

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
Inquiry Brief Pathway



CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT
Do NOT Quote or Cite Without Permission

TEAC Site Visit Report
Based on the Inquiry Brief of the
University of Southern Maine
Teacher Education Program
October 28-30, 2014

Supplementary materials sent to auditors by: October 24, 2014
First draft of Audit report sent to program faculty on: March 3, 2015
Final audit report accepted by program faculty on:

Site Visit team Members:

Katharine D. Rasch, Unit Assessment Research Director, Delta State University,
Cleveland, MS
Aaron Popham, Assessment and Accreditation Director, Brigham Young University,
Provo, UT
Joanna Payne, Humanities Teacher, No current affiliation, Portland, ME

Brief Authors:

Jean C, Whitney, Julie Caniff, and Amy Johnston

Observers:

None

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway



Part One: INTRODUCTION

Summary of the Case University of Southern Maine Teacher Education Program October 28-30, 2014

The Summary of the Case is written by the auditors and approved by program faculty. The Summary reflects the auditors' understanding of the case the faculty are making for accreditation.

Authorship and approval of the Inquiry Brief:

The Inquiry Brief was written by Jean C. Whitney, Julie Caniff, and Amy Johnson, and was approved by the Professional Education Council faculty on November 15, 2013.

Introduction:

The University of Southern Maine is one of 7 campuses of the University of Maine System which includes 3 campuses in Portland, Gorham, and Lewiston. The university has both urban and rural campuses. The institution's roots and history come from Western Maine Normal School (1878), Gorham Normal School (1889), Portland Junior College (1933), and Gorham State Teachers College (1945). Known as Maine's Metropolitan University, it serves the most densely populated part of the state. This regional, comprehensive institution confers a wide variety of baccalaureate and master's degrees, as well as doctoral degrees in school psychology, nursing, pre-pharmacy, [public policy](#), and law. It enrolls nearly 9000 students.

The University of Southern Maine has as its mission to "educate future leaders in the liberal arts and sciences, engineering and technology, health and social services, education, business, law, and public service. Faculty are committed to fostering a spirit of critical inquiry and civic participation. USM embraces academic freedom for students, faculty, and staff, and advocates diversity in all aspects of its campus life and academic work. It supports sustainable development, environmental stewardship, and community involvement. As a center for discovery, scholarship, and creativity, USM provides resources for the state, the nation, and the world." USM is committed to increasing access to higher education through public, affordable education at a regional comprehensive university.

Teacher Education is a long-established priority at USM, though the period since the last accreditation visit has been a period of blending established programs with new alternatives, particularly in undergraduate studies. In 1990, USM initiated major changes to its baccalaureate programs and established a post-baccalaureate / partnership school model known as ETEP (Extended Teacher Education Program). In 1998, the 4.5 year undergraduate-graduate model known as TEAMS (Teachers for Elementary and Middle Schools), which was a certification program that accompanied academic degree programs in the College of Arts and Sciences. These programs

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

were accredited in 2009. Since this time, there have been multiple changes in the organization and structure of the programs and new pathway development. For example, in September 2011, the UG initial special education program was moved to the newly formed department of Educational Psychology and Exceptionality and redesigned into the Teacher Students with Disabilities strands of the Masters of Science Special Education Degrees. At the same time, the final cohorts of the ETEP pathways leading to dual special education and general education cohorts were taught out (2011-2013, 2012-2014). At the same time, new undergraduate pathways to general education teacher certification were added to existing undergraduate options. (See Table 1 below). In September 2012, the TEAMS pathway was discontinued and candidates can currently pursue undergraduate teacher certification completely at the undergraduate level. Students began the new undergraduate pathways during the 2012-2013 school year. All undergraduate students pursue a unified core curriculum and currently receive a degree in their content area and certification through the undergraduate pathway.

Currently, there are three pathways for the ETEP program: 1) the full-time nine month elementary or secondary certification pathway, 2) a part-time, 13-month elementary or secondary certification pathway, 3) the Newcomer ETEP option designed to recruit immigrants and language-minority candidates into teaching,

Currently, the special education program has its own degree and pathway to initial certification in special education.

Certification programming is designed and implemented through the School of Education and Human Development (SEHD) that is part of the reorganized College of Management and Human Services and is coordinated through the Office of Educator Preparation and the Teaching and Learning Department within the SEHD.

Data from all programs from 2009-2014 program completers are included in this Inquiry Brief. For the purposes of the brief, all programs, both old and newly designed are part of the teacher education programs put forward for the October 2014 visit.

The teacher education faculty consists of 15 full-time and 19 part-time faculty members. The program graduated 81 students in 2013 and enrolled 303 students in 2013-2014 in the following options:

Table 1
University of Southern Maine Options

Pathway	Certification Options	Status	Level	Number of completers in previous academic year (2013-2014)	Number of students enrolled in current academic year (2013-2014)

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

9-month ETEP	K-8 general education; 7-12 English/Language Arts, Math, Life Science, Physical Science, Social Studies; or K-12 Foreign Language	On-going	PB	46	48
13-month ETEP	K-8 general education; 7-12 English/Language Arts, Math, Life Science, Physical Science, Social Studies; or K-12 Foreign Language	New, Spring 2013	PB	8	24
Undergraduate Pathways	K-8 general education; 7-12 English/Language Arts, Math, Life Science, Physical Science, Social Studies; or K-12 Foreign Language, Art, Music	New 2012-2013 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligned with majors in CAHS, Csth, and CMHS • 	UG	18	136
Special Education	K-8 or 7-12 special education certification (mild to moderate disabilities or severe to profound)	New 2011-2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Students with Disabilities strand of the Masters of Science in Special Education 	GR	21	22
ETEP Special Education	K-8 or 7-12 special education certification (mild to moderate disabilities)	Discontinued in ETEP, 2011	GR	0	0
TEAMS	K-8 general education	Discontinued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new admits as of spring 2012 • Teaching out • Replaced by new UG pathways 	UG & GR	17	18

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

TEAMS Unified	K-8 general education and special education (mild to moderate disabilities)	Discontinued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new admits as of spring 2012 Teaching out 	UG & GR	8	8
TEAMS Unified ESL	K-8 general education and ESL endorsement	Discontinued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new admits as of spring 2012 Teaching out 	UG & GR	0	0
ETEP Unified K-8	K-8 general education and special education (mild to moderate disabilities)	Discontinued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new admits as of spring 2013 Teaching out students currently in the pipeline Dual cert. still possible across two programs 	PB	15	16
ETEP Unified 7-12	7-12 English/Language Arts, Math, Life Science, Physical Science, Social Studies; and K-12 Foreign Language and special education (mild to moderate disabilities)	Discontinued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new admits as of spring 2013 Teaching out students currently in the pipeline Dual cert. still possible across two programs 	PB	6	6
ETEP Unified ESL	General education K-8 or 7-12 and ESL endorsement	Discontinued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new admits as of spring 2012 Teaching out 	PB	0	0
Newcomer ETEP	K-8 general education; 7-12	Discontinued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grant 	PB	0	1

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

	English/Language Arts, Math, Life Science, Physical Science, Social Studies; or K-12 Foreign Language	funding ended in 2010, but students can still pursue this pathway			
--	---	---	--	--	--

Program claims:

All interns who complete the USM teacher preparation program are competent, qualified, and caring, demonstrating proficiency with subject matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and caring & teaching skill, including learning to learn, multicultural perspective, and technology.

Evidence supporting the claims

As USM’s claim uses each of the elements of Quality Principle 1, the assessments are varied and there are multiple assessments used for each quality principle. USM used assessments from admissions, assessment during the program and assessments at program completion. Claims and Assessments are also aligned with Maine’s Common Core Teaching Standards (InTASC and NETS-T) and the six Maine State Program Approval Standards: 1) Candidate Performance and Program Delivery, 2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluations, 3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice, 4) Diversity, 5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance & Development, 6) Unit Governance and Resources. Content validity was evident in the careful alignment to Maine Standards and to the claims.

Components of different assessments were used in support of components of the claims as they were tied to quality principles. Praxis I and Praxis II scores are required for all candidates in the state of Maine and provide a basis for national comparison.

The use of GPAs include an admission GPA that does not have a specific minimum, but traditionally follows guidelines UG GPAs of 3.0, 2.5 for ETEP and 2.75 for TEAMS candidates. In addition, methods GPAs (coursework that focuses on instructional methods and strategies), content GPAs (content area coursework required before internship) were used to measure pedagogical knowledge and content knowledge respectively.

Locally developed instruments include:

1. ETEP Admissions Interview—This interview was developed for the ETEP program and has been modified over the years. The main categories remain the same: good teaching and positive classrooms, understanding of children and adolescents, role of technology, equity and responsiveness, collegiality and group processes, content knowledge, readiness for the program, and placement interests. Each component is scored on a 1 to 4 scale with 1

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

unacceptable and 4 *excellent* and mean scores are determined from 2-3 interviewers.

2. TEAMS Candidacy Rubric—This locally developed instrument uses the first 5 USM Teacher Standards (aligned to Maine Standards—InTASC and NETS-T. The portfolio assessment evaluates candidate evidence at candidacy (before the internship) as to the extent to which they meet the standard. Ratings range from 1--*Does Not Meet* to 4--*Exceeds* on a 4 point scale. Indicators help identify whether or not evidence presented is appropriate and mean scores from multiple raters are reported. Cronbach Alpha's inter-rater reliability ranges from .88 (mid-program) to .99 (end program).
3. Entry Survey 2013 and Exit Surveys 2013—These two instruments are candidate self-report on teacher preparedness across a wide variety of dimensions. The 73 dimensions (entrance survey) and 59 dimensions and effectiveness of program components (exit survey). Data were analyzed from a 4 point scale with 1 being not at all prepared to 4 Very well prepared.
4. Principal Survey – USM developed a principal survey that asks for feedback on elements of Maine Teaching Standards. Principals used a 4 point scale with 1 being *More poorly than teachers prepared elsewhere* to 4 *Much better than teachers prepared elsewhere*.
5. Teaching Standards Review Rubric—This rubric assesses ETEP and TEAMS candidates (mid-program and program exit) and TEAMS candidates (program exit): as to the extent to which they meet the 10 USM standards. Ratings range from *Does Not Meet* to *Exceeds* on a 4 point scale. Indicators help identify whether or not evidence presented is appropriate. (Some of the data had been scored on a 3 point scale and was converted to a 4 point scale for the 5 year analysis) Cronbach Alpha's Inter-rater reliability ranges from .88 (mid-program) to .99 (end program).
6. Undergraduate GPA—The undergraduate GPA is used as a measure of learning to learn.
7. Content GPA—The content GPA is used to measure candidates' content knowledge.
8. Three-year Follow Up Survey—Candidates are asked to rate the extent to which they feel that the USM teacher preparation program prepared them to teach on elements related to the Maine teaching standards. Items to be rated parallel the exit survey and employer survey items. Candidates rate on a 4 point scale from 1 –*very little* to 4—*very much*.
9. Disciplinary or Multidisciplinary Instructional Unit Rubric—Candidates

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

instructional units are assessed on their ability to plan related to USM Standards 1,2, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Ratings are on a 3-point scale from 1 *Does not meet*, 2 *partially meets standard* to 3 *Exceeds Standards*.

