



TEAC Audit Report
Initial and Continuing Teacher Preparation Program

Teacher Education Department (TED)
College of Education and Human Development
University of Southern Maine, Gorham, Maine
March 8 – 11, 2009

Audit team Members:

Frank Murray, President, Teacher Education Accreditation Council, Washington, DC

Rebecca Pelton, Vice President for Membership, Teacher Education Accreditation Council, Washington, DC

Susie Hanley, Assistant Principal, Gorham Middle School, Gorham, ME (local practitioner)

Brief authors:

Ken Jones, Director of Teacher Education

Cathie Fallona, Teacher Education Chair

Jean Whitney, Teacher Education Faculty Member



I. Introduction

Summary of the Case for Accreditation for the Initial and Continuing Teacher Preparation Program

Teacher Education Department (TED)
College of Education and Human Development
University of Southern Maine, Gorham, Maine

Authorship and approval of the *Inquiry Brief*:

The writing of the *Inquiry Brief* was coordinated by the director of the program (Ken Jones), the chair of the department (Cathie Fallona) and a faculty member (Jean Whitney). The *Brief* was approved by the program faculty on November 14, 2008.

Introduction:

The University of Southern Maine (USM), one of seven campuses of the University of Maine System, is a comprehensive regional university that acquired its name in 1978, although it has historical connections to several prior normal school institutions from 1878 onwards that provided teacher education programs in Maine. USM currently operates three campuses (Portland, Gorham, and Lewiston), and its 400 faculty members serve approximately 10,000 students (8000 undergraduates) in 115 areas of study.

The teacher education program is housed in the USM College of Education and Human Development (CEHD), which has 37 faculty members and approximately 1300 students. The program seeking accreditation is given by 11 faculty members and one full-time lecturer (66% female and 91% white), and 27 part-time faculty members in the Teacher Education Department (TED), one of three departments in CEHD. The program enrolls 217 students annually and about 90 students (76% women and 90% white) complete the program¹ each year.

Since 1990, the program has been structured as a post-baccalaureate/partnership school model program, called the Extended Teacher Education Program (ETEP), and in 1998 a companion certification option, called Teachers for Elementary and Middle Schools (TEAMS), was developed. The program also has a recently developed secondary education option, or pathway, for majors in the College of Arts and Science who seek teacher certification in mathematics and foreign language (German, Latin, and Spanish).

¹ The program has twelve options which lead to Maine teaching certificates: K-8, K-8 dual general and special education, 7-12 in Mathematics, English, Social Studies, Life Sciences, Physical Science, K-12 Foreign Language, and 7-12 dual general and special education. Also K-8 dual gen ed & K-12 ESL, K-8 Special Education and 7-12 Special Education

Program claims:

The program, which seeks to develop the graduates' committed to equity and teaching that engages the student, is grounded in seven core values – democracy, civility & caring, equity & diversity, social justice, ethical practice, scholarship and professional development – which in turn guide eight USM professional practices and five TED commitments to the program (infuse it with fieldwork, make it performance based, organize it by cohorts, increase the use of mentors, and genuine collaboration with partner schools & districts). The mark or “stamp” of a USM teacher is the teacher's inquiry into practice, providing a variety of opportunities for student learning, holding high expectations for student achievement, collegiality, expertise in pedagogical content knowledge, making valid inferences about student learning, appropriately adjusting pedagogy to student needs, and contributing to and applying the scholarship available in the field to professional practice.

The program holds itself to ten standards, eight of which are aligned to one of the ten Maine teacher standards and to the components of TEAC's *Quality Principle I*. Five of the standards emphasize what the prospective teacher must understand – viz., (1) human diversity, (2) the teaching subject, (3) appropriate uses of technology, (4) a variety of instructional strategies, and (5) how to assess student learning. In addition, five other standards emphasize the USM prospective teacher's performance, but each standard blends understanding and performance. The USM teacher is expected (1) to be able articulate his/her beliefs about how to insure success for all students, (2) to demonstrate ethical and legal professional practices, (3) to create a democratic learning environment, (4) to plan effective lessons, and (5) to engage in career long professional improvement.

Evidence supporting the program's standards:

The faculty make multiple assessments, most of a formative purpose during the year long internship. The main lines of evidence the faculty relies on to convince itself that the candidates have met its ten standards were collected over a period of three to five years, but mostly from the interns in 2004-2008. They are:

1. Grades (in method courses, content areas, and overall undergraduate GPA), which consistently yield means above 3.0
2. Standardized test scores: Praxis I and II mean scores for the interns, which exceed the state standard and national averages.
3. Admission interview: ratings by two to three interviewers (faculty and mentors) of the candidate's understanding of content, technology, and equity as exhibited in prompted essays, Q&A, philosophical statement, portfolios, etc., which met or exceeded the program faculty's expectations in these areas.
4. Intern Assessment System: ratings of instructional units on six standards by faculty supervisors & mentors, and ratings of the semester's aggregate evidence on the ten program standards at the mid-point and end of the program by faculty supervisors, mentors, and the intern, which usually met or exceeded the program faculty's expectations.
5. Entry and Exit Surveys: at the end of the program, the mean ratings from candidates on the importance of the program's values & practices are at the top of

the scale, and ratings of the degree of candidate preparedness met or exceeded the program faculty's expectations.

6. Partner School Principal Survey: mean ratings by employers regarding program completers' preparation in the areas of the ten standards were in the *adequately to well-prepared* scale range.
7. Employment information: upon completion of the program, 76% of the candidates, on average, are employed as teachers and another 14% assume other positions in a school.
8. Program impact: assessment scores made at the program endpoint are invariably higher than those at the midpoint of the program and significantly higher in the areas of program emphasis.

The program has a mastery oriented internship which means that all program completers are given the time they need to finally meet the program standards and all completers must satisfy all the standards. In addition the program faculty requires interns to do an in-depth study of a class of students, draft a *vision of teaching* statement, keep a dialog journal of reflections about the internship, maintain a teaching file of key teaching events, videotape segments of lessons, devise a classroom management plan, and develop a portfolio of artifacts for panel presentation.

With regard to its own locally developed assessment instruments and practices, the faculty's inquiry into the reliability of the assessments gave acceptable percents of agreement and correlations between raters.

Plan for program improvement

In addition to its current inquiry into the reliability of its assessments, the program faculty has conducted several inquiries into some factors (e.g., cohort and gender) that may influence candidate attainment. Their plans include strengthening the program in the areas of relative weakness revealed in the exit surveys and standard reviews, improving the reliability and consistency of all assessments, modifying and tailoring the assessments, and investigating the success of graduates through longer spans of their careers.

Internal audit:

An internal audit of the program's quality assurance system (QAS) was designed, piloted, revised, and implemented by a team of five (the director, chair, two support staff and a graduate assistant). The auditors selected five targets and made 26 probes which entailed random sampling of 10% of the available evidence. The audit team examined course & program approvals, student folders, syllabi, faculty hiring practices, meeting minutes, interviews with administrators and staff, questionnaires, surveys, websites, handbooks, and facilities. On the whole, the auditors concluded that the quality assurance system worked as it was expected to but few problematic quality issues were uncovered in the audit. Those that were discovered triggered responses to re-align all course "blueprints", syllabi, and catalog descriptions, to produce written criteria for the selection of part-time supervisors, mentors and cohort

coordinators, address a cohort relations problem, and to monitor in the future the advisement in TEAMS, lagging computer upgrades, and school district weakening support for cohorts.

The faculty also concluded that the College of Education and Human Development and University of Southern Maine are both committed to their teacher education program.

Acceptance of the Summary of the Case

The Summary of the Case was accepted by the faculty of the University of Southern Maine on March 9, 2009. The faculty made minor changes in the summary submitted by the auditors.

Audit logistics

The audit visit took place in various rooms in Bailey Hall, but principally in a work space in room 301C set aside on the third floor in an all purpose room (300). The visit was coordinated with a program approval visit by a state team assembled by the Maine Department of Education. The auditors and members of the state team conducted some joint interviews with the institution's and program's administrators, but otherwise worked separately.

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 the University of Southern Maine is committed to the teacher education program.

 **II. Audit Map**

Audit tasks organized by TEAC elements & components and noted as verified, verified with error, and not verified.

TEAC Component	Verified	Verified with Error	Not Verified
1.1 Subject matter	A1, A11		
1.2 Pedagogy	A2, A11-13, A22	A23	
1.3 Teaching	A3, A11		
1.4 Cross-cutting themes	A4, A21		
2.1 Rationale	C1-2, C5-6, C8-13, A8, B1-3	C7	
2.2 Validity evidence	A5-7, A9-10, A14-20, C14		
3.2 Quality control system	C3-4, C16-17, C19, B5-8, B10	C15, B4, B9	

A, B, C refer to the sections of the report and C indicates that the task was a clarification task.

 **III. Method of the Audit**

The TEAC staff and the auditors selected a number of targets in the *Brief* and crafted tasks that were designed to verify these targets. (A target is any aspect of the *Brief*, such as text, data, or a figure, which is related to any of TEAC's principles and standards.) The auditors also had instructions from the TEAC staff to corroborate some of the evidence in the *Brief*. In addition, while on site, the auditors created other audit tasks and follow-up audit tasks.

With regard to any one component of the TEAC system, the auditors employ a range of tasks. Typically, the auditors will attempt to *clarify* the meaning of targets in the *Brief* that are unclear to them and to examine the *precision* of targets that they may suspect are unclear to the *Brief's* authors. Most tasks are straightforward probes designed to *verify or confirm* the target (e.g. recalculating figures, interviewing informants, examining catalogs, policy manuals). Some tasks reconcile other representations of the same target in the *Brief* for *internal consistency* (e.g., the figures in two tables on the same point, restatements of the target in other places of the *Brief*). A few audit tasks seek to *corroborate* (or in some cases *disconfirm*) the target by examination of evidence not cited in the *Brief*, but could be thought to be related to what was cited in the *Brief*. Typically the auditors corroborate the evidence

in the *Brief* by new or extended statistical analyses of the evidence cited in the *Brief* and related evidence outside the *Brief* (e.g., on-site and on-line surveys of key informants).

