



Teacher Education Accreditation Council

TEAC Case Analysis for Georgian Court University Administration and Leadership Program *Inquiry Brief*

Audit Opinion

The *Inquiry Brief* overall received a clean audit opinion. Since 93% of the targets were verified, the *Brief* was found to be acceptably accurate and trustworthy. The auditors also concluded that the evidence supports the view that Georgian Court University is committed to the Administration and Leadership Program.

Summary of claims and evidence

The School of Education faculty at Georgian Court University makes four claims about the Administration and Leadership Program that are aligned with TEAC Quality Principle 1 (QP1):

1. Program completers acquire the knowledge to effectively supervise and manage faculty and the school setting;
2. Program completers collaborate with others (school members, family members, and community partners) in a caring, respectful, and ethical manner to promote the success of *all* learners, including culturally diverse students and those with disabilities;
3. Program completers apply knowledge of curriculum to create environments conducive to learning for *all* students; and
4. Program completers are visionary school leaders who make research based, data-driven decisions.

Evidence in support of the claims

The faculty support the claims with the following sources of evidence:

- Course Grades (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4)
- Pass Rates on Nationally Standardized Tests (1.1)
- Program Completer Surveys (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4)
- Ratings by Faculty Advisors and Cooperating Administrators (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4)
- Ratings on Course Embedded Assignments (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4)

Quality Principle I: Evidence of student learning

Component 1.1: Professional knowledge

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with professional knowledge

- **Course Grades:** Faculty identified course objectives and aligned them with NJPSSL and certification requirements. They also identified one or more performance tasks representative of the knowledge and skills expected in the course.
Ratings indicate candidates' mean grades in the 5 courses for Claim 1; 3 courses for Claim 2; 1 course for Claim 3; and 3 courses for Claim 4 over a five year period indicate all grades are above 3.0 in all courses across all five years (AY 2007-2008 to AY 2011-2012).
- **Pass Rates on Nationally Standardized Tests:** Praxis II examinations are one indicator that candidates have acquired professional knowledge and those seeking principal certification must pass the Praxis II examination *School Leaders Licensure Assessment* (6011/1011) and those seeking certification as superintendents must pass the Praxis II *School Superintendent Assessment* (6021/1020). Program completers' (N-126) Praxis II examination result for all three versions across all five years was 100% pass rate (AY 2007-2008 to AY 2011-2012).
- **Ratings by Faculty Advisors and Cooperating Administrators:** Faculty Advisor and Cooperating Administrator Internship I & Internship II evaluation forms requires both evaluators to rate candidates' competence on tasks identified by faculty as important to the professional work of school leaders (Quality Principle 1) and explicitly included in state and national standards. Ratings for Claim 1 audit samples indicate *excellent preparation* (3.46 -4.91) in all areas from Spring 2010- Spring 2012; Ratings for Claim 2 audit samples indicate *excellent preparation* (3.90-4.94) in all areas from Spring 2010- Spring 2012; Claim 3 audit samples indicate *excellent preparation* (4.04-4.86) in all areas from Spring 2010- Spring 2012; and Claim 4 audit samples indicate *excellent preparation* (3.83-4.89) in all areas from Spring 2010- Spring 2012.
- **Ratings on Course Embedded Assignments:** ALP faculty established procedures to collect artifacts of candidates' performance on tasks embedded in ALP courses. The rubrics included a five-point scale: 1- Significantly Below Expectation, 2- Below Expectation, 3- Meets Expectation, 4- Above Expectation, and 5- Significantly Above Expectation. Findings indicate that mean scores (Proficient) were achieved for all years audited (AY 2007-2008-2011-2012) for Claim 1, Claim 2, Claim 3, and Claim 4.
- **Program Completer Surveys:** These surveys include indicators from the feedback solicited from program completers approximately one year after they complete their program. Findings indicate program completers: were satisfied (2.75-4.56 on a 5 point scale) with their overall preparation to lead, manage, and organize a school setting (Claim 1) for AY 2006-2007 to AY 2010-2011; were satisfied (3.38 -4.63) with their preparation to support a diverse student population, collaborate with stakeholders, and act in a professional and ethical

manner (Claim 2); were satisfied (3.38-4.5) with their preparation to create a culture for learning (Claim 3); and were satisfied (3.25-4.44) with their preparation to implement a strategic plan and engage in reflective, data based decision-making (Claim 4).

- Audit Task A3, Audit Task A4, Audit Task A6, Audit Task A7, Audit Task A9, Audit Task A10, & Audit Task A13 indicate that evidence is accurately recorded and statistics accurately computed.

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with professional knowledge

None

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

No rival explanations.

Component 1.2: Strategic decision-making

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with strategic decision-making

- **Course Grades:** see above
- **Ratings by Faculty Advisors and Cooperating Administrators:** see above
- **Ratings on Course Embedded Assignments:** see above
- **Program Completer Surveys:** see above
- Audit Task A14 and Audit Task A15 indicate that evidence is accurately recorded and statistics accurately computed.

Evidence available to the panel that is not consistent with strategic decision-making

None

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with strategic decision-making

No rival explanations.

Component 1.3: Caring leadership skills

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

- **Course Grades:** see above
- **Ratings by Faculty Advisors and Cooperating Administrators:** see above
- **Ratings on Course Embedded Assignments:** see above
- **Program Completer Surveys:** see above
- Audit Task A18 and Audit Task A19 indicate that evidence is accurately recorded and statistics accurately computed.

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with caring leadership skills

None

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

No rival explanations.

1.4 Crosscutting themes for Quality Principle I

Evidence available to the panel for the crosscutting themes

- **Course Grades:** see above
- **Ratings by Faculty Advisors and Cooperating Administrators:** see above
- **Ratings on Course Embedded Assignments:** see above
- **Program Completer Surveys:** see above

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

None

Component 1.5: Evidence of valid assessment

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

Audit Task 25 addresses validity and Audit Task 27 addresses reliability.

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 presents a rationale for their assessments on pages 12-15.

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 describes plans based on their responses to the evidence collected for their Inquiry Brief on pages 35-41.

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

- Audit Task B5, Audit Task B7, Audit Task B8, Audit Task B9, Audit Task B10, Audit Task B13, Audit Task B19, Audit Task B21, Audit Task B22, and Audit Task B23 indicate for the most part that quality control mechanisms were functioning 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)

<i>Quality Principle I</i> Candidate Learning	<i>Quality Principle II</i> Faculty Learning	<i>Quality Principle III</i> 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