Quality Principle 1.1 (imbedded in claim) was assessed using Admissions Interview Ratings, Content GPA, Praxis II, instructional unit scores for Standard 2, and the final Standards Review ratings for Standard 2. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation Matrix examined the relationship between each of the assessments to confirm the validity of the use of multiple measurements for each quality principle. Results showed that the Standards Review Assessment scores and the Admissions Interview Ratings did not have a significant correlation raising questions for USM regarding the predictive validity of the interview against other measures. While not strong, all correlations except those mentioned above were significant at least at the .05 level. Candidates' mean Content GPA of 3.06 (SD= .57) is well above admissions standards of a general undergraduate GPA of 2.5. The mean interview score for content knowledge is significantly above the mean score for applicants not admitted to the program.

Exit survey items reflect candidates' strong perceptions of their pedagogical knowledge, but also highlighted lower levels of preparedness in teaching students with 504 plans, different levels in the same class, high-incidence disabilities and development of IEPs.

Quality Principle 1.2 (imbedded in claim) was assessed using the Methods GPA, instructional unit scores for Standards 1,7,8,9 and the final Standards Review ratings for Standards 1,7,8,9. A Pearson Production Moment Correlation matrix examined the relationship among the assessments, with the highest correlations within Unit and Standards Review Scores, providing evidence of internal consistency for those measures. All correlations were significant at the .05 level. Candidate data for pedagogical knowledge includes Standards Review Scores meeting or exceeding 3 on a 4 point scale. The mean scores for student diversity (3.11, SD .52), instructional planning (3.11, SD .57), instructional strategies (3.06, SD .52), and assessment (2.96, SD .52). Unit scores show similar results with mean scores well above 2 on a 3 point scales with standard deviations hovering around .50. The mean methods GPA of 3.91 (SD .14) indicated a high level of proficiency for all candidates.

Quality Principle 1.3 (imbedded in claim) was assessed using Instructional unit scores for Standards 1,2,7,8,9,10, the final Standards Review ratings for all Standards, and the candidates' exit preparedness self-report scale. A similar matrix confirmed high and significant correlations within the Unit and Standards Review on measures of Caring and Effective Teaching skill, which were designed to be complimentary in measures this principle. Mean unit scores of 2.14 (SD .92) indicate strong performance, though there is notable variability. Sub-scores are as follows for Student diversity (2.44, SD. 52), subject knowledge (2.46, SD .45), instructional

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

planning (2.39, SD .49), instructional strategies (2.41, SD .46), assessment (2.31, SD .50), and professional development (2.46, SD .58).

Standards review data range from 2.96, SD .52 for assessment to 3.15, SD .56 for professionalism and collaboration. In each case, assessment metrics reflected acceptable, but the lowest ratings. Exit survey data confirmed preparedness with items with the highest mean scores reflecting caring and effective teaching skills.

Quality Principle 1.4.1 (imbedded in claim) was assessed using Praxis 1, B.A. GPA, instructional unit scores for Standards 5 and 10, and selected exit survey items. Correlation analysis on this cluster of assessments showed that Praxis I subtests were moderately correlated with each other, as well as BA GPAs. Interns showed significant correlations between Professional development, and undergraduate GPAs, and collaboration. While data from Praxis and GPA are satisfactory, the confirming data were from Unit score for professional development (2.5, SD .59), and Standards review for Std.5 (collaboration and professional mean 3.15, SD .56) and Std. 10 (prof dev 3.15, SD .56). Exit survey items confirm high self report levels of preparedness (means 3.75-3.52, SD .44-.66).

Quality Principle 1.4.2 (imbedded in claim) was assessed using a composite score on selected Admission Interview ratings, instructional unit scores for Standard 1, the final Standards Review ratings for Standard 1, and selected exit survey items. Correlational analysis found that interview scores were only significantly correlated with the unit diversity outcomes and did not significantly correlate to standards review diversity scores at all, showing little to no predictive value of the equity interview ratings. Data confirm clear commitment to equity with mean admissions interview data (3.17, SD .57), unit scores (2.44 SD .52), and Standards review for Standard 1 (3.11, SD .52).

Quality Principle 1.4.3 (imbedded in claim) was assessed using a composite score on selected Admission Interview ratings, the final Standards Review ratings for Standard 4. Scores on this principle included means admissions interview scores (3.17, SD .57), unit scores on diversity (2.44, SD .52), and Standard Review (3.11 SD .52).

The program makes the case that candidates from all areas of certification have participated in the same experiences, the same cohorts and the same course requirements. Data are presented collectively for all candidates for the 5 years (2009-2013).

In addition to the claims presented above, the program analyzed and compared data from those candidates accepted as opposed to those who were not, elementary and secondary candidates and comparison of on-line and face-to-face candidates.

Internal audit:

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

The internal audit of the USM Quality Assurance System was initially developed in 2007-2008. A revised graphic depicts the components of the system, organized by program and student learning quality, Instilling Commitment to Equitable and Engaging Learning. The system begins with the primary responsibility of the cohort coordinators who are responsible for the welfare and quality of candidate performance. The audit also included evaluation of procedures for faculty, partnership schools, university program evaluation, and faculty selection, support and promotion.

Files of 95 candidate completers from 2011 were audited for the candidate quality assurance procedures as well as 43 course blueprints (departmental syllabi) were examined. Specific individuals were identified in school districts from the partnership and relevant offices at the university.

The internal audit committee probed admission, candidacy and completion; coursework; standards and performance assessment; and internship and seminar. Other relevant procedures audited included university program review and evaluation; faculty selection, support and promotion; school district partner collaboration; and administrative support.

The audit committee found the quality control system to be working as designed with minor exceptions. There were errors in records of 2 of the 95 candidate completers; major turnover in administrative structures in the university and the schools identified areas where procedures need to be reviewed and some reorientation needs to occur.

Plans for program improvement:

While the analysis in the Inquiry Brief demonstrated that the claim is verified by the candidate performance evidence. Data analysis revealed several areas for program improvement and faculty are acting upon those areas.

In particular the program outlines plans to:

- To bring all initial teacher certification programs into a unit-wide program with 5 years of data for the next accreditation cycle
- To examine the admissions process and tools to identify assessments/interview questions, that provide more predictive data and, in the areas of equity, content, and technology in ways that have greater internal consistency and correlate with other measures
- Development of unit-wide InTASC and NETS-T standards (Maine standards for teacher education and technology) standards review rubric elements for all pathways.
- Exploration and development of new assessments of planning, teaching, and assessment of student learning.
- Further identification of a body of teaching, assessment and learning evidence for use in the standard review process that is complementary and correlated to

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

other outcome measures.

- Creation, implementation and scoring of key program assessments in Tk20 for each pathway
- Use of Tk20 reporting functions to assist in program review and improvement, inter-rater reliability and other measures of reliability as faculty are trained in the standard review process.
- Align entry admissions requirements for undergraduate and graduate routes of entry into the program
- Improve faculty assessment of candidates by doing inter-rater reliability checks on approximately 10% of the instructional units and review of 10% of candidate portfolios
- Examine course sequences and assessments to address areas of need
- Improve preparation of candidates to address the needs of students from special populations
- Re-invigorate partnerships with districts, with an emphasis on urban areas
- Systematize data collection with follow-up surveys

Statement regarding commitment and capacity:

The faculty concluded that University of Southern Maine is committed to the teacher education program and that there is sufficient capacity to offer a quality program.

¹The University of Southern Maine teacher education program offers options at the undergraduate level in K-8 general education; 7-12 English/Language Arts, mathematics, life science, physical science, social studies and K-12 foreign language, option at the post-baccalaureate level in K-8 general education; 7-12 English/Language Arts, mathematics, life science, physical science, social studies and K-12 foreign language, and at the graduate level in K-8 or 7-12 special education—mild to moderate and severe to profound. The state of Maine, at its discretion, offers licensure to program completers in these option areas.

Acceptance of the Summary of the Case

The faculty accepted the Summary of the Case as accurate on February 27, 2015.

Audit Logistics

Auditors examined electronic documents primarily in Room 320 of Bailey Hall on the Gorham Campus. They met with groups and observed class sessions in Bailey Hall, and met with administrators of the University on the Portland Campus. They also participated in an online class meeting, on-line interviews and face-to-face interviews with school partners, faculty, candidates, and alumni. The state of Maine review was conducted concurrently from October 26-29, 2014.

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.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
Inquiry Brief Pathway

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

	Part Two: METHOD OF THE AUDIT
---	--------------------------------------

The IB Commission staff and the auditors selected a number of targets from the Brief and created tasks 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.) In addition, the auditors may have created follow-up audit tasks based on their on-site experiences.

With regard to any one component of the TEAC system, the auditors employ a range of tasks. Some tasks (the clarification questions) are intended to clarify the meaning of targets in the Brief that are unclear to the auditors. Most tasks are straightforward probes designed to verify or confirm the target (e.g. recalculating figures, interviewing informants, examining catalogs, policy manuals). Some tasks seek to reconcile multiple 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 tasks seek to corroborate the target by examination of evidence not cited in the Brief, but relevant to assertions in the Brief. The auditors may 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).

	Part Three: AUDIT MAP
---	------------------------------

Audit tasks are organized by TEAC elements & components and are noted as Verified, Verified with Error, Not Verified, or Disclaimer. Audit Task numbers are hyperlinked to the audit tasks in the accompanying report.

Table 2: Audit Tasks by TEAC Component and Result

TEAC Component	Verified	Verified with Error	Not Verified	Disclaimer
1.1 Subject matter	A1 , A3 , A4 , A17			
1.2 Pedagogy	A1 , A5 , A10	A18		
1.3 Caring and effective teaching skill	A1 , A6 , A12 , A19		A11	
1.4 Cross-cutting themes	A1 , A7 , A8 , A9			

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

	A13 , A14 , A15 , A16 , A20			
1.5 Evidence of reliability and validity	A1 , A2 , A21			
2.1 Rationale for assessments	B3	B2 , B4		
2.2 Use of evidence	B1 , B5 , B6 , B7 , B9 , B10			
2.3 Quality control system	B8 , B11			

	Part Four: AUDIT OPINION
---	---------------------------------

The scoring and meaning of the audit task findings. Each audit task is scored in one of four ways:

- Verified, indicating that the auditors found that the target was accurately described or represented in the Brief
- Verified with Error, indicating that the auditors found some inaccuracy in the target, but the inaccuracy did not alter the basic meaning of the target
- Not Verified, indicating that the auditors found inaccuracy in the target that did alter its the basic meaning
- Disclaimer, indicating that the auditors were unable to undertake the task.

Table 2: Audit Findings and Audit Opinions for the Brief

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 Evidence of Student Learning	21	20	2	95%	9%	Clean
2.0 Institutional Learning and Quality Control	11	11	2	100%	18%	Clean
Overall totals	32	31	4	97%	12%	Clean

Column 1 = Total number of Targets

Column 2 = Number of Targets scored as Verified and Verified with Error

Column 3 = Number of Targets scores as Verified with Error and Not Verified

Column 4 = Column 2 divided by Column 1 gives the percent of Targets verified

Column 5 = Column 3 divided by Column 1 gives the percent of Targets with errors

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Audit Opinion:

The Inquiry Brief overall received a clean audit opinion, indicating that the university had thoroughly evaluated its assessments related to its claim and identified specific actions based upon analysis of its data. Since 97% 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, qualified, adverse, or disclaimer audit opinions by the following considerations: an element receives a clean opinion if at least 90% of its associated targets are confirmed. An element is given a qualified opinion when at least 75%, but less than 90%, of its targets are confirmed; or if more than 25% of the targets reveal misstatements of any kind (that is, if the associated audit tasks are scored as either Verified with Error or Not Verified). If less than 75% of the targets can be verified, the element or component receives an adverse opinion if the examined evidence did not support the target or a disclaimer opinion if the audit tasks could not 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 auditors therefore do not 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 alert to evidence that is at variance with how the program is represented in the Brief, and 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.