The auditors will also, whenever it is possible and feasible, examine the *primary* source for any target (e.g., the actual rating or survey forms, formal documents, student portfolios, artifacts, roll & grade books, classroom facilities, budgets, correspondence, etc).

IV. Audit Findings

The audit findings consist of clarification task findings and audit task findings. Both clarification task and audit tasks consist of a target from the *Brief* and a probe about that target. The audit tasks are associated with specific components of the TEAC system, which are denoted in parentheses following the task number.

Clarification Tasks

Directions to the *Inquiry Brief* authors: *Please respond to the questions and comments below as if you were responding orally upon hearing them. Adjusting the text spacing in this document as necessary, simply insert and type your response into the document below (use italics, if possible, for your responses). In most cases only a sentence or two should be needed to clarify the point being raised in the item. In some cases only word or two, or a number or two, are needed.*

Your responses should be reasonably spontaneous as if the auditors had posed the questions directly to you during the audit visit.

Because the demands of your schedule may not give you time to respond during the audit visit itself, please respond at your convenience, knowing that your responses are needed for the auditors to complete their report to you.

The USM responses are in *blue italics* below and were completed on-site before the audit visit concluded. The decimal numbers in parentheses are the components of the TEAC system the probe was designed to address.

C1. On page 4, why is it that only some programs have an aligned set of core practices linked to the core values? (2.1)

As the college reconsidered its Conceptual Framework, in light of the more decentralized nature of TEAC accreditation from NCATE accreditation and with the agreement of the state higher education specialist, the faculty decided that there would be a set of Core Values that all "unit" programs agreed to, but that each individual program could also develop a more operational set of Core Practices to guide its curriculum development and program delivery. The Teacher Education Program developed a specific set of Core Practices that was subsequently adopted

by all other initial teacher certification pathways. Advanced programs chose to simply adhere to the CEHD Core Values.

The probe was an effort to verify that there is a single program in the IB and the response implies that this is largely, but only partly, true.

Verified with error (the options are not yet completely integrated into a single program)

Program Response:

The response in blue pertained to the difference between the program in the IB and the “advanced programs” outside of the IB that were concurrently standing for state approval. In fact, all program options in the IB do adhere to the TED Core Practices, as they are all housed in TED.

TEAC Response:

Your point is accepted. The score is changed to **Verified**.

Verified

C2. Again on page 4, how do the interns, or the faculty for that matter, determine what an “attainable standard is for all learners” (High Expectations)? How can attainable be distinguished from unattainable? (2.1)

With respect to our interns’ performance, attainable standards relate to the indicators for our standards. We regard “meets” as an attainable standard for all beginning teachers. We don’t define anything as unattainable because the faculty has spent a great deal of time over the last several years developing the indicators to be reflective of the competencies that all beginning teacher should have. At the beginning of the internship year, we spend a lot of time getting to know who our interns are as learners and people beyond the classroom. Using what we learn, we work with interns individually to set goals that will allow them to meet the standards. Through formative assessment practices, such as observing interns and giving them feedback, we support interns in meeting the standards. In addition, we meet with the interns at least 2 times during the internship year to give them feedback on their progress toward attaining the standards. Those interns who are struggling to attain the standards are put on action plan with clear targets and a timeline for improvement. Interns in trouble must meet these targets on the timeline in order to continue in the program.

With respect to the K-12 learners our interns will teach, we are explicit about the ways in which our practices for getting to know students as learners and people, clearly articulating the standards, setting goals, and formatively assessing serves as a model for our interns with regard to what we believe they should do as classroom teachers. In addition, we explicitly teach them strategies for understanding their students, clearly articulating standards, setting goals for meeting those standards, and providing

students with ongoing formative feedback that will support their students in meeting the standards.

The probe was an effort to verify the precision of the program's rationale.

Verified (with respect to precision in the use of the term, *attainable*)

C3. On page 4, isn't it more accurate to portray pedagogical content knowledge as fostering student learning rather than *professional expertise*? (3.2)

It's both fostering student learning and professional expertise. Fostering student learning is a central aspect, but not the only aspect, of professional expertise and pedagogical content knowledge is used in the broader context as well. For example, professional expertise includes what the teacher brings to curriculum and assessment development, school and district data analysis, parent communications, and peer collaborations. Understanding that pedagogical content knowledge is essential in the wider range of teacher action avoids putting a narrow emphasis on instruction and conceptualizes teaching as a profession that goes beyond the classroom.

The probe was an effort to address the requirement in the quality control system that the faculty has *balanced and accurate* view of the field and the response is taken as having verified that in this narrow case.

Verified

C4. On page 4 and 5 – how are *inquiry* and *formative assessment* really different given that the definitions that are written in the IB? Both seem based on evidence to improve instruction. And similarly, what distinguishes *responsiveness* from *pedagogical content knowledge* given that both entail an adjustment in teaching based on learning and learners? (3.2)

Inquiry and formative assessment are related but distinct. Inquiry is the broader disposition and practice that encompasses seeking professional knowledge, exploring educational topics of interest to the teacher as a professional, participating in ongoing professional development and engaging in the improvement of individual teaching as well as the educational system. Formative assessment is focused on the assessment of individual interns' development as teachers and their progress toward meeting the USM Teacher Certification Standards. Our use of formative assessment with interns is also a model for how we hope our students will use assessment for learning with their students. We also seek to invest beginning teachers with the interest and skills for ongoing inquiry into their own practice.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge and responsiveness are connected in just the way you describe - both entail an adjustment in teaching based on learning and learners. Pedagogical Content Knowledge, however, is focused on subject matter understanding and application. Responsiveness also includes using knowledge, interests, and cultures of students, parent concerns, community characteristics,

assessment information, feedback from colleagues and administrators, and other variables that impact teaching and learning.

The probe was another effort to address the faculty's balanced and accurate view of the field and the response is taken as having verified that in this narrow case.

Verified

C5. On page 8 the program has different standards for education courses (3.0 or better) from content courses (2.75 or better) and yet both content and pedagogy are each one of the standards. What commends different standards? (2.1)

The program requires that the overall GPA that includes content and education courses be 2.75 or higher. Education courses need to be a B or better and content courses need to be a C or better. The content course requirements match what is generally required by undergraduate majors — most majors at USM require students to earn a C or better in their courses. With regard to the B or better in education, we have a twofold stance: (1) This is their profession, and we want students who have the desire and motivation to achieve at the highest level in their prospective field; (2) we teach those courses and can ensure that the teaching is of the highest quality and supports student success. Therefore, we feel comfortable expecting a higher level of achievement in teacher education courses than in the courses offered in the College of Arts and Sciences.

The probe was about the rationale for the assessments and the response provides a way to verify the program's different standards for each domain.

Verified

C6. On page 11, Table 2.1 – is there some logic or rationale for the order of the USM standards? Why are just the first five used in admission decision? (2.1)

Yes, there is. Although each of the standards requires practical knowledge and skill in order to meet the standard, there are elements of the first five standards that are basic, pre-requisite knowledge for teaching. For example, we expect that upon entering the internship, prospective interns view learners as individuals who have different family and cultural backgrounds, different learning styles and intelligences, and different interests. We also expect that prospective interns have mastery in the content areas they are to teach; have basic technology skills, and have a level of professionalism that includes the beginning ability to articulate their beliefs about teaching and learning. Standards 6 - 9 comprise the heart of the instructional process learned during the internship. Developing the knowledge and skills related to standards 6-9 requires that interns spend a substantial amount of time in classrooms. Standard 10 is last as that points to the future and to cycling back through the preceding standards ongoing professional development leads to improvements in the areas of standards 1 – 9.

The probe was about the rationale for the assessments and the response provides a way to verify the program's differential selection of USM standards.

Verified

C7. On page 13, Table 2.2 – In TEAC the cross-cutting themes are said to be embedded in, or cutting across, subject matter, pedagogy, and teaching, but in this table they seem disconnected from them and more free-standing. For example, don't multiple perspectives interact with a positive class environment, and isn't technology linked to subject matter, pedagogy, and -teaching? What is the faculty's view of the *cross-cutting* aspect of the themes? (2.1)

For the sake of analysis, we aligned the TEAC cross-cutting themes with the USM Teacher Certification Standards they most closely match. That being said, we understand that the cross-cutting themes are similar to our TED standards in that they overlap with and are embedded in the TEAC Quality Principles and with many different TED standards. So, although we perceive the cross-cutting themes to be most closely connected to the standards to which they are aligned on the chart, we also acknowledge that each may manifest in other standards as well.

Thus, teaching events and evidence of teaching knowledge and skill may reflect more than one standard or cross-cutting theme at a time. This is where we go beyond our analysis and look for more of a synthesis in our intern assessment system. The teaching unit and lead teaching and the year long internship that leads to these, for example, are synthesizing teaching events through which the standards are assessed. These assessments require the interns to experience teaching as a meaningful, holistic, and ever changing process.

The probe was designed to verify the embedded character of the themes and the response avoids directly answering the question of whether technology (as a program standard) is part of 1.1-1.3 for example. On the other hand the table was constructed simply to demonstrate the alignment of the USM standards and the TEAC system, not address the embedded feature of the themes.

Verified with error (the error being that table is still somewhat misleading with regard to the embedded character of the cross-cutting themes.

C8. On page 14, how does the selection of two components from the Intern Assessment System, as opposed to all of them, provide a greater basis for analysis and review? (2.1)

The two assessments we chose, the unit and standard review, are the two most comprehensive program assessment in that they assess multiple standards. They are understood to be primary culminating summative assessments that include the kind of synthesis described in the response to the previous question.

The probe was an attempt to verify the rationale behind the assertion that two items of a set would be better than the whole set in providing a basis for analysis and review. The response claims that the two components more or less represent the whole set.

Verified

C9. On page 15, judgments about evidence are said to be made by consensus. What is the procedure, if any, for instances when consensus is not possible should there be legitimate disagreement, for example? (2.1)

Faculty supervisors are committed to consensus and engage in ongoing discussions with mentors and interns to ensure understandings about whether standards are being met. When legitimate disagreements occur and consensus is not possible, it is understood that the faculty supervisor is the primary evaluator. Only one score for each standard is recorded, but comments are documented from all participants.

