placements at designated points in the program.

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

None

**Rival explanations for the evidence about the program's rationale for the program's assessments**

No rival explanations.

**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 *IB* describes the program's continuous improvement approach, and the ways in which it has improved various assessments on pages 9-10.
- The *IB* provides details about how faculty used program results to improve both the digital portfolio and the professional behaviors evaluation form on pages 78-79.
- Audit Task B4 verified by minutes of faculty meetings that improvements in the program's quality control system were the result of examination of evidence of candidate learning.
- The *IB* describes the program's continuous improvement approach, and the ways in which it has improved various assessments on pages 9-10.
- The *IB* provides details about how faculty used program results to improve both the digital portfolio and the professional behaviors evaluation form on pages 78-79.
- Audit Task B3 verified by minutes of faculty meetings that improvements in the program's quality control system were the result of examination of evidence of candidate learning.

- Audit Tasks B5 and B12 confirmed program's use of P-12 partners to solicit evidence based input used in program decisions.
- Faculty have self-identified the following areas for improvement based upon this *IB*: strengthen preparation for ELL and children with special needs; establish formal structures to identify why candidates complete and why they do not; strengthen mechanisms to locate and gather data on completers' impact on K-12 learning and retention rates in the profession for completers; and improve systems for data integrity and analysis (page 5 of the Audit Report).

**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**

- Appendix A in the *IB* indicates that the faculty found the quality control system working as developed.
- Audit Tasks B1, B6, B7, B8, B9, B10, B11, B13, B16, and B17 indicate an effective quality control system.

**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 AFIs and Stipulations

none

#### Suggested Accreditation Recommendation (shaded)

| <u><i>Quality Principle 1.0</i></u><br>Candidate Learning | <u><i>Quality Principle 2.0</i></u><br>Faculty Learning | <u><i>Quality Principle 3.0</i></u><br>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                              |