Part Five: AUDIT FINDINGS

The audit findings consist of clarification task findings and audit task findings. Both clarification tasks 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.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Clarification Tasks

This section of the report contains tasks intended to clarify or elaborate statements in the Brief:

Clarification Task 1

Please provide enrollment data for the program options with students and completers in 2013-2014 to complete Table 1.1 in the Summary of the Case.

Program response: Attached is a new table to map out the names of the various variables that were used in each of the operational definitions in the report. (This has been uploaded in the Inquiry Brief Data folder, "Match of data to variable names".) If possible, I would encourage you to use the SPSS files rather than the excel files when trying to look at the data, as the SPSS has a variable label field that is important in figuring out what each means (and is not included when the data are exported to excel).

TEAC
Table 1.1
University of Southern Maine Options

Table 1.1 Program Options and Pathways

Pathway	Certification Options	Status	Level	Number of completers in previous academic year 2013-2014	Number of students enrolled in current academic year 2013-2014
9-month ETEP	K-8 general education; 7-12 English/Language Arts, Math, Life Science, Physical Science, Social Studies; or K-12 Foreign Language	On-going	PB	46	48
13-month ETEP	K-8 general education; 7-12 English/Language Arts, Math, Life Science, Physical Science, Social Studies; or K-12 Foreign Language	New, Spring 2013	PB	8	24
Undergraduate Pathways*	Art, K-8 general education; 7-12 English/Language Arts, Math, Life Science, Music, Physical Science,	New 2012-2013 • Aligned with majors in CAHS, CSTH, and	UG	18	136

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

	<i>Social Studies; or K-12 Foreign Language, Art, Music</i>	<i>CMHS</i>			
<i>Special Education</i>	<i>K-8 or 7-12 special education certification (mild to moderate disabilities or severe to profound)</i>	<i>New 2011-2012</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teaching Students with Disabilities strand of the Masters of Science in Special Education</i> 	<i>GR</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>ETEP Special Education</i>	<i>K-8 or 7-12 special education certification (mild to moderate disabilities)</i>	<i>Discontinued in ETEP, 2011</i>	<i>GR</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>TEAMS</i>	<i>K-8 general education</i>	<i>Discontinued</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No new admits as of spring 2012</i> • <i>Teaching out</i> • <i>Replaced by new UG pathways</i> 	<i>UG & GR</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>TEAMS Unified</i>	<i>K-8 general education and special education (mild to moderate disabilities)</i>	<i>Discontinued</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No new admits as of spring 2012</i> • <i>Teaching out</i> 	<i>UG & GR</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>TEAMS Unified ESL</i>	<i>K-8 general education and ESL endorsement</i>	<i>Discontinued</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No new admits as of spring 2012</i> • <i>Teaching out</i> 	<i>UG & GR</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>ETEP Unified K-8</i>	<i>K-8 general education and special education (mild to moderate disabilities)</i>	<i>Discontinued</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No new admits as of spring 2013</i> • <i>Teaching out students currently in the pipeline</i> • <i>Dual cert. still possible across two programs</i> 	<i>PB</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>ETEP Unified 7-12</i>	<i>7-12 English/Language Arts, Math, Life</i>	<i>Discontinued</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No new admits as of</i> 	<i>PB</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>6</i>

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

	<i>Science, Physical Science, Social Studies; and K-12 Foreign Language and special education (mild to moderate disabilities)</i>	<i>spring 2013</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teaching out students currently in the pipeline</i> • <i>Dual cert. still possible across two programs</i> 			
<i>ETEP Unified ESL</i>	<i>General education K-8 or 7-12 and ESL endorsement</i>	<i>Discontinued</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No new admits as of spring 2012</i> • <i>Teaching out</i> 	<i>PB</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Newcomer ETEP</i>	<i>K-8 general education; 7-12 English/Language Arts, Math, Life Science, Physical Science, Social Studies; or K-12 Foreign Language</i>	<i>Discontinued</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Grant funding ended in 2010, but students can still pursue this pathway</i> 	<i>PB</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>

**Note: Details on completers and students enrolled in all UG pathways:*

Undergraduate Pathways	New 2012-2013 Aligned with majors in CAHS, CSTH, CMHS, LAC	Number of completers 2013-2014	Number of students enrolled 2013-2014
	<i>MAJOR</i>		
	• <i>Art (K-12)</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>17</i>
	• <i>Arts and Humanities (K-8)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>13</i>
	• <i>Arts and Humanities (7-12)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>5</i>
	• <i>Biology (7-12)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
	• <i>English (K-8)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>22</i>
	• <i>English (7-12)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>
	• <i>French (K-12)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>
	• <i>Geo-Anthro (7-12)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
	• <i>History (K-8)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>8</i>
	• <i>History (7-12)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>17</i>
	• <i>Music Education</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>44</i>
	• <i>Natural and Applied Sci. (K-8)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
	• <i>Natural and Applied Sci. (7-12)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>
	Total:	18	136

Clarification Task 2

Describe how data were summarized and used in tables such as Table 4.4, particularly related to assessments used for more than one claim, or data that is summarized across elements of the assessments.

Program response: *In looking specifically at table 4.4 since you raised a question,*

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

we realized it may be confusing that 4.4 presents the percent of students that meet or exceed the standard, and table 4.5 presents only the proportion that exceed the standard. I'm not sure if this was misleading. To be unambiguous, we re-did both tables to provide both the percent that met or exceeded AND the percent that exceeded the proficiency standard. These tables are also uploaded in the Inquiry Brief data section of the blackboard site.

Clarification Task 3

List those who participated in the development of and describe the execution of the internal audit of the quality control system.

Program response: *Dr. Julie Canniff coordinated the Internal Audit.*

POST-AUDIT Clarification Task 4

As a result of information provided the auditors during interviews with the Interim Provost and President, please provide the correspondence regarding restructuring and budget cutting that has occurred throughout the Fall of 2014 and will continue into Spring 2015.

Program response: Auditors received a copy of a September 18, 2014, email from Provost Joseph W. McDonnell containing the following information:

"USM is expected to submit a balanced budget to the UMS Board of Trustees in January for FY 16 – the academic year beginning July 1, 2015. Our finance office is projecting a \$16 million shortfall based on current enrollments – a deficit that will deepen if the trend in declining enrollment continues into the next academic year.

"A \$16 million cut from our operating budget will inevitably result in reductions in faculty and staff positions. It also forces us to rethink our academic programs, our organizational structure, and the expectations for faculty and staff workloads. The product of this rethinking must address the urgent need to recruit and retain more students.

"Below are criteria the deans and I developed that would inform decisions about modifying or eliminating programs. [Criteria include: community engagement, student interest, financial contribution, relationship to other programs, system coordination, curriculum]"

Auditors received a copy of the following October 6, 2014, email from Provost McDonnell with the following information:

"... We essentially have two options: eliminate many of our academic programs or reconfigure our many small departments into more interdisciplinary programs. We chose to pursue the latter course to fundamentally transform the university with the cooperation of the faculty. If we are unable to secure that cooperation, we must pursue the first path and eliminate more programs.

"In some departments, discussions are already taking place to reconfigure

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

programs along the lines recommended in this letter. In other departments, these proposals will give faculty from different programs an opportunity to come together over the next several months to create new programs that cross disciplinary lines. ...

“We have 100 faculty eligible for retirement who have until October 20 to take advantage of the retirement incentive offered by the University of Maine System. Some have already applied; we anticipate others will apply before that date. ...

“For many years we have been cutting budgets without changing our academic programs or the culture of the university. Our current crisis is too deep to merely trim the sails. It will require fundamental change in academic programs, in our culture, and in expectations of faculty inside and outside of the classroom. These fundamental changes are designed to benefit current and future students. We believe the following actions must be taken to reimagine the university:

- Take advantage of our locations to move beyond the classroom to have more courses that address real-world problems by working with businesses, schools, non-profits, government and social agencies, health care organizations, and other community organizations. ...*
- Accelerate off-campus learning to become an integral part of the curriculum and the scholarly agenda of faculty. ...*
- Create a student-centered culture where full time faculty will be on campus or working with students on projects in the community at least four days a week. ...*
- Serve a diverse student body – students just out of high school, residential students, commuter students, veterans, transfer students, and non-traditional students balancing work, family, and school. ...*
- Make our upper division courses and our graduate programs fiscally sustainable. ...*
- Teach Lewiston programs university-wide and find efficient ways to bring some of our Portland and Gorham academic programs to Lewiston
....*
- Train all faculty to teach on-line and in blended formats. ...*
- Create different models of teaching by offering some large, medium and small sized classes. ...*
- Find the right balance throughout the university with tenured/tenure track faculty with research agendas, full time teaching faculty, and part time clinical or practice faculty. ...*
- Closely align the work of the faculty with the revenue required to run the university. ...*

....

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Education. The School of Education and Human Development offers many relatively small graduate programs that will have to find more common courses for the program to operate successfully with fewer faculty. The school will be reduced to 24 full time faculty positions, eliminating 2.5 faculty positions through retirement or retrenchment notices by October 31. We expect the faculty in these programs to provide recommendations about these realignments no later than December 1, 2014.

Additional faculty lines scheduled for elimination that will affect the undergraduate education programs include:

Arts and Humanities 1
English 4.5
History 1
Languages 3
Music 2
Theater 1

POST-AUDIT Clarification Task 5

Please describe the School of Education's response to the proposed reorganization.

Program response: *In SEHD we reorganized into two departments: (1) Teaching and Learning (includes: ETEP, Literacy, Special Ed., and School Psych., and UG pathways) and (2) Adult and Higher Ed., Counseling, and Ed. Leadership. They are being chaired by Bob Kuech and Jeff Beaudry, respectively. Program coordinators no longer sit in on the leadership committee since both of the chairs represent their programs.*

POST-AUDIT Clarification Task 6

On page 2 of the Inquiry Brief, 3-5 departments are referenced. When did the reorganization to 2 departments occur?

Program response: *The reorganization to two departments occurred in November, 2014. The two department names are: (1) Teaching and Learning and (2) Adult and Higher Education, School Counseling, and Educational Leadership. The chairs are Robert Kuech and Jeffery Beaudry respectively. The membership of the leadership team now includes: Assoc. Dean, Department Chairs, Chair of Promotion and Tenure, Chair of Curriculum, Chair of Ad Hoc Partnership and Outreach Committee, Director of Student Affairs, [and] College Administration Coordinator. The program coordinators no longer attend leadership meetings.*



A. Tasks Related to Quality Principle 1: Evidence of Candidate Learning

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

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

Program Content and Outcomes

- 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 effectively, professionally, and in a caring manner.
- 1.4 **Cross-cutting liberal education program content themes.** For each component of element 1.0, the program must also address three cross-cutting liberal education themes:
 - 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 lifelong learning in their field.
 - 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.
 - Technology. Candidates must know the technologies that enhance student learning and the work of leaders and staff. TEAC requires evidence that graduates have acquired the basic productivity tools of the profession.
- 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.