The probe is about the rationale and the response indicates that when consensus fails, the faculty makes the final determination of record.

Verified

C10. Which of the following questions in the admission interview provide the basis (on page 15) for *content proficiency*? What kind of answers do you find that supports the proficiency conclusion? (2.1)

1. What content areas do you believe are a real strength for you and why?
2. What content area will be the most challenging for you to teach and why?
3. How will your knowledge in different content areas influence what and how you will teach those content areas?
4. Describe a unit or a topic that you would love to teach. How would you envision doing that?
5. How will you approach learning new content in order to teach it?

OR

G. Secondary candidate questions:

1. What content expertise will you bring to a team of teachers?
2. Describe a unit or a topic that you would love to teach. How would you envision doing that?
3. Is there a specific aspect of your content area that you would find challenging to teach and why?

Each of the above questions may be used to assess a candidate's content proficiency. The specific questions that we use depend upon what we learned about the candidate's content proficiency during the paper screening of the applicant. For example, if content GPA, individual courses on the transcript or Praxis I are low and red flags, then we ask about those specific content areas that appear weak. If content GPA, course grades on the transcript, and Praxis I scores are strong, then we tend to explore the candidate's pedagogical content knowledge. The interview is semi-

structured to allow follow-up questions that are not scripted and pursue a particular train of thought. Often, the practitioner leads the questioning until a level of satisfaction is obtained about the presence or lack of content proficiency.

The probe is also about the rationale for the admission assessment and the response indicates that the procedure is tailored and nuanced to the strengths and weaknesses of the applicant.

Verified

C11. On page 16, Technology, what kind of answers would receive a bottom and a top rating to the following question from the admission protocol? (2.1)

A bottom rating would be a prospective intern who lacks personal technological knowledge and skill. For example, someone who is a technophobe, is unfamiliar with many technology applications, and/or doesn't use technology much in his/her daily life would earn a lower score. A top rating would be someone who is digitally literate and can think about how they might use technology as a tool for learning in their classroom.

The probe is about the rationale for the technology assessment and the response could have provided some empirical support for the assertions in it, but as it is, it provides modest basis for verifying that the rationale.

Verified

C12. On pages 21-22, Table 3.3 lists 19 distinct categories of evidence that are linked to Quality Principle I's components. Do these link to the ten standards as well so that the program could identify the line of evidence that support standard 10 or standard 5? (2.1)

Yes, they link to the ten standards. The operational outcomes of the evidence include the standards review scores and the unit scores, both of which measure multiple standards. Both of these identify a line of evidence that support standard 10, and the standards review scores also include evidence of standard 5.

Verified

C13. On page 23, the procedure for inter-rater reliability is described. On what exactly were the correlations calculated? Just describe what was in each column of the data sheet on which the correlation was run. How, in other words, were the pairs created? (2.1)

Intra-class correlation reliability was calculated for a random sample of 20 interns' interview summary sheets. For each candidate who applies to the program and is interviewed a summary score sheet is generated. On the sheet, each interviewer reports his or her scores on the interview questions as well as over-all scores. The reliability analysis was conducted on interviewers' scores for candidates' responses to the technology, diversity, and content knowledge questions in the interview. The data

in the columns for reliability analysis were candidates' scores awarded by each interviewer. Although we calculate a mean score for these questions, we were seeking a measure of consistency among interviewers on content, technology, and diversity.

Verified

C14. On page 26, what generally were the correlational patterns that were found in the data from the '07 and '08 program completers? (2.2)

We ran hypotheses of correlation in our first draft and then took that analysis out when we reorganized according to their QP's and cross cutting themes. This text should have been deleted. The correction has been made in the edited IB text.

Disclaimer

C15. On page 27, what is the faculty's interpretation of the low 2.18/4.00 mean from the TEAMS candidates in their content area? (3.2)

There was an error on Table 4.1 in the original submission. TEAMS candidates are assessed on a 3-point scale. So, it is really a 2.18 out of 3. Beginning with the Spring 2009 TEAMS Candidacy Process, the scale will be a 4pt scale like ETEP. We have revised to Inquiry Brief to correct for this error.

Verified with error

C16. In Table 4.3 on page 29 and in some other tables there seem to be ceiling effects in some measures (e.g., Methods GPA or Importance ratings). One interpretation is superior performance of the candidates and another would be inflation or indiscriminate rating. How did the faculty rule out one when they advanced the other? (3.2)

All the measures work in concert to support our claim that interns who complete the program have good pedagogical knowledge. That being said, it is true that there is a ceiling effect for some of the measures like methods GPA and importance ratings. A possible explanation is that the TEAMS candidacy and ETEP admissions processes are rigorous. Those whom we admit are high achievers. In addition, as a part of this process, we screen for candidates who share our values (e.g., equity, learner centered education). This most likely explains why they view those things that we value as important. The high methods GPA reflects the fact that most of our faculty view assessment and grading from a perspective of continuous improvement and mastery of standards. Therefore, interns may revise and resubmit course assessments until they meet the standards for that assessment and earn an A for the course.

Verified (a mastery approach would yield the noted ceiling effects)

C17. Page 30-31, there seems to be some mix-up in table numbers in the text. This was merely an oversight in proofreading, right? (3.2)

Yes. This has been corrected in the edited version of the Inquiry Brief.

Disclaimer

C18. Is there any particular reason the adjunct faculty were not included in Appendix C? How does the program integrate the instruction given by the adjuncts with the regular faculty? (nonspecific)

While the chart for Appendix C includes only full time faculty, the online version of Appendix C includes vitas and resumes of all part-time instructors, supervisors, and site coordinators. We were advised by TEAC staff to include only the chart of full time faculty in the hard copy print out.

The majority of our adjunct faculty are teachers and/or administrators in our K-12 partner schools. We rely heavily on them to deliver our program, and we view their contributions to the development of novice teachers as essential. The full time faculty teach the internship seminar and supervise interns in their placements; whereas, most part time faculty are integrated into the program as methods of instructors.

Disclaimer

C19. On page 24, what is the faculty's interpretation for the different reliability estimates for the mid-year assessments (.57) and the end-of-program assessments (.92)? (3.2)

The faculty interpret the difference in the internal consistency between mid-term and final standards review in three ways. First, the mid-term review uses a 2-pt scale while the final standards review uses a 3-pt scale. Therefore, the 2-pt scale does not reveal enough variability to fully capture internal consistency in the way the 3 pt scale does. We are in the process of developing a four-point standards review rubric that will be used at both mid-year and final standards review, thereby addressing the issue of different scales of measurement. In addition to this interpretation, it is our assumption that both our interns and faculty do, in fact, become more consistent in their practice and assessment respectively over the course of the internship year. This is an inquiry question that we will probe further when we begin using a consistent scale of measurement at both points in the standards assessment process.

The probe was about the program's rationale and the response indicates that the rationale has taken the point in.

Verified



A. Tasks Related to the Evidence of Student Learning

This section of the report addresses targets associated with *Quality Principle I*, which has the following requirements:

1.0 QUALITY PRINCIPLE I: EVIDENCE OF CANDIDATE LEARNING

Overview. Programs must provide sufficient evidence that candidates have learned and understood the teacher education curriculum. This evidence is verified through audit and evaluated for its consistency and sufficiency. Each component and cross-cutting theme of *Quality Principle I* must contribute to the overall goal of producing competent, caring and qualified teachers.

- 1.1 **Subject Matter Knowledge.** The program candidates must learn and understand the subject matter they will teach.
- 1.2 **Pedagogical Knowledge.** The program candidates must be able to convert their knowledge of subject matter into compelling lessons that meet the needs of a wide range of pupils and students.
- 1.3 **Caring and Effective Teaching Skill.** The program candidates must be able to teach caringly and effectively and to act on their knowledge in a professional manner.
- 1.4 **Cross-cutting themes.** In meeting each of TEAC components 1.1–1.3, the program must demonstrate that its candidates have addressed the following three cross-cutting liberal education themes:
 - 1.4.1 **Learning how to learn.** Candidates must demonstrate that they have learned how to learn information on their own, that they can transfer what they have learned to new situations, and that they have acquired the dispositions and skills that will support life-long learning in their field.
 - 1.4.2 **Multicultural perspectives and accuracy.** Candidates must demonstrate that they have learned accurate and sound information on matters of race, gender, individual differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives.
 - 1.4.3 **Technology.** Candidates must be able to use appropriate technology in carrying out their professional responsibilities.
- 1.5 **Evidence of valid assessment.** The program must provide evidence regarding the trustworthiness, reliability and validity of the evidence produced from the assessment method or methods that it has adopted.

The first eight tasks refer to the online and onsite surveys of students, faculty, and cooperating teachers with regard to their ratings of the adequacy of the students' preparation in the areas represented by *Quality Principle I*.

Audit task A1 (1.1)

Target: The evidence in tables 4.1 and 4.2 on subject matter knowledge on pages 27-28.

Probe: Corroborate the program's assessment results with online surveys of convenience samples of program students, faculty, and cooperating teachers.

Finding: The results from the convenience samples are in the table below:

Table A1
On-Line Student, Faculty and Cooperating Teacher Mean Ratings (1-5) on the Adequacy of the Students' Accomplishments in Subject Matter Knowledge

Topic of Survey Question	Number of Raters	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation
Student ratings of adequacy of own knowledge	46	4.31	.70
Student ratings of adequacy of courses	46	3.91	1.20

Topic of Survey Question	Number of Raters	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation
Student ratings of adequacy of faculty	46	4.22	1.02
Faculty ratings of student knowledge	23	4.39	.78
Cooperating teacher ratings of student knowledge	66	4.08	.93

The scale is: 1. *Inadequate*, 2. *Barely Adequate*, 3. *Adequate*, 4. *More than Adequate*, and 5. *Excellent*.

The results show that all groups of raters saw the student's subject matter understanding in the *more than adequate* range, a finding which aligns with the data in tables 4.1 and 4.2.

Verified

Audit task A2 (1.2)

Target: The data in Tables 4.3 & 4.4, pages 29-30.

Probe: Corroborate the program's assessment results with online surveys of convenience samples of program students, faculty, and cooperating teachers.

Finding: The results from the convenience samples are in the table below:

Table A2
On-Line Students, Faculty and Cooperating Teacher Mean Ratings (1-5) on the Adequacy of the Students' Accomplishments in Pedagogical Knowledge

Topic of Survey Question	Number of Raters	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation
Student ratings of own pedagogical knowledge	46	4.30	.72
Student ratings of adequacy of pedagogy courses	46	4.20	.77
Student ratings of adequacy of methods faculty	46	4.35	.71
Faculty ratings of pedagogical knowledge	23	4.17	.88
Cooperating teacher ratings of pedagogical knowledge	66	4.12	.95

The scale is: 1. *Inadequate*, 2. *Barely Adequate*, 3. *Adequate*, 4. *More than Adequate*, and 5. *Excellent*.

The results show that the raters in all groups saw the students' pedagogical understanding was in the *more than adequate* range.

Verified

Audit task A3 (1.3)

Target: The data in tables 4.7-4.10 on pages 32-36.

Probe: Corroborate the program's assessment results with online surveys of convenience samples of program students, faculty, and cooperating teachers.

Finding: The results from the convenience samples are in the table below:

Table A3
On-Line Student, Faculty and Cooperating Teacher Mean Ratings (1-5) on the Adequacy of the Students' Accomplishments in Caring Teaching Skill

Topic of Survey Question	Number of Raters	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation
Student ratings of own teaching skill	46	4.76	.53
Student ratings of adequacy of clinical courses	46	3.91	1.01
Student ratings of adequacy of clinical faculty	46	4.04	.93
Faculty ratings of students' teaching skill	23	4.65	.64
Cooperating teacher ratings of students' teaching skill	66	4.52	.75

The scale is: 1. *Inadequate*, 2. *Barely Adequate*, 3. *Adequate*, 4. *More than Adequate*, and 5. *Excellent*.

The results indicate that all groups of raters found that the students' teaching skill was in the *more than adequate* range and closer to the *excellent* mark than other areas. In fact the students' ratings of their teaching skill is significantly higher than their evaluation of subject matter knowledge ($t=4.56$, $df=44$, $p<.001$) and pedagogical knowledge ($t=3.77$, $df=43$, $p<.001$), a finding that also held for the faculty ratings and the cooperating teacher ratings. While the IB does not speak about the superiority of the evidence for teaching skill over subject matter and pedagogical knowledge, it is a view held by the students, the faculty, and the cooperating teachers. An anova analysis also showed that the differences in mean ratings of the adequacy of the students' accomplishments among the three groups of raters were insignificant for subject matter, pedagogy, and teaching skill. The results in Table A3, and the subsequent analyses, are in line with the findings reported in the IB.

Verified

Audit task A4 (1.4)

Target: The data in tables 4.11-14 on the cross-cutting themes, pages 37-40.

Probe: Corroborate the program's assessments with online surveys of convenience samples of program students, faculty, and cooperating teachers.

Finding: The results from the convenience samples are in the table below. With two exceptions in the faculty's ratings, the ratings are otherwise in the *more than adequate* range.

Table A4
On-Line Student, Faculty and Cooperating Teacher Mean Ratings (1-5) and (Standard Deviations) on the Adequacy of the Students' Accomplishments in The Three Cross-Cutting Themes

Cross-Cutting Theme Areas	Student Mean Rating (N=46)	Faculty Mean Rating (N=23)	Cooperating Teachers Mean Rating (N=66)
Multicultural Understanding	4.28 (.81)	3.91 (.73)	4.27 (.77)

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

Technology	4.58 (.58)	3.83 (.98)	4.15 (1.02)
Learning How to Learn	4.28 (.75)	4.52 (.73)	4.30 (.93)

The scale is 1. *Inadequate*, 2. *Barely Adequate*, 3. *Adequate*, 4. *More than Adequate*, and 5. *Excellent*.

Student ratings of their understanding of technology are significantly higher than their ratings of multicultural understanding and learning to learn. However the mean faculty ratings of multicultural understanding and technology, while insignificantly different from each other, are significantly lower than the faculty ratings of learning to learn ($t=-3.73$, $df=22$, $p<.001$ and $t=-3.42$, $df=22$, $p<.002$ for technology). None of the differences in cooperating teacher ratings are significantly different from each other. An anova analysis did show that only the differences in the mean ratings of technology were significant among the three groups of raters, presumably due to the high student ratings and relatively low faculty ratings.

Verified

Audit task A5 (2.2)

Target: The reliability and validity of the TEAC surveys above.

Probe: Calculate correlations among the mean ratings of adequacy for the common items on each group's survey (8 items in common between faculty and students and six with cooperating teachers).

Finding: The tables below gives the correlations mentioned above. On the whole the correlations indicate that the student, faculty, and cooperating teachers responded to the survey items in comparable ways.

Table A5
Correlations between Student, Faculty, and Cooperating Teacher Ratings of the Students' Subject Matter Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, and Teaching Skill

Topic	Student/Faculty Ratings	Student/Cooperating Teacher Ratings	Faculty/Cooperating Teacher Ratings
Mean Ratings of Survey Items (6-8)	.62	.53	.61

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Verified

Audit task A6 (2.2)

Target: The validity of the corroborating TEAC student survey

Probe: Calculate the correlations for the student, faculty, and cooperating teacher mean ratings of their students' adequacy in each of the six areas of *Quality Principle I*.

Finding: There is an implicit assumption that they each component of *Quality Principle I* signifies an aspect of the overall competence of the beginning teacher as

such they could be expected to be correlated with each other. The correlations are presented in Table A6 and show significant positive correlations in all but one instance. On the whole, in the estimation of the raters, students proficient in one area are proficient in the others and vice versa.

Table A6
Correlations between the Students' Subject Matter Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, and Teaching Skill for Each Group of Raters (Students, Faculty, & Cooperating Teachers)

Related Topics	Student Raters	Faculty Raters	Cooperating Teacher Raters
Subject Matter & Pedagogy	.58*	.75*	.80**
Subject Matter & Teaching	.27	.69*	.46*
Teaching Skill & Pedagogy	.53*	.66*	.50*

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The same pattern of correlations were found between the ratings of multicultural understanding and technology for the student, faculty and cooperating teachers raters, respectively (.49**, .48**, and .61**), between multicultural and learning to learn (.45**, .43**, .58**) and between learning to learn and technology (.42**, .39, 62**). Within themselves the three groups of raters are consistent with regard to their ratings insofar as students who are rated by them as high in one domain are rated highly in the others and vice versa.

Verified

Audit task A7 (2.2)

Target: The reliability and validity of the TEAC surveys above.

Probe: Calculate correlations among the adequacy of the students' understanding of each areas and their rating of the adequacy of the area's courses and faculty and their reported GPAs.

Finding: There is an implicit claim made by the program that there is a relationship between the students' accomplishments and the quality of the faculty and courses. By way of validating the TEAC survey for the program's students and also this implicit claim the correlations among these ratings were computed. The table below gives the correlations mentioned above:

Table A7
Correlations between the Program Students' Rating of the Adequacy of Their Understanding of Each Area of Program Claim and their Ratings of the Adequacy of the Courses, Faculty and Reported GPA and the Correlation Between Their Ratings of the Adequacy of the Faculty and Courses

Area of Student Rating of Their own Understanding	Student Rating of Courses	Student Rating of Faculty	Reported GPA	Correlation Between Student Ratings of Faculty and Courses
Subject Matter	.44**	.51**	-.30	.72**
Pedagogy	.64**	.48**	-.18	.72**
Teaching Skill	.46**	.37*	-.16	.83**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Students' ratings of their own understanding and ability, seems strikingly unrelated to their reported GPA in the program, but is significantly related to their ratings of the adequacy of the courses and faculty in each area. Their ratings of the quality of the faculty and courses are also significantly and more highly correlated with each other.

Verified

Audit task A8 (2.1)

Target: The “embeddedness” of the cross-cutting themes in each component of *Quality Principle I*.

Probe: Corroborate the target by calculating the correlations from the faculty and student survey ratings between the adequacy of their subject matter, pedagogy, and teaching skills with the adequacy of their understanding of each of the cross-cutting themes.

Finding: The correlations for the survey completers were significantly positive in most instances between their ratings of the adequacy of their knowledge of the QPI components and the adequacy of their understanding of each of the cross-cutting themes. The link between multicultural understanding and pedagogical knowledge, while positive, is weaker than it is for the other cross-cutting theme topics.

Table A8
Correlations Between Ratings of the Cross-Cutting Themes and Ratings of Each Component of Quality Principle I for Student and Faculty Survey Completers

Cross-Cutting Theme Areas	Subject Matter Knowledge		Pedagogical Knowledge		Caring Teaching Skill	
	Student	Faculty	Student	Faculty	Student	Faculty
Multi-cultural	.21	.46*	.27	.23	.33*	.60**
Technology	.38**	.45*	.29*	.45*	.56**	.40
Learning to Learn	.49**	.58*	.70**	.89*	.38*	.79**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Verified

Audit task A9 (2.2)

Target: The reliability of the TEAC surveys of students, faculty, and cooperating teachers.

Probe: Calculate Cronbach's *alpha* for each of the three online surveys.

Finding: Cronbach's *alpha* for each of the surveys is: student survey, .90, faculty survey, .76, cooperating teacher survey, .85. The student and cooperating teacher surveys satisfy a reasonable criterion for reliability, while the faculty survey reliability is borderline, perhaps owing to the fewer number of raters.

Verified

Audit task A10 (2.2)

Target: The equivalence of the on-site and on-line faculty, student, and cooperating teacher survey responders.

Probe: Calculate the mean ratings and analyze any differences between the on-line and on-site responders to the survey.

Finding: Table A8 shows the number of times a mean online or onsite rating was greater than the other group's mean for the ten items of the survey. There were no significant differences between the faculty and student online and onsite ratings, but the onsite cooperating teachers gave higher ratings significantly more times than online respondents. The online student GPA was marginally higher (3.83) than the onsite reported GPA (3.79), indicating that the onsite interview participants were not appreciably different from those who did not participate in the interviews. The purpose of this audit task is to place the responses of those interviewed on site in the context of the wider population of which they were a sample.