Audit Task A1 (1.1-1.5)

Target: *The program has an aligned mission, to instill a commitment to equitable and engaging learning, and set of Core Practices that articulate how the program enacts the SEHD mission and Core Values. (The SEHD-TED Vision Alignment document in Appendix A and B shows specific alignment details. The practices are as follows:*

- *Inquiry: Continually examining beliefs and practices and acting upon findings to improve teaching and learning.*
- *Opportunity to learn: Providing a variety of accessible learning experiences that attend fairly to learners' strengths, needs, and interests.*
- *High Expectations: Establishing and communicating clear, challenging, and attainable standards for all learners.*
- *Collegiality: Supporting and refining teaching and learning through sharing diverse perspectives and understandings.*
- *Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Integrating teaching knowledge and disciplinary knowledge to foster and support professional expertise.*
- *Formative Assessment: Using multiple sources of information, including performance-based assessments, to make valid inferences about student learning and informed instructional decisions.*
- *Responsiveness: Providing feedback and adjusting teaching based on growing understandings about learners and learning.*
- *Scholarship: Creating, studying, critiquing, and applying research related to teaching, learning, schooling, and teacher education. (pages 6-7)*

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Probe: Interview faculty, current candidates and alumni in order to determine the extent to which these principles interface with the claim and how these core practices are manifested.

Finding: Faculty describe a series of scaffolded experiences from admission to completion that provide opportunities to learn and demonstrate skills related to each delineated practices. In particular they repeatedly emphasize high expectations, responsiveness, inquiry, and opportunities to learn. Candidates confirmed that their preparation required them to demonstrate the principles in several assessments including the standards review at the end of the program. Candidate work samples confirmed attention to these principles. The principles were revised slightly in May 2013 after the publication of the Brief.

Verified (Faculty and candidates verified assessments that address these principles).

Audit Task A2 (1.5)

Target: *Tables 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8 (pages 17-23), correlations of multiple variables in terms of Quality Principle 1 2.3 (page 17) Alignment of Evidence with Program Standards*

Probe: Use raw data provided to verify initial calculations for data used to address correlations measuring data for QP 1.1-1.4.

Findings: To verify the accuracy of the data presented in the USM IB, the auditor used the SPSS and MS Excel data files provided by the Program to recalculate the statistics reported in the IB. To help the auditor understand the data provided by the Program, he met with Amy Johnson, one of the IB authors, to review the files and discuss the statistical methods that she employed. They discussed the labels for the variables in the SPSS file so that the auditor understood which variables in the file were actually used to calculate the results reported. Dr. Johnson explained that she transferred her results from SPSS to MS Excel so that they were accessible by the other IB authors and Program faculty. This transfer from one application to the other introduced differences in the reported data due to rounding.

To conduct his review, the auditor first recalculated the descriptive statistics using SPSS for the following assessment and data sources reported throughout the IB:

- 1 GPA (BA, content, methods, program , graduate)
- 2 Admissions Interview (subject area score, equity score, technology score)
- 3 Praxis I (reading, writing, math)
- 4 Praxis II (1st, 2nd, 3rd attempts)
- 5 Unit Scores for 1st and 2nd Internship Years (subject knowledge, assessment, diversity, instructional planning, instructional strategy, professional development)
- 6 Standards Review Scores for Mid and End Year (subject knowledge, diversity, beliefs, technology, collaboration, positive classroom, instructional planning, instructional strategies, assessment, professional development).

The auditor verified that the descriptive statistics reported in the IB matched the recalculated statistics. There was a rounding difference between the Program data reported in the IB and the auditors' results. The Program only reported to two decimal

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

places while the auditor reported to three decimal places.

Verified: (Descriptive statistics reported in the IB match the recalculated statistics)

Audit Task A3 (1.1)

Target: *Table 2.4 Correlations between Subject Matter Variables (page 18)*

Probe: Verify Table 2.4 Correlations between Subject Matter Variables

Findings: The auditor then recalculated the correlations reported in Tables 2.4-2.8 and the Technology subsection of Section II: Claims and Rationale. The auditor verified that the reported correlations were the same as those he calculated in SPSS.

Verified: (Calculations presented in the table are accurate)

Audit Task A4 (1.1)

Target: *Referring to Table 2.4 --Correlations between Subject Matter Variables*

Probe: Ask faculty for their analysis of the result that *Standards Review Subject Knowledge Scores do not significantly correlate to either the Unit scores or Admission/Candidacy interview questions*. Ask for their interpretation of *the degree to which the interview scores are able to predict future performance and the nature of the relationship between the unit and standards review data*.

Findings: Faculty indicated that much of the Data Analysis to date has been for accreditation purposes. They are currently using Tk20 to make the data more accessible. Faculty indicated that they are revising interview questions and are studying the relationship between the unit review and the Standards Review as well as creating more reliable and comprehensive strategies to systematize standards review. They were not able to provide interpretation for the data presented in the brief.

Verified: (Faculty are aware of the data analysis for the IB and are studying ways to make processes more predictive)

Audit Task A5 (1.2)

Target: Table 2.5 Correlations between Pedagogical Knowledge Variables (page 19)

Probe: Verify Table 2.5 Correlations between Pedagogical Knowledge Variables

Findings: The auditor then recalculated the correlations reported in Tables 2.4-2.8 and the Technology subsection of Section II: Claims and Rationale. The auditor verified that the reported correlations were the same as those he calculated in SPSS.

Verified: (Calculations verified as accurate)

Audit Task A6 (1.3)

Target: Table 2.6 Correlations between Caring and Teaching Skills Variables (page 20)

Probe: Verify Table 2.6 Correlations between Caring and Teaching Skills Variables.

Findings: The auditor then recalculated the correlations reported in Tables 2.4-2.8 and the Technology subsection of Section II: Claims and Rationale. The auditor verified that the reported correlations were the same as those he calculated in SPSS.

Verified: (Calculations verified as accurate)

Audit Task A7 (1.4.1)

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Target: Table 2.7 Correlations between Learning to Learn Variables (page 21)

Probe: Verify Table 2.7--Correlations between Learning to Learn Variables

Findings: The auditor then recalculated the correlations reported in Tables 2.4-2.8 and the Technology subsection of Section II: Claims and Rationale. The auditor verified that the reported correlations were the same as those he calculated in SPSS.

Verified: (Calculations verified as accurate)

Audit Task A8 (1.4.2)

Target: Table 2.8 Correlations between Multicultural Variables (page 22)

Probe: Verify Table 2.8 Correlations between Multicultural Variables

Findings: The auditor then recalculated the correlations reported in Tables 2.4-2.8 and the Technology subsection of Section II: Claims and Rationale. The auditor verified that the reported correlations were the same as those he calculated in SPSS.

Verified: (Calculations verified as accurate)

Audit Task A9 (1.4.2)

Target: Table 2.8 Correlations between Multicultural Variables (page 22) *“In this analysis, we see that interview scores are only significantly correlated with the unit diversity outcomes at very low levels and do not significantly correlate to standards review diversity scores as all. This finding suggests little to no predictive value of the equity interview ratings”* (pgs. 22-23).

Probe: Interview faculty as to what Table 2.8 reveals and what steps are being taken to address multicultural perspectives and accuracy.

Findings: Faculty reported that they believe that they recruit with specific attention to diversity and that the interview essay they use to assess this area has worked, though not perfectly. They believe that the program itself instills a strong attention to multiple perspectives in the teachers that they prepare. While they are reexamining the scenarios in the interview, they believe that the standards review process confirms that candidates meet the needs of diverse students. They did not address the predictive validity of the interview scores.

Verified: (Faculty understand the need to refine the admissions interview while attending to multicultural perspectives explicitly and extensively in the program)

Audit Task A10 (1.2)

Target: Table 4.3 Pedagogical Knowledge Measures (page 36)

Probe: Verify contents of Table 4.3 Pedagogical Knowledge Measures

Findings: The auditor then reviewed the descriptive and comparative data reported in Tables 4.1-4.6, 4.9, 4.11 and the Technology section and replicated the results.

Verified: (Pedagogical Knowledge Measures were verified as calculated)

Audit Task A11 (1.3)

Target: Table 4.6—Means and Standard Deviations for Measures of Caring and Teaching Skills

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Probe: Ask faculty how these data are actually interpreted as a sample of the interpretation of data to verify QP 1.3 and as an example of how faculty verify skills through the data.

Findings: The faculty indicates that data presented in the brief were being used by the faculty who are cohort coordinators and were only beginning to be used in a more systematic way in the program. The brief authors indicated that more than 60% of the data were missing when the brief was beginning to be prepared, and that it was necessary to go back and recover candidate performance data. Faculty could not give an interpretation of the data being used in this table.

Not verified: (While faculty are now completing all assessments, they were not systematically collecting data on candidates until the full implementation of TK20 and therefore were unable to use data to verify candidate skills)

Audit Task A12 (1.3)

Target: *“In order to more fully understand how prepared to be caring and skillful teachers our interns see themselves to be, we examined the items that comprised our preparedness scale when they left the program.”* (page 39)

Probe: Ask faculty how exit survey data have or have not confirmed candidate impressions of the claim. Verify with alumni in interviews that their perceptions of preparation are consistent with that in the survey.

Findings: Faculty indicated that surveys had primarily been used for accreditation to confirm claims from the candidate’s preparation. Candidates confirmed that same strength and areas needing more emphasis that were highlighted in the exit survey data.

Verified: (Survey results confirm other evidence regarding the claim)

Audit Task A13 (1.4.1)

Target: *Tables 4.9 Learning to Learn Measures and Table 4.10 Exit Survey Items Related to Learning to Learn* (page 44)

Probe: Interview candidates and alumni to confirm their levels of preparation and corroborate with Exit Survey items.

Findings: Candidates confirmed preparation on these components of the program consistent with exit surveys. They gave specific examples of coursework and field experiences to verify that they were supported and given opportunities to develop their abilities to learn how to acquire information independently and apply what they have learned in their clinical settings. They indicated that, with support, they applied and analyzed what they were learning.

Verified: (Candidates confirm preparation on learning to learn)

Audit Task A14 (1.4.2)

Target: *“Analysis of the data also revealed that while completers feel well prepared to establish equitable classrooms they feel less well prepared to take practical steps to meet the needs of students from special populations.”* (page 66)

Probe: Interview faculty to verify that survey results are consistent with standards review assessment. Interview candidates to confirm this analysis.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Findings: Faculty acknowledged that candidates' preparation for meeting the needs of students from special populations was an ongoing area of concern for candidates, while candidate opportunities to establish equitable classroom on other components was probably stronger than in the area of meeting the needs of students from special populations in those not preparing specifically for special education. Candidates and alumni confirmed that they did not believe they were prepared for special needs and ELL populations.

Verified (Faculty confirmed that candidates' performance was consistent with candidate impressions of preparation for students with special needs. Candidates confirmed the need for more preparation in this area.)

Audit Task A15 (1.4.3)

Target: *"It is interesting to note that among the scores for program completers after their first internship, the mean change from mid-internship to end-of-internship on the technology standard showed the least amount of growth (.84 points). Technology was not the lowest rated standard for this group at either review point, but it appears that the program may have had the least amount of influence on interns in this area"* (page 67).

Probe: Interview candidates to determine how candidates articulate the ways in which the program enhanced their use of technology in their teaching.

Findings: Candidates report that they are expected to use technology in their teaching. They indicated that they are expected to use technology, though instruction regarding technology was more limited.

Verified (Candidates do not attribute growth in this area to the program)

Audit Task A16 (1.4.2)

Target: *"As a whole group, however, all of our program completers feel less well prepared to meet the needs of English language learners. While they have some level of practical concerns for directly serving these students, they feel well prepared to seek help, advocate, and develop as professionals"* (page 66).

Probe: Interview candidates and faculty to corroborate these findings

Findings: Candidates reported that they needed more experience with differentiation. When asked about their preparation to teach English Language Learners, candidates reported taking Spanish for Educators in order to talk with parents with language barriers.

Candidates and faculty confirmed a strong emphasis on advocacy for children and the importance of meeting the needs of all learners. They indicated that the field experiences in different schools provided candidates with an opportunities to plan engaging experiences for all children.

Verified: (Candidates are prepared to advocate for students and develop as professionals)

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

The following audit tasks are from the TEAC online survey of the program’s candidates, faculty and cooperating teachers. Prior to the audit CAEP requests email addresses for program faculty, program candidates, and cooperating teachers who work with the program. Table A below indicates how many in each category were invited to take the email survey, how many of the emails were successfully delivered, how many opened the email, and how many and what percentage responded to the email survey:

Table A
On-Line Survey Responses

	Invited	Email Delivered	Email Opened	Responses Completed	Percentage Responding
Program Faculty	13	13	53.80%	6	46.20%
Program Candidates	166	166	27.10%	33	19.90%
Cooperating teachers	60	58	55.20%	18	31.00%

Candidates responding to the survey were asked to report their overall GPA. The mean GPA of the responding candidates was 3.77, which is comparable to the mean GPA of 3.89 of program candidates reported in the Brief, suggesting that candidates responding to the survey were academically similar to candidates in the program overall.

Audit Task A17 (1.1)

Target: Results of subject matter knowledge assessments

Probe: Corroborate the results of the program assessments of subject matter knowledge by determining that TEAC on-line survey results reflect those of the program assessments.

Finding: The TEAC on-line survey results are given in **Table A17** below:

Table A17
On-Line Candidate, Faculty and Cooperating Teacher
Mean Ratings on the Adequacy of the Candidates’ Accomplishments in
Subject Matter Knowledge

Topic of Survey Question	Minimum Rating	Maximum Rating	Mean Rating	STD
Candidate ratings of own knowledge	3	5	4.21	0.74
Candidate ratings of adequacy of courses	2	5	3.70	0.85
Candidate ratings of adequacy of faculty	3	5	4.31	0.69
Faculty ratings of candidate knowledge	3	5	4.17	0.75

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Topic of Survey Question	Minimum Rating	Maximum Rating	Mean Rating	STD
Cooperating Teacher ratings of candidate knowledge	3	5	4.17	0.79

1=Inadequate, 2=Barely Adequate, 3=Adequate, 4=More than Adequate, 5=Excellent

Respondents consistently rated the content knowledge of candidates as adequate to excellent. 19% of candidates and 31% of cooperating teachers surveyed responded. Candidates themselves were more disparate in their ratings of adequacy of courses, though the mean remained well above the adequate rating. The respondents did not indicate whether they had attended University of Southern Maine or another institution for their baccalaureate.

Verified: (Survey data confirm adequacy of knowledge)

Audit Task A18 (1.2)

Target: Results of pedagogical knowledge assessments

Probe: Corroborate the results of the program assessments of pedagogical knowledge by determining that TEAC on-line survey results reflect those of the program assessments.

Finding: The TEAC on-line survey results are given in **Table A18** below:

Table A18
On-Line Candidate, Faculty and Cooperating Teacher Mean Ratings on the Adequacy of the Candidates' Accomplishments in Pedagogical Knowledge

Topic of Survey Question	Minimum Rating	Maximum Rating	Mean Rating	STD
Candidate ratings of own knowledge	2	5	3.94	0.83
Candidate ratings of adequacy of courses	2	5	3.85	0.97
Candidate ratings of adequacy of faculty	2	5	4.30	0.88
Faculty ratings of candidate knowledge	4	5	4.50	0.55
Cooperating Teacher ratings of candidate knowledge	2	5	4.06	0.94

1=Inadequate, 2=Barely Adequate, 3=Adequate, 4=More than Adequate, 5=Excellent

Unlike survey results regarding content knowledge ([A17](#)), mean ratings on the adequacy of the candidates' accomplishments in pedagogical knowledge portray much more disparate ratings. Again, all scores are well above adequate, but there is considerable disparity between the very high and narrow range of ratings from faculty and the much wider range of ratings (as well as lower mean ratings) by cooperating teachers and candidates. Those ratings of candidates and cooperating teachers

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

indicate some ratings of “barely adequate.” This does not completely corroborate findings from interviews of candidates, faculty and cooperating teachers.

Verified with error: (Candidates and Cooperating teachers rated candidate knowledge, adequacy of courses and adequacy of faculty from barely adequate to excellent)

Audit Task A19 (1.3)

Target: Results of teaching skill/assessments

Probe: Corroborate the results of the program assessments of teaching skill by determining that TEAC on-line survey results reflect those of the program assessments.

Finding: The TEAC on-line survey results are given in **Table A19** below:

Table A19
On-Line Candidate, Faculty and Cooperating Teacher
Mean Ratings on the Adequacy of the Candidates’ Accomplishments in
Teaching Skill

Topic of Survey Question	Minimum Rating	Maximum Rating	Mean Rating	STD
Candidate ratings of own knowledge	3	5	4.52	0.62
Candidate ratings of adequacy of courses	1	5	4.03	1.21
Candidate ratings of adequacy of faculty	2	5	4.25	0.98
Candidate ratings of adequacy of cooperating teachers	2	5	4.09	1.0112998
Faculty ratings of candidate skill	4	5	4.67	0.52
Cooperating Teacher ratings of candidate skill	3	5	4.61	0.61

1=Inadequate, 2=Barely Adequate, 3=Adequate, 4=More than Adequate, 5=Excellent

The ratings of candidates’ teaching skills by candidates, cooperating teachers and faculty generally show a high level of ratings, with all means above 4. Again, there are low candidate ratings on adequacy of courses, though the mean remains above 4. However, the agreement among the 3 constituencies that the average scores were well above more than adequate confirm an overall demonstration of quality teaching skills.

Verified: (Candidates, faculty and cooperating teachers corroborate other measures that show a high level of teaching skills)

Audit Task A20 (1.4)

Target: Results of cross-cutting themes assessments

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Probe: Corroborate the results of the program assessments of cross-cutting themes by determining that TEAC on-line survey results reflect those of the program assessments.

Finding: The TEAC on-line survey results are given in **Table A20** below:

Table A20
On-Line Candidate, Faculty and Cooperating Teacher
Mean Ratings on the Adequacy of the Candidates' Accomplishments in
The Cross-Cutting Themes

Topic of Survey Question	Minimum Rating	Maximum Rating	Mean Rating	STD
Learning How to Learn				
Candidate ratings of own knowledge	3	5	4.67	0.54
Faculty ratings of candidate knowledge	3	5	4.67	0.82
Cooperating Teacher ratings of candidate knowledge	2	5	4.29	0.92
Multicultural Perspectives and Accuracy				
Candidate ratings of own knowledge	2	5	4.13	0.96
Faculty ratings of candidate knowledge	3	4	3.83	0.41
Cooperating Teacher ratings of candidate knowledge	3	5	4.13	0.72
Technology				
Candidate ratings of own knowledge	2	5	4.09	0.91
Faculty ratings of candidate knowledge	2	5	3.67	1.03
Cooperating Teacher ratings of candidate knowledge	2	5	3.89	0.96

1=Inadequate, 2=Barely Adequate, 3=Adequate, 4=More than Adequate, 5=Excellent

Survey results for these cross-cutting themes confirm findings from other assessments. The highest scores on learning to learn are consistent with the program goals and the curriculum. Interviews corroborate the findings for multicultural perspectives and accuracy, as the program emphasizes and screens for candidates who are willing to consider ways to be responsive to the needs of all learners. The high ratings in technology confirm candidate interviews that suggest that it is expected that candidates will be able to utilize technology for their own learning and that of their students. As with other ratings, there is at least one rating of barely adequate on many items; this occurs for cooperating teachers, faculty and candidates. However, the vast majority of scores are at the adequate to excellent levels.

Verified (Survey results corroborate other data presented and interviews with stakeholders)

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Audit Task A21 (1.5)

Target: The validity of cooperating teachers' ratings.

Probe: Corroborate the program assertion of the validity of Cooperating Teacher ratings of candidates by determining that TEAC survey results reflect the raters' preparation for their role.

Finding: The results are given in **Table A21** below:

Table A21
Cooperating Teacher Ratings of Their Connections
With the Teacher Education Program

	Minimum Rating	Maximum Rating	Mean Rating	STD
Relationship with program faculty	2	5	3.33	0.91
Training for evaluation role	1	5	3.33	1.14
Understanding of program	2	5	3.41	1.06

1=Inadequate, 2=Barely Adequate, 3=Adequate, 4=More than Adequate, 5=Excellent

Eighteen of 60 cooperating teachers surveyed responded. Mean ratings indicate that cooperating teachers rate their connections with the program as adequate. However, the ratings in these categories are lower than any of the other survey data and might suggest a representative group of cooperating teachers are not well connected to the program. Of particular note is the full range of ratings regarding training for their evaluation role. This confirms the IB report and faculty and administrative concerns that connections to partnerships need to be renewed and reenergized in a time of dwindling resources.

Verified (Cooperating teachers report a range of connections, understanding of program and training for their evaluation role)

	Summary of Tasks Related to Quality Principle 1: Evidence of Candidate Learning
---	--

On the whole, the auditors could verify the evidence cited in the Inquiry Brief for the scores of the many assessments related to the program's claim. Assessment data was presented clearly, and reflects data that were from program completers who are in current pathways (ETEP--graduate and undergraduate) and other pathways that have been phased out. Plans were clearly in place for the new undergraduate pathways (initiated 2012-2013) that have replaced the TEAMS pathway. Data from the pathways were combined and the data presented represented 5 years of candidate data. Data appeared to be relatively stable over the cohorts and pathways.

In Spring 2013, a more systemic and comprehensive assessment system was adopted and, as of Fall, 2013 all candidates are using Tk20 for the key assessments.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

The program faculty will be able to maintain data in real time and provide reports for analysis that can begin to analyze trends over time.

The study of current assessments showed that the program's scores and certain aspects of the admission interview did not correlate highly with other measures. In addition, the particular assessments did not appear to add value to the profile of assessments. The Brief reports that revision/reconsideration of these assessments will occur as a result of the data analysis.

The Standards Review that represents the candidate's summative demonstration of their abilities to teach was acknowledged by all stakeholders as a significant and rigorous assessment. Transition to Tk20 and new InTASC and NETS-T standards seems to be proceeding more smoothly at the time of the audit than it was in its inception in Fall 2013.