Table A10
Number of Times Mean Rating Was Greater in One Group (Online or Onsite) than the Other Group for Faculty, Student, and Cooperating Teacher for the Ten Survey Items

Raters	Online	Onsite	Binomial test
Faculty	4	6	p>.05
Students	8	2	p>.05
Coop Teachers	0	10	p<.001

Verified (with regard to the faculty and students only; the onsite cooperating teachers may not be representative of the set of cooperating teachers)

Audit task A11 (1.1-1.4)

Target: Data cells for 2007-08 in Table 3.2, pages 19-20, and Table 4.2, page 28

Probe: Use the data from the internal audit randomly drawn sample of 39 students and calculate the means for the measures cited in Table 3.2 & 4.2

Finding: Table A9 gives the sample means for the measures

Table A11
Mean Scores in Grades and License Tests for a Random Sample of 39 Program Completers in 2007-08

	Number	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
BA GPA	34	2.09	4.00	3.13	.54
Subject Matter GPA	39	1.90	4.00	3.04	.55
Methods GPA	39	2.00	4.00	3.83	.37
Praxis I Reading	39	176	187	182.87	3.19
Praxis I Writing	39	172	189	178.28	3.61
Praxis I Mathematic	39	174	190	183.48	4.45
Praxis II test 1	37	118	200	177.13	17.55
Praxis II test 2	11	170	198	184.00	8.27

The mean scores are essentially the same as those reported in the IB and are all above the program's standard, although some minimum scores are below the program standard.

Verified

Audit task A12 (1.2)

Target: Mean cell entries in Table 4.9, page 34 for standard review scores

Probe: Use the internal audit randomly drawn sample of 39 students and calculate the means for the measures cited in Table 4.3

Finding: The mean scores from the sample are presented in Table A10 below and show overall comparability with the scores reported in the IB, which were all in the 2.3-2.6 range.

Table A12
Mean Standard Review Scores for Each Program Standard for a Randomly Drawn Sample of Program Completers, 2007-2008

Program Standards	Number	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Equity	36	2.00	3.00	2.62	.47
Content	35	2.00	3.00	2.52	.50
Beliefs	35	2.00	3.00	2.65	.46
Technology	35	2.00	3.00	2.57	.49
Collaboration	35	2.00	3.00	2.65	.46

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

Positive climate	35	2.00	3.00	2.55	.49
Planning	35	2.00	3.00	2.50	.46
Instructional Strategy	35	2.00	3.00	2.51	.49
Assessment	35	2.00	3.00	2.32	.44
Professional Dev	35	2.00	3.00	2.54	.49

Verified

Audit task A13 (1.2)

Target: Mean cell entries in Table 4.3, page 29 for unit scores

Probe: Use the internal audit randomly drawn sample of 39 students and calculate the means for the measures cited in Table 4.3

Finding: The mean scores for raters from the sample are presented in Table A12 in the following audit task and show overall comparability with the scores reported in the IB, which were all in the 2.3-2.6 range.

Verified

Audit task A14 (2.2)

Target: *In May, 2008 a random sample of 17 units were selected and scored by a second reader in order to establish the reliability of scores generated with the unit rubric developed the previous year... These findings demonstrate adequate reliability, page 25.*

Probe: Compare the mean ratings of the two raters to determine if the differences in ratings are insignificant.

Finding: The point of the probe is that if the raters are reliable in their scoring of the units, the mean differences in ratings for each standard should be inconsequential. The mean ratings are presented in Table A14 and indicate that the two raters mean scores were statistically insignificantly different from each other, had small standard errors, and that the outcome conveys the same meaning in each case, namely that the rating signifies that the standard has been met. The raters' scores were also positively correlated with each other.

Table A14
Mean Ratings of Two Raters of a Random Sample of 17 Units for Each Program Standard

		Mean	Number of Units	Standard Deviation	Std. Error	Correlation betw. raters
Pair 1	Diversity Rater 1	2.55	17	.52	.12	.45
	Diversity Rater 2	2.33	17	.70	.17	
Pair 2	Content Rater 1	2.55	17	.49	.12	.63**
	Content Rater 2	2.39	17	.65	.15	

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

Pair 3	Plan Rater 1	2.50	16	.57	.14	.46
	Plan Rater 2	2.25	16	.63	.15	
Pair 4	Strategy Rater 1	2.50	17	.50	.12	.44
	Strategy Rater 2	2.32	17	.63	.15	
Pair 5	Assessment Rater 1	2.31	17	.51	.12	.44
	Assessment Rater 2	2.25	17	.51	.17	
Pair 6	Professional Dev Rater 1	2.55	17	.49	.12	.38
	Professional Dev Rater 2	2.27	17	.69	.16	

Rater 1, however, always gave higher mean ratings than rater 2 and always found fewer units that failed to meet the standard (ratings below 2 ranged from 0-10%, while rater 2's below standard findings range from 6%-18%). In these instances there is an importance difference in meaning. With regard to finding units above standard (3.0) of the two, rater 1 was always more generous in his/her ratings than rater 2 (finding 1-4 more instances of 3 in each standard), again a difference that makes a difference in the meaning of the ratings.

Verified (with regard to the IB text)

Audit task A15 (2.2)

Targets: *The internal consistency reliability of the standards reviews scores was estimated using Chronbach's [sic] alpha. Reliability of standard scale scores is estimated to be .57 for the mid-year standard score scale and .92 for the end-of-program standard score scale, page 24.*

Probe: Corroborate the Cronbach *alphas* by calculating *alpha* for the ratings in the internal audit sample, which was randomly selected.

Finding: The respective *alphas* were .57 and .89 for the sample mid-term and end-term standard review scores.

Verified

Audit task A16 (2.2)

Target: The validity of the program's content measures (GPA, admissions rating in content, standards review, unit score, & Praxis II) presented in Table 3.3, page 21.

Probe: Calculate the correlation coefficients between and among the measures from the internal audit sample of 2007-08 program completers.

Finding: Table A14 gives the pertinent correlations.

Table A16

Correlations Among the Program's Measures of Teaching Content Knowledge for a Sample of 39 Program Completers in 2007-08

	BA GPA	Subject Matter GPA	Admission Rating for Content	Standards Review of Content	Unit Rating of Content Rater 1
Subject Matter GPA	.70**				
Admission Rating for Content	-.13	-.34			
Standards Review Content	.40*	.25	-.01		
Unit Content Rater 1	.41	.47*	-.15	.61**	
Unit Content Rater 2	.25	.59*	.45	.04	.63**
Praxis II	.29	.15	.34	.16	.39 & .32 (rater 2)

The pattern of correlations is only partly supportive of the assertion that these separate measures address the students' subject matter understanding, although the fact that the measures are administered at different times in the program and that subject matter knowledge could be expected to change and mature over the course of the program may account for some low correlations. Even here, while assessments that occur together in time (like rater 1 and 2 unit assessments) are associated, there are some puzzling disconnects in the negative correlations. The pattern, for example, does not show that the faculty's admission evaluation of content knowledge has much relationship with any other assessment they make of content knowledge.

The statistically significant correlations, however, are all in line with what would be expected if the assessments were about the students' subject matter understanding. The other correlations could also be attenuated by the small sample sizes for some comparisons.

Verified

Audit task A17 (2.2)

Target: The validity of the program's cross-cutting equity theme measures presented in Table 3.4, page 21.

Probe: Calculate the correlation coefficients between and among the measures from the internal audit sample of 2007-08 program completers.

Finding: Table A15 gives the pertinent correlations.

Table A17

Correlations Among the Available Equity Assessments in a Sample of 2007-08 Program Completers

Assessment	Admission Rating for Equity	Equity Standards Review	Rater 1: Diversity Unit
Equity Standards Review	.45*		
Rater 1: Diversity Unit	.49	.80**	
Rater 2: Diversity Unit	.08	.43	.45

With the exception of rater 2's absent relationship with the equity admission evaluation, the program's separate equity assessments show positive and some significant correlations with each other. On the other hand the correlation between the admission's technology evaluation and the standards review for technology was low and negative, viz., -.07.

Verified (with respect to the equity assessments)

Audit task A18 (2.2)

Target: The validity of the program's pedagogy measures presented in Table 4.3, page 29.

Probe: Calculate the correlation coefficients between and among the measures from the internal audit sample of 2007-08 program completers.

Finding: The methods GPA was weakly related to all other measures of pedagogy, having only one significantly positive correlation (with unit instructional strategies) and a negative -.01 correlation with equity standards review. The standards review assessments and the unit assessments were all positively correlated with each other and 77% were statistically significant.

Verified

Audit task A19 (2.2)

Target: Praxis validity for the internal audit sample

Probe: By way of establishing the range of correlations that could be had from the internal audit sample with standardized tests, compute the correlations among the Praxis tests cited by the program

Finding: Praxis Reading correlated with Writing (.48**) and Mathematics (.40*) and Praxis II (.45**). Praxis I Writing and Mathematics correlated weakly (.14). Praxis II had significant positive correlations with writing (.37*) and mathematics (.47**). Subject matter and methods GPA had no significant correlations with any of the standardized tests. The conclusion is that correlations in .40-.50 range are of

reasonable magnitude for the internal audit sample. These correlations also signify that the standardized tests have some internal validity for the sample.

Verified

Audit task A20 (2.2)

Target: Cohort differences between 2007 and 2008

Probe: Determine the significance of the mean differences of each assessment for the two cohorts.

Finding: The IB presumes that there are no significant cohort differences, and for all intents and purposes, none were found in any of the 31 assessments. The only significant difference between the cohorts was in Praxis I mathematics scores (2007, N=27, mean=182 and 2008, N=17, mean=186).

Verified

Audit task A21 (1.4)

Target: *All interns who complete the program are competent, including...multicultural perspective, page 18 and must meet a standard for the use equitable and culturally responsive practices, page 46.*

Probe: Pose a multicultural problem for a sample of students to determine their reasoning about how the program students are taught to deal with multi-cultural differences.