Several assessments corroborated two areas of relative weakness, serving students with special needs and differentiation for English language learners. In other areas, the high selection requirements for both academics and commitment to meeting the needs of all learners have resulted in teachers who demonstrate their growth in pedagogical knowledge, caring and teaching skills, learning to learn and multicultural perspective. While follow-up survey data were only conducted at this time for accreditation, the survey data have netted valuable information that is confirming of other assessments. It was clear that the faculty as a whole have not analyzed this information or acted upon the survey's findings.

Comparisons of candidate performance across pathways confirmed that undergraduate candidates are in fact performing as well as those in the ETEP program. Similar comparisons for on-line students vs. face-to-face and elementary vs. secondary candidates were verified by the auditors.

While the brief authors were steeped in the understanding of data presented in the IB, auditors were not able to determine to what extent faculty are currently engaged in assessing the myriad of data to move from statistical significance presented in much of the analyses to the practical importance of which statistics provide the most robust demonstrations of candidate knowledge. External survey results also showed some variation in evaluations by candidates and faculty, though the level of satisfaction and reporting of candidate competence overall is at above an acceptable level.



B. Tasks Related to Quality Principle 2: Evidence of a Quality Control System

This section of the audit report addresses targets that are associated with Quality Principle II, which has the following requirements:

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

- 2.1 **Rationale for the assessments.** There must be a rationale for the program's assessment methods that explains why the faculty thinks the assessments are valid and why the criteria and standards the faculty have selected as indicating success are appropriate.
- 2.2 **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.
- 2.3 **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, that it promotes the program's continual improvement, and that it yields outcomes specified in TEAC subcomponents 2.3.1 Curriculum, 2.3.2 Faculty, 2.3.3 Candidates, and 2.3.4 Resources.

Audit Task B1 (2.2)

Target: *“The Educator Preparation Unit at USM created and approved a Comprehensive Unit Assessment and Evaluation Plan in May 2013. The Assessment Plan provides the overarching structure for candidate assessment and program evaluation for all programs and pathways in the Unit. In the 2012-2013 academic year, the Unit adopted the Tk20 assessment management system for all programs and pathways. The system was piloted and customized for USM for use by all programs and pathways and students matriculating in the fall of 2013. For the purposes of this Inquiry Brief and accreditation self study we are in a period of transition from our previous Access database to our new Tk20 system. Going forward all data, Unit-wide, will be collected and managed in Tk20”* (page 16).

Probe: Interview administrators and faculty to understand the rationale for the system and how it ensures that evidence is appropriately identified, gathered, and analyzed. Probe candidates as to whether the scheme for assessment and emphasis of the assessments are clear and meaningful to them.

Findings: Administrators (Director of Teacher Education) and faculty confirmed that they have moved from data collection that was both more informal and less systematized. All candidates have made the transition to the Tk20 software; administrators have assumed a collective responsibility to ensure that all data are collected from all programs. The shift to the new system occurred because faculty determined that its previous systems did not ensure systematic gathering of data that was available for analysis readily.

Verified: (All data is are now being collected and managed in TK20; data presented at the time of the visit was collected in Excel and analyzed using SPSS)

Audit Task B2 (2.1)

Target: *Table 2.3 Alignment of Evidence with Program Standards (page 17)*

Probe: With reference to Table 2.3, interview faculty as to how scores have been interpreted and what data were not only significant, but important since significance was achieved readily with such large n's.

Findings: Faculty were conversant with each of the data points, and could describe in detail how the assessments were developed and how they have been used historically. Faculty indicated that the Standards Review data process as very

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

important, while GPA and Praxis were mentioned as predictors. Faculty have become more involved in standards review across content areas and programs; they report that expectations have become more uniform and that candidates' demonstration of achievement of the standards requires convincing evidence. In addition they report that the reliability of this assessment and the revised expectations produce better data for the programs. They were not able to make reference to the specific data that confirmed the assessments' validity for them nor did they refer to the analysis presented in the IB. Faculty were unable to explain which evidence presented in the Brief provided information as to how the criteria and standards set were deemed to continue to be appropriate.

Verified with Error (Faculty confirmed rationales for the assessments, but were unable to articulate how the assessment data presented in the Brief provided valid confirmation as to how candidates met standards)

Audit Task B3 (2.1)

Target: Table 2.3 Alignment of Evidence with Program Standards --- *“Each component of Quality Principle 1 is assessed using multiple measures....each source of data fits into the overall candidate assessment system; our rationales for the criteria and standards as appropriate indications of success.”* (page 17)

Probe: Interview faculty and program administrators to learn how assessments have evolved and developed to be the key assessments to provide evidence for claims.

Findings: Administrators were strongly able to describe the development of assessments related to the IBP and the evolution of Maine program approval standards. Faculty were articulate in describing how each of the assessments in Table 2.3 informed candidate performance in the USM programs. They were confirming that each was important in assessing candidate performance in relation to the USM claim. They described the ways in which they had refined instruments as they made the transition from USM standards to the InTASC standards.

Verified: (Administration and faculty were clear and explicit in the rationale for each of the assessments used to verify the USM claim for candidates)

Audit Task B4 (2.1)

Target: *“In their year-long internships, program completers demonstrate strong skills in caring and teaching. The Intern Assessment System provides a comprehensive means for ongoing formative and summative assessment. ...Taken together, these findings suggest that they will continue to develop their teaching skills in order to serve diverse students”* (page 66).

Probe: Interview faculty and candidates regarding the particular rationale for the assessments currently use for QP 1.4.2.

Findings: Faculty articulated the ways in which they assess and support the development of candidates' skills in caring and teaching. Faculty voiced strong and specific commitment to the cohorts with which they had worked across content areas. They were able to voice how current assessments (particularly the Standards Review) provide sufficient evidence of the ways in which candidates address the needs of a culturally diverse student body.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Candidates and cooperating teachers corroborated that the candidates were able to be assessed with their competence for caring and teaching. They also, however, indicated that there was wide variation in the cohort coordinator's emphasis on the varied assessments and their expectations for candidate performance.

Verified with error: (The internship assessment system provides accurate evidence of candidates development of skills in caring and teaching, though there is variability in the emphasis and evaluating of performance with the various assessments)

Audit Task B5 (2.2)

Target: *Table 3.2 Study of Pathway Differences (page 26)*

Probe: Interview administration and faculty to determine why the pathways of differences delineated were chosen to study how program candidates perform based on different pathways (both past and those of current emphasis).

Findings: Program administrators and faculty confirm that the current assessments are developed and validated by the faculty as representative of the data necessary to confirm claims from admissions through program completion.

The differences in pathways confirm modifications in university and program expectations as to how candidates will best facilitate educator preparation. Since faculty have not always advanced the changes in pathways for program completion, current analyses are deliberately designed for faculty to be able to study/challenge assumptions as to optimal multiple pathways to program completion.

Verified: (Faculty confirm the findings regarding the adequacy of new, primarily undergraduate pathways for teacher education)

Audit Task B6 (2.2)

Target: *Tables 4.16 and 4.17 Pathway Comparisons of Program Outcomes (page 50-51)*

Probe: Interview faculty and administrators about comparisons of ETEP vs. TEAMS to determine what has been learned by the pathways comparisons and what actions might be taken; interview candidates about the pathway and prep. Verify statistics in these tables.

Findings: The authors of the brief explained that the consultant with whom they had worked for both visits had suggested the comparisons among the pathways. They reported that the data had provided evidence to suggest that undergraduates pathway of matriculation through the program performed at levels at or above those enrolled in the ETEP pathway. Changes in the pathways (particularly the transition of the UG pathway from TEAMS to the current UG pathway) have been part of a larger university repositioning. Faculty acknowledge the success of current UG candidates and have preserved the integrity of the program through restructuring and institutional changes. They have adapted program expectations for new pathways.

The auditor then recalculated the comparison statistics using independent-samples t-tests. He recalculated the results reported in Tables 4.14-4.20 which compare TEAMS to ETEP, K-8 to 7-12, and Traditional to Online across multiple assessments scores. The auditor verified the accuracy of the reported statistics with his own calculations.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Candidate from multiple pathways confirmed reports of strong and successful preparation.

Verified: (Pathway Comparisons have produced satisfactory results with program modifications made.)

Audit Task B7 (2.2)

Target: *“Analysis of the data also revealed that while completers feel well prepared to establish equitable classrooms they feel less well prepared to take practical steps to meet the needs of students from special populations.”* (page 66).

Probe: Interview candidates and faculty regarding these findings. Find out current candidate and recent grad impressions of preparation to meet the needs of students from special populations.

Findings: Faculty acknowledged that the program has begun to provide more attention to specific strategies for differentiation. Current candidates and alumni confirmed that they believe they had insufficient preparation, particularly for high school students with special needs. Candidates also reported that they were not prepared for the extent of paperwork associated with assisting students with special needs.

Verified (Candidates and faculty confirm that candidates need additional preparation in meets the needs of students from special populations)

Audit Task B8 (2.3)

Target: *“In the past few years, teacher education faculty and school partners have examined the Unit mission and core values, developed and approved a governance document and comprehensive unit assessment plan. The following elements that have been in place prior to 2009 continue to guide and inform program implementation and improvement:*

- *An ETEP specific mission and set of Core Practices aligned with the unit-wide mission and Core Values;*
- *An Equity Framework for use in program admissions decisions and review/revision of coursework;*
- *Integrated existing program quality control mechanisms into a comprehensive Quality Assurance System (QAS) and an operational Quality Control System (QCS) (Appendix A)”* (pages 68-69)

Probe: Verify with the coordinator of the Internal Audit that practices have been in place since the IBP in 2009.

Findings: The coordinator of the internal audit provided evidence that elements above have, in fact, been in place for the past 5 years and continue in the current programs. Additionally faculty, candidates and cooperating teachers confirmed the ETEP specific mission and set of core practices.

Verified: (Ongoing processes outline in the IB are in place for the teacher education programs)

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Audit Task B9 (2.2)

Target: *“The following are new Unit-wide programmatic tools have been introduced in the last two years or are underway and are expected to guide and inform program implementation and improvement university-wide:*

- *Creation and approval of a unit-wide Comprehensive Assessment Plan*
- *Adoption and implementation of the Tk20 assessment management system*
- *Unit-wide acceptance of the InTASC and NETS-T standards that are consistent with the Maine Standards for Initial Teacher Certification” (page 69).*

Probe: Interview faculty and administration to understand how the collection and analysis of evidence lead to these changes. Interview candidates about how the implementation of changes in the assessment system were explained to them.

Findings: As faculty and administrators began to prepare the Inquiry Brief Proposal in 2009, individual programs developed tools and gathered and warehoused their own data. At that time, there was a lack of consistent data collection. In 2012, a work slowdown impeded the efforts to involve faculty broadly in the self-study. Faculty did make the decision to focus on achieving unit wide assessments overseen by the PEC. At that time, 60% of the data from the 5 years needed for the IB was missing, as coordinators had manually maintained their own program data. There was a tremendous amount of faculty turnover. As the unit moved to using InTASC Standards instead of their own institutional standards, programs developed common assessments that are program specific but with common themes. Instead of using Wiki’s to house individual candidate data, the institution purchased TK20 and fully implemented its use in 2013. Candidates report a relatively smooth transition and faculty now have full access to candidate performance data.