Finding: A scenario was given to a sample of 12 students concerning two Native American students, one of whom was helping the other on an examination (cheating). When the teacher confronted the students, they stated that their culture required friends to help each other above all else. The program students were asked how the program had prepared them to respond to this kind of teaching situation. While some students initially insisted the students' cultural practice would have to give way to the school's policies, a consensus developed that the program taught them to anticipate and plan for such contingencies beforehand, to provide other venues for cooperation which would respect the students' cultural requirements, and finally to employ alternative assessments, such as portfolios, collaborative group assessments, questioning, and group work. These might enable them to find out what the students knew by other means and that this culturally problematic testing situation could be avoided. Some said they would attempt to "reframe" the issue by arguing that *cheating* really wasn't in line with the cultural requirement to help your friend as true help would be to insure that the friend knew the material in question.

When a sample of faculty members were asked how they hoped their students would respond to the scenario, they were pleased with what the students were reported to have said, but there was more insistence that the school's policy trumped cultural practices and that their students should be led to see that multiculturalism requires more "give and take" between cultures.

Verified

Audit task A22 (1.2)

Target: *High Expectations: Establishing and communicating clear, challenging, and attainable standards for all learners, page 4.*

Probe: Pose an instructional strategy problem for a sample of students to determine their reasoning about how the program students are taught to deal with different instructional practices.

Finding: The students were asked if they would want to see the IQ data for their students before they began teaching them and what guidance had the program given them on a question like this. The program students did not think having the data was essential to any instructional strategy they might use and would make no high stake decision based on it. They articulated the risk of inaccurate expectations but also so the benefit of being better prepared for the range of ability in the class. The consensus was that more information about one's students was better than less information, but that IQ wasn't that critical to their decision-making. They were unaware of the scholarship on predictive power of IQ in educational settings.

Verified (insofar as could place IQ in a context of high expectations, per the target)

Audit task A23 (1.2)

Target: *Scholarship: Creating, studying, critiquing, and applying research related to teaching, learning, schooling, and teacher education, page 4.*

Probe: Pose an instructional problem that has an established research base for a sample of students to determine their reasoning about how the program students are taught to deal with issues that also have a scholarly base.

Finding: The program students were asked whether they would recommend promotion or retention of some of their students who had not succeeded in accomplishing what was expected of them in the year's class. The program students said they were taught not to wait until the end of the year to make this kind of determination as they would have been addressing the students' low performance all year and their students would not be surprised. They would have used the RTI process so the issue would be minimized. Only one student mentioned *social promotion* and neither he nor the rest of the students, when asked, knew the literature on the subject. On the other hand, the consensus was that the students should be *socially promoted* because the students should be kept with their age-peers, so in that sense the program students' views were coincidentally in line with the literature. They also thought this was not an *all-or-nothing* proposition and remediation should be tailored to the specific weaknesses in the students' accomplishments.

Verified with error (the error being that the scholarship was not evident in the students' discussion).

Summary of Tasks Related to the Evidence of Student Learning

The auditors were able to verify and corroborate the evidence cited in the *Inquiry Brief* for the magnitude of the scores from the assessments associated with the program’s claims with regard to *Quality Principle I*. There are lawful and consistent relationships within and between selected program assessments that were uncovered by the auditors and which support the view that the program is able to make valid interpretations of its assessments. Interviews with students also corroborated the claims in the IB.

B. Tasks Related to the Program’s Quality Control System

The next section of the audit report addresses targets that are associated with the Program’s control and enhancement of program quality. The following components are treated:

- 2.1 **Rationale for the assessments.** There must be a rationale for the program’s assessment methods that shows the links between the assessment and (1) the program’s goals, (2) the claims made about student learning, and (3) the program’s requirements.
- 3.1 **Program decisions and planning based on evidence.** Where appropriate, the program must base decisions to modify its assessment systems, pedagogical approaches, and curriculum and program requirements on evidence of student learning.
- 3.2 **Influential quality control system.** The program must provide evidence, based on an internal audit conducted by the program faculty, that the quality control system functions as it was designed and that it promotes the program’s continual improvement.

Audit task B1 (2.1)

Target: Capacity of the faculty to use their student teaching evaluation form consistently.

Probe: Have a sample of program faculty score a video lesson with the program’s evaluation instrument.

Finding: Table B1 below gives the mean rating (1-4) for each of the 13 faculty members who rated a video-lesson with the faculty’s 10 item instrument. Four faculty members saw the lesson as deserving a rating of 3.00 or more, but nine saw the lesson in the lower 2.00-3.00 range, and none saw it earning less than a 2.00 on average.

**Table B1
Mean Rating (1-4) of Each Faculty Members of the Video-Lesson, the Number of Items Rated and the Minimum and Maximum Ratings**

Faculty Rater	Number of Items Rated	Minimum Rating	Maximum Rating	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	8	2	4	3.38	.74
2	9	2	3	2.83	.35
3	7	2	3	2.71	.48

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

4	6	2	3	2.50	.54
5	8	3	3	3.00	.00
6	9	2	3	2.67	.50
7	5	2	3	2.20	.45
8	8	1	3	2.50	.76
9	7	2	3	2.14	.38
10	8	2	4	3.12	.64
11	7	1	3	2.00	.82
12	10	2	3	2.70	.48
13	8	3	4	3.87	.35

1 Does not meet, 2 Partially Meets, 3 Meets, 4 Exceeds

There was some variation in the number of items that the faculty saw evidence for in the lesson, but on average it was about 8 items (7.69, sd=1.31). This is a reasonable number as there were some aspects of the lesson where a program standard was not directly evident (professional development and the teacher's beliefs about teaching and their communication). On the whole the faculty members, as a group, arrived at the same interpretation of the merits of the lesson.

Verified

Audit task B2 (2.1)

Target: Capacity of the faculty to use their student teaching evaluation form accurately.

Probe: Have a sample of program faculty score a video lesson with the program's evaluation instrument.

Finding: The video lesson was a direct teaching of a procedure for solving an algebraic equation to a high school class with diverse mixture of students. On the

whole, as Table B2 indicates, most raters saw evidence for all but three of the program standards where there was less evidence in the lesson for them. There was almost no basis for determining "professional development" or the "teacher's beliefs about teaching." The evidence for collaboration would have been restricted to the presence of teaching aides to assist the students. There were three areas in which the raters saw the lesson in the 3.00 or above range and these were content, a positive classroom environment, and planning. There was evidence to support these three ratings in the video as the teacher was in command of her subject, the class was free of discipline issues as all interactions were respectful and amiable, and the teacher had clearly planned the lesson. The lowest rating of a standard by the full group of raters was "technology," which was appropriate because the only technology in evidence and used was an over-head projector.

Table B2
Mean Rating of Each Program Standard in the Video Lesson

Areas of Program Standards	Number of Raters	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Diversity	12	1	4	2.58	.79
Content	12	2	4	3.12	.61
Beliefs	6	2	4	2.83	.98
Technology	11	1	3	2.09	.70
Collaboration	8	2	3	2.62	.52
Positive Environment	13	2	4	3.00	.58
Planning	12	2	4	3.00	.60
Strategies	13	2	4	2.92	.64
Assessment	12	2	4	2.75	.62
Prof. Development	1	2	2	2.00	.00

1 Does not meet, 2 Partially Meets, 3 Meets, 4 Exceeds

Verified

Audit task B3 (2.1)

Target: The program’s implicit claim that the faculty, students, and mentor teachers have accepted and understand the program’s standards.

Probe: Have a sample of program faculty, students, and mentors score a video lesson with the program’s evaluation instrument.

Finding: Table B3 below gives the mean ratings for each standard made by convenience samples of faculty, students, and mentors. There were 13 faculty, 13 students, and 10 mentor teachers who participated. In most instances the faculty and mentor teachers gave the mean scores within the same range for each standard – within the 2.00-3.00 range.

Table B3
Mean Sum of the Faculty, Student and Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Group	Number of Raters	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Faculty	13	11	31	22.15	5.91
Student	13	14	36	22.46	6.97
Mentors	10	7	28	22.00	6.42

10 Does not meet, 20 Partially Meets, 30 Meets, 40 Exceeds

The overall means for the entire form for the ten standards were essentially identical. The raters were also asked to solve an equation like the ones taught in the video lesson. The percentages of raters who solved the equation correctly were 61% (faculty), 72% (students), and 50% (mentors). There were no significant correlations between the any group's ratings of the quality of the lesson and their own problem solving with regard to the lesson's content.

Verified (the three group's came to the same conclusions about the overall quality of the video lesson – viz., that it partially meets the program standard)

Audit task B4 (3.2)

Target: *The intensive year-long mentored internships form the heart of the Teacher Education Program, page 16 and...mentors provide scaffolding and coaching as needed and administer action plans....page 46.*

Probe: Corroborate the competence of the mentors with a survey the cooperating teachers or mentors about whether they understand the program, were trained as mentors, know the program faculty, and their predictions about the future success of the program completers.

Finding: There is an implicit claim in the quality control system that the cooperating teachers/mentors, given their central role in the program, would have good relationships with the faculty, have been trained, understand the program, and know the students. Table B4 gives the mean ratings of an online sample of mentor teachers on these issues and shows that the ratings fall into the *adequate* range with the exception of the mentor's rating of the preparation the graduates have had for future success which is in the *more than adequate range*. There were, however, some *inadequate* ratings and *excellent* ratings.

Table B4
Mean Ratings (1-5) of Mentors for Four Survey Topics

Survey Topic	Number of Raters	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. Relationship with Faculty	59	1	5	3.64	1.12
2. Training Received	64	1	5	3.44	.99
3. Understanding of the Program	65	1	5	3.66	.97
4. Graduates Preparation for Success	64	1	5	4.17	.88

The scale is: 1. *Inadequate*, 2. *Barely Adequate*, 3. *Adequate*, 4. *More than Adequate*, and 5. *Excellent*

Verified with error (the error being that the IB rhetoric implies that the mentors have *more than adequate to excellent* capacity in the areas of the survey)

Audit task B5 (3.2)

Target: *The intensive year-long mentored internships form the heart of the Teacher Education Program, page 16 and...mentors provide scaffolding and coaching as needed and administer action plans....page 46.*

Probe: Follow-up verification of the targets above with an onsite interview of a convenience sample of 10 mentors.

Finding: When the 10 mentors were asked if they were trained in making assessments of the interns, they cited local trainings, regional trainings (SWYK), USM courses, local courses for local "credits", and said that National Board certification is recommended but not required to be a mentor. Some mentors are also ETEP grads (so they know the program expectations). The mentors were specifically asked what they looked for in assessing two of the standards -- assessment and beliefs. With regard to assessments the mentors said they looked for different forms of assessment, Stiggins basic constructs, double scoring of student assessments for a match, and students "fresh eyes" in seeing events the mentor missed. In the assessment of their beliefs about teaching, the mentors ask questions, probe the intern's thinking to expose their thinking, by observing interns' general interactions with kids, and noting the kinds of questions they ask the mentors, what they are noticing, and what they are reflecting on. When they were asked about what kinds of things they would have to see to score a student below standard, the cited the following:

- not attending to inequities in the classroom
- if they didn't have a real interest in meeting all kids needs
- if they aren't asking questions
- if they had favorites and when confronted did not alter their style
- failure to use the information from the surveys, inventories they build and ask the kids to fill out to their student's advantage or to improve their instruction
- grouping students inappropriately

Their responses were in line with the online survey responses, and gave further evidence of training and familiarity with the program and its standards.

Verified

Audit task B6 (3.2)

Target: Qualifications of the adjunct faculty.

Probe: Corroborate the implicit claim in the IB that the adjunct faculty members are as qualified for their teaching assignments as the full-time faculty.

Finding: Ten students were asked if they could tell who the full-time were and who the adjunct faculty members were. They could and they liked the balance of the two groups and were sure that it would not be possible to see only adjuncts in the program. They said they who knew the adjuncts because the faculty told them who they are, but they would also know because practicing teachers tell and share stories of their real experiences. The students acknowledged that the practicing teachers serving as course instructors were qualified but perhaps not as clear about what they expect or what work should or could look like. There is good collaboration between the two groups and they are seen by the students as a team. Their view is that there are very few redundancies in assignments within the program and across courses.

Verified

Audit task B7 (3.2)

Target: *The Director has primary responsibility within the Teacher Education Department for functions such asreviewing course evaluations, page 2.*

Probe: Examine the course evaluations for the program.

Finding: A university report for the Fall 2006 on 456 student responses to 40 items was provided by the Director. For all but three items the ratings fell between the top most favorable ratings (1-2) on a five point scale. The three items referred to the pace of the covered material (3.19) and workload (3.31), where presumably a mid-rating is desirable, and to intellectual discipline required (2.04, where 1 was *very much*). The TED courses had perfect marks in the integration of labs with lectures (1.0) and overall quality of the labs and lab instructors.

Verified

Audit task B8 (3.2)

Target: The accuracy of the Praxis I and II entries in the program's spreadsheet

Probe: Select five of the internal audit sample Student Information Report records and compare the entries with those on the spreadsheet.

Finding: The scores were each entered accurately on the spreadsheet.

Verified

Audit task B9 (3.2)

Target: The accuracy of the entries in the program's spreadsheet for the Admission scores in content, technology, and equity.

Probe: Select five of the internal audit sample Student Information Report records and compare the entries with those on the spreadsheet.

Finding: There were errors, usually only at the second decimal place, for most scores between the five Student Information Reports and the spreadsheet entries, which were later determined to be rounding errors introduced by the computer program for the Student Information Report.

Verified with error

Audit task B10 (3.2)

Target: The accuracy of the entries in the program's spreadsheet for the Standards Review scores for the ten standards

Probe: Select five of the internal audit sample Student Information Report records and compare the entries with those on the spreadsheet.

Finding: In each case there was agreement between the spreadsheet and the Student Information Report.

Verified



Summary of Tasks Related to the Quality Control System

The auditors were able to verify that the program's quality control system is more or less as it is described in Appendix A and that the internal audit occurred also as described.



C. Documentation of Commitment and Capacity

In **Table III.1** below, the auditors have indicated whether they have found evidence that satisfies each requirement for commitment as judged with respect to parity between the program and the institution. Hyperlinked text refers to an audit task that explores the documentation further. Commitment is confirmed when the preponderance (at least 75%) of the supporting documents are found and/or further audit tasks verify associated commitment targets.

Table III.1 Parity
Documents were Found, Found in Part, Not Found, Not Checked or Not Available for Inspection with Regard to Parity Between the Program and Institution in each Area of TEAC’s Requirements (3.1.1 - 3.1.6)

Finding 3.1.1 Curriculum	Target for Parity Between the Program & the Institution	Auditor’s Probe
<p>Found</p>	<p>The number of credits required for degree at the institution and program are comparable. (pg. B11 in the IB)</p>	<p>TEAMS – degree is in the Arts & Sciences; ETEP – BA required Graduate Catalog degree programs were examined. The University of Southern Maine has a expectation that the average of 36 credit hours for a graduate degree. In comparison to other graduate degree programs within the university, graduates from the Teacher Education Department (TED) graduate with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Extended Teacher Education Program (ETEP) requires 33 credit hours for program completion and then may go on to take plus13 additional hours in order to graduate from the Master’s in Teaching and Learning (MTL), which is 46 credit hours. - All undergraduate in “graduate feeder programs” (TEAMS, Math, For. Language) interns need to do 30 stand alone credits beyond their BA (which is 120 credits) totaling 46 credits. - The Unified programs are 54 credits. <p>* The auditor checked this information with the on-line catalogue and talking with the TED Chair.</p>
<p>3.1.2 Faculty</p>		

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

Found	The program students have the same access to services as other students in programs at the institution. (pg. B17 in the IB)	Source: Kim Warren , CEHD Director of Student Services (e.g., see New to USM website) Student support services exceed university norm.
3.1.6 Student feedback		
Found	Student course evaluations for the program and institution show parity.	Fall 06 stats which were the most recent available for TED from the Scanning Services of the Office of Academic Assessment Courses are consistent with college and university averages. Auditors recalculated the mean scores for 456 Fall 2008 students and the mean was 1.63, which is greater than the overall mean course rating reported in the brief (pg B 20) for TED.

**Table III.2a Capacity
Auditors' Probes, and Whether Documents were *Found, Found in Part, Not Found, Not Checked or Not Available* for Inspection with Regard to Program Capacity in each Area of TEAC's Requirements for 2.3**

Findings	TEAC Requirements for Quality Control of Capacity (2.3)	Auditor's Probe
2.3.1. State license		
Found	Statement from the state liaison officer to verify that the program graduates are entitled to state licensure.	State documents available on site
Found	Formal notification from the state that it has approved the program.	State documents available on site
2.3.2 Faculty		
Found	Minutes of a meeting show that the <i>Brief Proposal</i> was considered and approved by the faculty.	December 2008 TED minutes available on site
2.3.3 Candidates		

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

Findings	TEAC Requirements for Quality Control of Capacity (2.3)	Auditor's Probe
Found	1. Admissions policy of the program is published.	ETEP Admissions Handbook TEAMS – USM Catalog Undergraduate Admissions ; for candidacy, TEAMS Handbook, was examined on site
Found	2. Admissions policies encourage diversity and service in high demand areas.	ETEP Admissions Handbook : ETEP Equity Framework Essay & Unified program TEAMS – USM Catalog Undergraduate Admissions ; for candidacy, TEAMS Handbook, available on site Auditors were provided with the Handbooks from both the ETEP and TEAMS programs
2.3.4 Resources		
Found	Satisfactory on-site survey results from faculty & students.	Email addresses were provided to TEAC

Table III.2b Capacity
Auditors' Probes, and Whether Documents were Found, Found in Part, Not Found, Not Checked or Not Available for Inspection with Regard to Program Capacity in each Area of TEAC's Requirements for 3.2

Findings	TEAC Requirements for Quality Control of Capacity (3.2)	Auditor's Probe
3.2.1 Curriculum		
Found	1. Credit hours required in the subject matter are tantamount to an academic major.	1. 24 credits is the rule in Maine and so is the program requirement. State regulation available on site. ** Auditor found information on pg. 19 of ETEP handbook.

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

Findings	TEAC Requirements for Quality Control of Capacity (3.2)	Auditor's Probe
Found	2. Credit hours required in pedagogical subjects are tantamount to an academic minor.	2. 33 credit hours are required for state certification program in the 9-month ETEP program; 46 hours for the master's degree. more than a minor (normally around 18 credit hours). [See program Handbooks, available on site]
3.2.2 Faculty		
Found	Full-time faculty selected at random have a terminal degree (major or minor) in the areas of course subjects they teach.	Vitas and resumes in Appendix C Were examined and all were found to have degrees in the area that they teach
Found	2. Adjunct faculty selected at random have a terminal degree (major or minor) in the areas of course subjects they teach.	Vitas and resumes in Appendix C Were examined and all were found to have degrees in the area that they teach
Found	3. Courses selected at random taught in the current semester by part-time faculty whose assignment and degree field align.	3. The Auditor checked the vitae of part-time faculty and out of the sample of 16 and found that their assignment matched their degree field.
3.2.3 Facilities		
Found	Satisfactory results from on-site faculty survey	Email addresses were sent to TEAC
3.2.4 Fiscal and Administrative		
Found	Statement from financial auditor attesting to the financial health of the institution.	Bond rating and letter were sent to TEAC by USM Chief Financial Officer.