Verified (The assessment system and new technology are now developed and implemented).

Audit Task B10 (2.2)

Target: *“As a result of this inquiry, the following improvements are planned or underway:*

- *Examination of the admission process and tools in order to identify and use interview questions and/or assessments that are more informative for individualized learning and/or predictive of program outcomes*
 - *Specifically, identify ways of assessing at admissions critical areas such as equity, content, and technology in ways that have greater internal consistency and correlate with other measures*
- *Development of unit-wide InTASC and NETS-T standards review rubric elements for all initial teacher certification pathways. The rubric is in draft stages (spring, 2013).*
- *Given the low internal consistency the ETEP instructional unit scores and their limited relationship to the end-of-program standards review scores on common standards, faculty need to explore and create improved assessment tools for the documentation of interns’ planning, teaching, and assessment of student learning” (page 69).*

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Probe: Verify with faculty that the following improvements are planned or underway.

Findings: Faculty verified that the admissions process is under review, particularly with the increase in those matriculating in the undergraduate programs. They reported plans for refinement of the interview process. The unit-wide rubrics are being developed and were reviewed by the state team. It was not clear what plans were yet developed to document interns' planning, teaching, and assessment of student learning, however faculty were articulate about the may changes outlined in the brief that were in process or planned.

Verified: (Faculty are using the results of the Inquiry Brief to further refine program assessments)

Audit Task B11 (2.3)

Target: *“Going forward all data, Unit-wide, will be collected and managed in Tk20”* (page 16).

Probe: Confirm with faculty and candidates that Tk20 is being used for all assessment.

Findings: Faculty and candidates confirm that all data are now being used in Tk20 and that candidates are receiving the support necessary to successfully use the technology.

Verified (Tk20 is the technology used to manage assessment related to the program's claims)



Summary of Tasks Related to Quality Principle 2: Evidence of a 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. The replication of the quality control system used five years ago accurately reflected the rationale for evolution of the curriculum and pathways in a way that capitalized on the needs of candidates and the ongoing commitment of faculty. The audit also highlighted the significance of university wide austerity measures and turnover in full-time faculty, as well as faculty work slowdowns at the beginning of the preparation of the Inquiry Brief.

Auditors verified that the brief authors did extensive statistical analysis to verify that the assessments were valid and reliable measures of the claim and quality principles. As mentioned in Standard 1, they realized that portions of the admissions interview and the assessment of the unit plan have not, in fact, provided the corroborating evidence or predictive validity that they were intended to have.

The consistency of the faculty's assessments of individual candidate performance across pathways and across levels of certification was not able to be corroborated.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Candidates and cooperating teachers reported differences in expectations across cohorts and cohort coordinators.

The auditors verified that the program has begun or is planning to make a substantial number of additional program adjustments to assessments that did not net the anticipated data. Given the adoption of Tk20 and a unit wide assessment system, the program faculty have moved from a pathway by pathway conception of assessment to a unit wide system of assessment that still honors the specific need of levels of certification and individual content areas. Faculty involvement in data analysis for program improvement appears to be very limited to date.

The auditors confirmed that the quality control system has remained with fidelity despite the repeated reorganizations of the departments and programs in teacher education. In addition, despite the changes, candidates are receiving the support they need to complete the programs.

Program reorganization has resulted in more faculty conversation and collaboration across pathways as well as renewed commitment to the use of Tk20 to create a vibrant and robust assessment system that has a strong foundation in the development and use of current assessments. At this time, much of these conversations are in their infancy as the financial strains and uncertainty around university staffing and organization have consumed most of the faculty's energies in the past year.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

	C. Tasks Related to Quality Principle 3: Documentation of Program Capacity
---	---

In Table C.1 below, the auditors have indicated whether they have found evidence that satisfies each requirement for monitoring and control of program quality. Hyperlinked text refers to either a web address or an audit task that explores the documentation further.

Table C.1
Quality Control of Capacity: Monitoring and Control (Component 2.3)
 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

Finding	Target (choose at least one for each subcomponent— indicate chosen target in bold)	Auditors' Probe
2.3.1. Curriculum (Target #1)		
Found	Formal notification from the state that it has approved the program.	In meeting with state team, it was verified that the program is currently approved. Renewal of approval occurs simultaneously with the findings of the state visit held in conjunction with the Audit.
2.3.2 Faculty (Target #2)		
Found	Minutes of a meeting show that the <i>Brief Proposal</i> was considered and approved by the faculty.	Reviewed minutes of 11/13/13.
2.3.3 Candidates (Target #3)		
Found	Admissions policy of the program is published.	Admission requirements for each program are on website at: http://usm.maine.edu/admission ETEP -- http://usm.maine.edu/teacher-education/etep-faqs#6 ETEP- http://usm.maine.edu/teacher-education/applying-graduate-teacher-education (there is a section about admissions requirements) http://usm.maine.edu/eng/ba-english-teacher-education-7-12-certification-track
2.3.4 Resources (Target #4)		

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Found	Satisfactory TEAC survey results from faculty & students.	See Table D.1
-------	---	-------------------------------

In Table C.2 below, the auditors have indicated whether they have found evidence that satisfies each requirement for monitoring and control of program quality. Hyperlinked text refers to either a web address or an audit task that explores the documentation further.

Table C.2

Parity between the Program and the Institution (Component 3.1)

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

Finding	Target (choose at least one for each subcomponent— indicate chosen target in bold)	Auditors' Probe
3.1.1 Curriculum (Target #5)		
Found	The number of credits required for degree at the institution and program are comparable.	<p>Review catalog to verify: http://usm.maine.edu/catalogs/2013-14</p> <p>ETEP and Pathways requirements -- http://usm.maine.edu/teacher-education/msed-teaching-and-learning-extended-teacher-education-program-etep</p> <p>Undergrad degree requirements -- http://usm.maine.edu/catalogs/2013-14/academic-policies</p> <p>Graduate</p>
3.1.2 Faculty (Target #6)		
Found	The percentage of faculty with terminal degrees in program and in the institution shows parity.	<p>Interviewed appropriate administrator and reviewed documentation to find that faculty in teacher education hold credentials that are comparable to the rest of the institution. Union agreement regulates faculty qualifications and hiring practices.</p> <p>Findings were confirmed with the Faculty Qualifications – Institutional Brief, and the accompanying exhibits for the state and TEAC teams housed in Blackboard.</p>
3.1.3 Facilities (Target #7)		

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Found	The space and facilities assigned to the program and to similar programs shows parity.	Toured facilities and found facilities are comparable to others and adequate for content majors and professional education
3.1.4 Fiscal and administrative (Target #8)		
Found	The budget allocations per student in the program and in the institution show parity.	Interviewed SEHD Assistant Dean for Finance to verify that the budget allocations for program and in the institution show parity. The institution is restructuring to deal with significant deficits. Teacher education is indicated as a priority for the institution by the Interim Provost. Changes in personnel meant that administrators in the Office of Finance verified the information in the Internal Audit, though they did not participate in the interview.
3.1.5 Candidate support (Target #9)		
Found	The program students have the same access to services as other students in programs at the institution.	Candidates verified that they have access to services. Interviews with advisors confirm one-on-one support for candidates in the program. On-line students indicated in interviews that they knew where and how to access services.
3.1.6 Candidate complaints (Target #10)		
Found	Candidate complaints proportionally no greater or significant than the complaints by candidates in the institution's other programs.	Interviewed Dr. Whitney to verify candidate complaints are proportionally no greater or significant than the complaints by candidates in the institution's other programs. See http://usm.maine.edu/catalogs/2013-14/academic-policies

In Table C.3 below, the auditors have indicated whether they have found evidence that satisfies each requirement for sufficiency of program quality. Hyperlinked text refers to either a web address or an audit task that explores the documentation further.

Table C.3
Quality Control of Capacity: Sufficiency (Component 3.2)

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

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Finding	Target (choose at least one for each subcomponent— indicate chosen target in bold)	Auditors' Probe
3.2.1 Curriculum (Target #11)		
Found	Credit hours required in the subject matter are tantamount to an academic major.	<p>Review catalog to verify: http://usm.maine.edu/catalogs/2013-14</p> <p>(this link shows that undergrad have a major in the content area) Egs. http://usm.maine.edu/eng/ba-english (to earn a BA in English a student must earn 48 credits) http://usm.maine.edu/history/ba-history (to earn a BA in History a student must earn 39 credits plus a foreign language requirement)</p>
3.2.2 Faculty (Target #12)		
Found	Full-time faculty selected at random have a terminal degree (major or minor) in the areas of course subjects they teach.	Verified assignments for Whitney, Keuch, Caniff, Shank, and Needleman
3.2.3 Facilities (Target #13)		
Found	Satisfactory TEAC survey results from program faculty.	See Table D.1
3.2.3 Facilities (Target #14)		
Found	Auditors' observations of at least two class sessions find that the rooms and equipment constitute adequate instructional settings.	Observed two class sessions: EDU 305, SED 335
3.2.4 Fiscal and Administrative (Target #15)		
Partially Found	Resources are adequate to administer the program.	Interviews with senior administrators and Dr. Whitney confirm that while the university is confronting a sizeable deficit and has had to make many strategic cuts including cutting programs, resources are adequate to administer the program (see clarifying questions). It is unclear as to whether the faculty layoffs and retirements, as well as the continued restructuring of the school will result in sufficient

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

		resources to maintain program quality.
3.2.5 Candidate support (Target #16)		
Found	Satisfactory TEAC survey results from students and faculty.	See Table D.1
3.2.6 Policies and practices (Target #17)		
Found	An academic calendar is published.	Review academic calendar at: http://usm.maine.edu/reg/academiccalendar
3.2.6 Policies and practices (Target #18)		
Found	Claims made in program website and in the catalog are consistent with claims made in the <i>Brief</i> .	Review pages 144-154 of Appendix D and compare to website and catalog for consistency.
3.2.6 Policies and practices (Target #19)		
Found	Grading policy of the program is published and is accurate.	Review grading policy on website: http://usm.maine.edu/catalogs/2013-14/academic-policies
3.2.6 Policies and practices (Target #20)		
Found	Transfer of credit policy and transfer of student enrollment policy are published.	Review transfer of credit policy at: http://usm.maine.edu/core/transfer-credits-and-usm-core And review transfer student policy at: http://usm.maine.edu/admit/transfer-students
3.2.6 Policies and practices (Target #21)		
Found	Program has procedures for student complaints.	Review complaint procedure: http://usm.maine.edu/catalogs/2013-14/academic-policies
3.2.6 Policies and practices (Target #22)		

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Found	If the audited program or any option within the program is delivered in a distance education format, the auditors verify that the program has the capacity to ensure timely delivery of distance education and support services and to accommodate current student numbers and expected near-term growth in enrollment.	Candidates confirmed adequate resources and auditors corresponded with candidates using the course delivery system on computer and using interactive video at 2 different sites.. There is not anticipated growth in enrollment in this population.
3.2.6 Policies and practices (Target #23)		
Found	If the audited program or any option within the program is delivered in a distance education format, the auditors verify that the program has a process to verify the identity of students taking distance education courses.	The campus uses a Blackboard based student verification system.

In Table C.4 below, the auditors have documented the results of the Call for Comment, which TEAC requires be distributed “to its communities of interest and to members of the public” according to CAEP Policy XLI (see <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/>).