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

Findings	TEAC Requirements for Quality Control of Capacity (3.2)	Auditor's Probe
Found	Education faculty teaching load aligns with the institution average.	TED tenure-track faculty have 3/3 teaching loads, aligning with university norm. Source: Provost's Office
Found	Program administrators are qualified for their positions	See Vitas Appendix C
Found	Resources are adequate to administer the program (pg. B15 in the IB)	Source: Robin Day , CEHD Assistant Dean FTE for the TED is \$3,399 per student, and CEHD FTE for CEHD is \$3,008 per student. TED costs per student are somewhat higher than the college-wide cost per student.
3.2.5 Student support		
Found	Satisfactory on-site survey results from students and faculty.	
3.2.6 Policies		
Found	An academic calendar is published.	See USM calendar ETEP cohorts have individual calendars, available on site
Found	Claims made in program Web site and catalog are consistent with claims made in the <i>Brief</i> .	See TED website also in Program Handbooks
Found	Grading policy of the program is published and is accurate.	USM grading policies
Found	1. Program has procedures for student complaints. 2. Program provides for student evaluations of courses.	1. See USM Undergraduate Catalog complaint procedures and USM Graduate Catalog student appeals and complaint procedures 2. Office of Academic Assessment – evaluations were examined
Findings for Nonspecific targets		

Findings	TEAC Requirements for Quality Control of Capacity (3.2)	Auditor's Probe
<p>Call-for-comment to third parties was distributed to the parties required by TEAC policy (XXXV) with the following results:</p> <p>A small sample of 7 was reviewed and of the 7 all the comments were positive about USM's TED programs.</p>		

 **V. Findings Related to Institutional Commitment**

The preponderance of the evidence on parity (Table III.1 above) showed that the program is treated equitably. The faculty sees the USM commitment to the program as more than adequate (see Table V), but resources available and facilities for teaching are rated in the lower *adequate* range. The students' ratings of facilities (3.66) are similar and their rating (3.64) of the support available to them outside of class is lower than the faculty's rating (4.00).

Table V
Mean Faculty Rating of Institutional Commitment and Adequacy of Resources, Facilities, and Support of Students

	Number of Raters	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Commitment to Program	22	3	5	4.50	.74
Resources for Teaching	23	1	5	3.52	1.20
Facilities for Teaching	22	2	5	3.36	1.00
Student Support Services	23	3	5	4.00	.79

The scale is: 1. *Inadequate*, 2. *Barely Adequate*, 3. *Adequate*, 4. *More than Adequate*, and 5. *Excellent*.

The president of USM, Selma Botman, cites several lines of evidence to indicate her and the institution's commitment to the program. She sees the CEHD and its TED program as vital to USM's sustainable future owing in part to its national research reputation and capacity to attract significant funds to support its research programs. The program is an institutional *point of pride*, partly because of the collaboration with Arts and Science, but mostly because USM teachers teach future USM students. She has a holistic K-16 view of education in Maine and sees the future of USM in a close connection with the state's public schools. The CEHD is tasked with the key role in

alignment of the K-16 curriculum in the state, an essential feature of her strategic plan for USM.

Moreover, she expressed great confidence in the college's dean, having appointed her to a four advisory group to her about changes needed at USM.

The audit team concluded that the university is committed to its teacher education program.



VI. Audit Opinion

The scoring and meaning of the audit task findings.

Each audit task is scored in one of three ways: (1) **verified** (indicating that the auditors found that the evidence was accurately described or represented in the *Brief*, (2) **verified with error** (indicating that any errors that were found in the description or representation did not alter the basic meaning of the evidence or text), or (3) **not verified** (indicating that the errors altered the basic meaning or significance of the evidence or text).

Occasionally, audit tasks cannot be completed and must be dropped from the audit analysis because the evidence could not be readily found owing to its absence, inefficient organization of the evidence, time constraints, or privacy and confidentiality considerations.

The audit report does not address the quality of the program or the meaning of the findings. In fact, the program faculty's responses may be more coherent and persuasive than the language in the *Brief* with the ironic result that the task could be scored as unverified because it is significantly at variance with what was written in the *Brief*. Similarly, the auditors may uncover better evidence than what is in the *Brief*, which might indicate that the evidence in the *Brief* was inaccurate and for that reason the target was not verified. The panelists, however, consider the full spectrum of evidence and give positive weight to audit findings in tasks scored as "not verified" owing to better evidence or more compelling explanations of the quality of the program.

Table VI.1: Audit Findings and Audit Opinions for the *Brief*

The total numbers of targets (column 1), the total numbers of verified targets, including those with trivial errors (in column 2), the numbers of targets with errors of any kind (trivial or consequential in column 3), the percent of verified targets (column 4), the percent of targets with errors of any sort (column 5), and the audit opinion: clean, qualified, adverse or disclaimer (column 6).

TEAC Element	1. Number of targets	2. Number of verified targets	3. Number of targets with errors	2/1 %	3/1 %	Audit Opinions
1.0 with 2.2 (Evidence of Student Learning)	23	23	1	100.0	4.3	Clean
3.0 with 2.1 (Program's Quality Control System)	28	28	4	100.0	14.3	Clean
Overall totals*	51	51	5	100.0	9.8	Clean

* Total number of targets may be less than the sum of the targets in each part as audit tasks may address more than one element or component.

Audit Opinion:

The *Inquiry Brief* overall received a clean audit opinion, because all targets were verified and only 9.8% had inconsequential errors. Since 100% of the targets were verified, the *Brief* was found to be acceptably accurate and trustworthy.

The auditors are initially guided in their award of *clean* or *qualified* audit opinions by the following considerations: an element (1.0 –3.0) receives a *clean* opinion if at least 90% of its targets are confirmed. An element, etc., is given a *qualified* opinion when at least 75%, but less than 90%, of its targets are confirmed. An element that would otherwise receive a *clean* opinion is also given a *qualified* opinion if more than 25% of the targets reveal misstatements of any kind (that is, trivial or consequential). If more than 75% of the targets cannot be verified, the element or component receives an adverse opinion (or a *disclaimer* if more than 75% of the audit tasks cannot be performed or completed).

These guidelines are not strict rules, because a simple counting of outcomes of probes may be misleading with regard to the trustworthiness of the *Brief*. Some audit tasks may be more revealing than others. For example, some may have targeted only minor points, and some may be merely following up on other audit tasks on a single point. Others may probe significant and central targets in the case for accreditation. The guidelines may prove unreliable in cases where the number of audit tasks is small.

The audit team knows that they are not to treat the guidelines or heuristics as rules that can be mechanically applied. If the findings suggest anomalies that make the

heuristic unworkable, the auditors rely on their good judgments, explaining in their audit report the difficulties they experienced and the reasons for their opinions.

The auditors are also instructed to be alert to any event that is at variance with how the program is represented in the *Brief*. None were found. The auditors report events and experiences during the audit that were not fully consistent with the manner in which the program is portrayed in the *Brief*.

Finally, it must be emphasized again that the audit opinion is not an opinion about the quality of the program or the degree to which the evidence in the *Brief* satisfies TEAC's quality principles and capacity standards. It is solely an opinion about whether the *Brief* is accurate as written. The issue in the audit is only whether what was in the Brief was accurate, not whether it could be made, or was made, more accurate by additional work on the part of the program faculty or the TEAC auditors during or after the audit.

VII. Audit Schedule

Sunday, March 8

Time	Activity
12:00	Review of standards content & expectations Bailey 301
12:00	Lunch Bailey 301
1:00	Review of standards continued Bailey 301
2:30	Campus Tour
4:00	Travel to hotel
4:30	Hotel check-in Wyndham Hotel
6:30	Dinner: Salt Water Grille 231 Front St., South Portland, 799-5400

Monday, March 9

Time	Activity 1	Activity 2	Activity 3
7:30	Breakfast Meeting Bailey 301C		
8:30	Interview: President Selma Botman Bailey 9	Interview: Provost Mark Lapping Bailey 8E	Interview: CFO Dick Campbell Bailey 8C
9:30	TEAC: Meeting with Inquiry Brief writers (Ken Jones, Cathie Fallona, Jean Whitney) Bailey 500		
10:00	School Visit: Congin Elementary, Westbrook [Literacy Program]. Principal: Peter Lancia	Classroom Observation: Counselor Ed Video Teaching (Schneiders) Bailey 408	School Visit: Windham Primary [Music Education Program] Principal: Kyle Rhoads Music Teacher: Nancy Cash-Cobb
11:00		Interview: Counselor Education Program Bailey 305	
12:00	State Team: Lunch interview with students Bailey 301C TEAC Team: lunch 301B		
1:00	State Team meeting Bailey 301		
2:00		Interview: Art Education Program Kidder Lounge, Robie/Andrews Hall	Interview: Educational Leadership Program Bailey 305
3:00	TEAC: Interview with Students Bailey 301C		
4:10	Classroom Observation: HCE 604 Career	Classroom Observation: AED 421 Art Education	Classroom Observation: EDU 671 Organizational

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

	Development (Van Zandt) Bailey 113	Seminar (Wilson) Bailey 207	Behavior (Capelluti) Bailey 321
5:30	Dinner: Macaroni Grill South Portland, 788-6620		

Tuesday, March 10

Time	Activity 1	Activity 2	Activity 3
7:00	Breakfast at hotel		
8:30	Interview: David Nutty, University Librarian Glickman Library 427, Portland campus	Interview: Literacy Program Bailey 305	Interview: Music Education Program Corthell 102
9:00			
10:00	Interview: Bill Wells, Associate Provost for Technology, and Stephen Hauser, Director, Information and Technology, Campus Computer Store, Luther Bonney, Portland campus		Interview: CLASS Program Bailey 305
11:00	TEAC: Interview with Mentor Teachers Bailey 301C		
12:00	Lunch & Team meeting Bailey 301		
1:00 1:30		1:30 School Visit: Deering HS, Portland [Art Education Program] Principal: Ken Kunin Art Teacher: Audrey Rolfe Art Teacher: Janie Young	1:00 Interview: School Psychology Program Bailey 305
2:00	Interview: CEHD Dean Betty Lou Whitford Bailey 8D		
3:00	TEAC: Interview with Faculty, Part-time Instructors, Supervisors Bailey 301C		
4:00	Classroom Observation: EDU 600 Research Methods and Techniques (Beaudry & Miller) Glickman 219, Portland campus	Classroom Observation: SPY 603 Consultation in School Psychology (Kelly) Payson Smith 43, Portland campus	Classroom Observation: (4:10) EDU 626 The Writing Process (Kennedy) Bailey 202
5:30	Dinner: Points North, Wyndham Hotel		
7:00	Report writing, Wyndham Hotel		

Wednesday, March 11

Time	Activity 1	Activity 2
------	------------	------------

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

7:00	Breakfast at hotel
8:30	Team meeting; report writing Bailey 301
11:00	Exit Interview CEHD Faculty Meeting – Bailey 301C
11:30	Team departs campus