**Table C.4
Call for Comment**

Call for comment to third parties distributed as required by TEAC policy (Target #23)	# Positive Comments	# Negative Comments	# Mixed Comments
Found	2	1	1

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway



Summary of Tasks Related to Quality Principle 3: Documentation of Program Capacity

Of the 23 potential targets associated with Quality Principle III, the auditors examined 23 and found that of these, 23 could be confirmed with the documentation provided by the program. These targets indicate that on the whole the program has parity with the institution and has documented its capacity for quality. Program capacity is confirmed because the preponderance (at least 75%) of the supporting evidence were consistent with claims of capacity and commitment and/or further audit tasks verified associated capacity targets, though institutional financial challenges are reflected in this program as well as other throughout the institution (See Section D below).



D. Tasks Related to Quality Principle 3: Auditors' Judgment of Institutional Commitment

During the time of the development of the Inquiry Brief and the Audit, the University of Southern Maine was facing many extraordinary challenges as an individual institution and with the system of the State Universities of Maine. The interim president indicated that the institution had had a very decentralized structure for academic and financial policies and procedures in the past. As the revenue for the system has declined, the need to create drastically streamlined structures and plans for financial responsibility has come with an impending financial crisis. Before next year's budget, the institution has had to face retrenchment, elimination of programs, reduction of faculty and staff, and measures to get costs and expenditures both under control and more systematized at the institutional level.

In this process, there has been a program for voluntary retirements, programs have been eliminated, and some faculty received their layoff notices on the second day of the audit. The interim president and provost were appointed to their positions in the summer to address the identified crisis and implement austerity measures. They have endeavored to work through the budgeting and retrenchment processes with as much transparency as possible. (See clarifying tasks [4](#), [5](#), and [6](#).),

In 2010, the College of Education and Development shared responsibility for teacher preparation with two other colleges in the university. At that time, the College of Education and Development merged in to the College of Management and Human Service and became the School of Education and Human Development. In January 2012 the role of Director of Teacher Education was renamed and re-envisioned to have a university-wide role. The Director of Educator Preparation has overall responsibility for the programs and pathways and serves as chair of the Professional Education Council. This structure remains, though the School's departments were further consolidated in November 2014 after the audit visit (see [clarification task 6](#)).

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Throughout this university-wide initiative, the central administration has confirmed commitment to continuing teacher education at USM, though more emphasis may be put on undergraduate pathways through the university’s envisioning to become Maine’s “metropolitan university.” In this process, the Brief’s discussion of parity indicates that in many cases, the structure of the cohort programs exceeds that of other programs in the university. Salaries are lower than other schools and colleges in the university, facilities are adequate but in need of some renovation, technology supports the academic programs, and faculty have been able to provide extraordinary support for cohorts. Not all structural aspects of the undergraduate programs parallel the ETEP program, but advisors and student services staff confirmed that candidates are receiving support throughout their matriculation at USM.

At the time of the audit, there remained uncertainty, tension, and suspicion regarding the cutback in faculty in particular. Faculty perception is that the same level of programming will be unable to be continued given the cutbacks in faculty in the School of Education as well as the supporting Arts and Science majors. Administrative and support staff have also been cut, and the School of Education no longer has direct participation in certain leadership councils and committees.

TEAC also surveyed students and faculty regarding aspects of the institutional commitment to the program. Results are in Table D.1 below:

**Table D.1
On-Line Candidate and Faculty Mean Ratings on
Indicators of Institutional Commitment**

Survey item	Number Raters	Minimum Rating	Maximum Rating	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation
Candidate Ratings					
Appropriateness of Classrooms, Equipment, Supplies	32	2	5	3.81	0.82
Availability of Classrooms, Equipment, Supplies	31	2	5	3.84	0.82
Helpfulness of Candidate Support Services	31	1	5	3.71	0.90
Availability of Candidate Support Services	31	1	5	3.71	0.94
Faculty Ratings					
Institutional Commitment to Program	6	2	4	3.00	0.63

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Resources for Teaching	6	2	3	2.83	0.41
Facilities for Teaching	6	3	3	3.00	0.00
Helpfulness of Candidate Support Services	6	2	5	4.33	1.21
Availability of Candidate Support Services	6	2	5	4.00	1.26

1=Inadequate, 2=Barely Adequate, 3=Adequate, 4=More than Adequate, 5=Excellent

Overall, the mean ratings of institutional commitment are varied with the lowest ratings for resources for teaching and facilities for teaching. The ratings on this section of the survey are the lowest; the range of responses is more disparate. Not surprisingly, given the financial pressures on the university as a whole and some of the austerity measures necessary to address budget deficits, faculty evaluation of resources for teaching received the lowest rating. Times are difficult for the institution and faculty are experiencing the effects of the overall need to streamline budgets and cut deficits. Survey results are consistent with faculty interviews. There was a very high level of concern with the cutbacks of the university and the elimination of faculty positions. It is unclear if some of the support for cohort coordinators in the field will continue.

In extraordinary circumstances, the institution has committed to the importance of continuing excellent programming in teacher education on campus and on-line. While the university is having to learn to do more with less financial resources, the commitment to teacher education remains strong.

	Part Six: AUDIT SCHEDULE
---	---------------------------------

University of Southern Maine

TEAC Visit Schedule (with concurrent visit by State of Maine Team)
October 27-30, 2014

Monday, October 27, 2014

5:00 p.m.	Team arrives at hotel
7:00 p.m.	Dinner with local practitioner

Tuesday, October 28, 2014

8:30 a.m.	Interview: Brief Authors - Jean Whitney, Julie Canniff, and Amy Johnson	
9:30 a.m.	Joint Interview with Special Education Faculty	Joint Interview with Undergraduate Pathways faculty
10:30 a.m.	Joint interview with Data/Assessment Group	Joint interview with ETEP faculty

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

11:30-1:00	Lunch
12:30 p.m.	Class observation: ED100 and/or ED305
1:30 p.m.	Travel to Portland Campus
2:15-3:00 p.m.	Interview Finance Group—Portland Campus Law Building
3:00-3:45 p.m.	Interview President and Provost –Portland Campus Law Building
3:45-4:30 p.m.	Interview Library and IT Group—Portland Campus Law Building
6:00 p.m.	TEAC auditors dinner

Wednesday, October 29, 2014

8:30-9:00 a.m.	TEAC tour of campus	
9:00-11:30 a.m.	Work time	
11:30-12:30	Lunch	
1:00-2:00 p.m.	Interview with representatives of Initial Teacher Certification Programs	Interview with Student Advisors—Faculty and Staff
2:00-3:00 p.m.	Class observation (face to faced and interactive TV): SED335	
4:00-4:45 p.m.	Interview with selected cooperating teachers	Interview with current students
5:00-5:45 p.m.	Interviews with selected alumni	Interviews with selected alumni

Thursday, October 30, 2014

8:30 a.m.	TEAC Next Steps meeting with SEHD faculty
9:00-11:30 a.m.	Work time on campus

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

	Part Seven: CASE ANALYSIS
---	----------------------------------

**Case Analysis for the Inquiry Brief Pathway
Teacher Education
University of Southern Maine
Teacher Education**

Presentation of the Case aligned to TEAC Quality Principles

QUALITY PRINCIPLE 1: EVIDENCE OF CANDIDATE LEARNING

Component 1.1: Evidence of candidates' subject matter knowledge
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with subject matter knowledge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry Brief pages 17-18, page 30, pages 34-35 page 50, pages 65-66 • Tables 2.4, 3.1, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.7, 4.15, 4.16, 4.18, 4.21 • Audit Tasks A1, A3, A4, and A18
Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with subject matter knowledge None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with subject matter knowledge, showing that the evidence is consistent instead with something separate from the quality principle None

Component 1.2: Evidence of candidates' pedagogical knowledge
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with pedagogical knowledge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry Brief pages 18-19, page 30, pages 34-37, pages 41-42, 54-56, pages 62-64, page 66 • Tables 2.5, 3.1, 3.4, 4.3, 4.7, 4.17, 4.18, 4.20, 4.21, Figure 4.1 • Audit Tasks A1, A5, A10, A18
Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with pedagogical knowledge None
Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with pedagogical knowledge, showing that the evidence is consistent instead with something separate from the quality principle <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The standards review process is a paper-based project. While the assessments in the Brief do include an evaluation of actual teaching performance, that is but a single basis for the review. Differences in scoring procedures in the standards review (page 30) may net inconsistent results for comparison.

Component 1.3: Evidence of candidates' caring and effective teaching skill
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with caring and effective teaching skill <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry Brief pages 19-21, page 30, pages 37-41 • Tables 2.6, 3.3, 3.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.18, 4.19, 4.21, 4.24 • Audit Tasks A1, A6, A12, A15, A19

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

<p>Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with caring and effective teaching skill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit Task A11
<p>Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with caring and effective teaching skill, showing that the evidence is consistent instead with something separate from the quality principle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences in scoring procedures in the standards review (page 30) may net inconsistent results for comparison.

<p>Component 1.4: Evidence that the cross-cutting themes are embedded</p>
<p>Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the cross-cutting themes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry Brief pages 21-23, pages 27-32, pages 43-48 • Tables 2.7, 2.8, 3.7, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.12, 4.13,4.18, 4.19, 4.21 • Audit Tasks A1, A7, A8, A9, A13, A17, A20
<p>Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the cross-cutting themes</p> <p>None</p>
<p>Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the cross-cutting themes, showing that the evidence is consistent instead with something separate from the quality principle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While candidate competencies with technology are confirmed, it was unclear from interviews with both faculty and candidates if the competency was actually a result of formal training within the teacher education program.

<p>Component 1.5: Evidence of valid interpretations of the assessments</p>
<p>Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with valid interpretations of the assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Inquiry Brief pages 16-23, 27-33 • See Table 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, • See Audit Tasks A1, A2, A21
<p>Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with valid interpretations of the assessments</p> <p>None</p>
<p>Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with valid interpretations of the assessments, showing that the evidence is consistent instead with something separate from the quality principle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Inquiry Brief (page 33) states: <i>We acknowledge limitations to the claims we make as a result of our analysis. We understand that our claim about our program’s influence is tentative until we can demonstrate its effect by including comparison groups in our evaluation designs.</i>

QUALITY PRINCIPLE 2: EVIDENCE OF FACULTY LEARNING AND INQUIRY

<p>Component 2.1: Rationale for assessments</p>
<p>Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with a rationale for assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Inquiry Brief pages 16-17, pages 27-33 • See Tables 2.2, 2.3, 3.4, 3.5,3.6, 3.7, • See Audit Tasks B2, B3, B4
<p>Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with a rationale for assessments</p> <p>None</p>

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with a rationale for assessments, showing that the evidence is consistent instead with something separate from the quality principle

None

Component 2.2: Evidence that program decisions and planning are based on evidence

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the program basing its decisions on evidence

- See Inquiry Brief pages 16, pages 50-51, pages 65-69
- See Audit Tasks [B1](#), [B6](#), [B9](#), [B10](#)

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the program basing its decisions on evidence

None

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with the program basing its decisions on evidence, showing that the evidence is consistent instead with something separate from the quality principle

- While authors of the Brief have outlined evidence from the analysis, there was very limited evidence that faculty have acted upon this analysis in meaningful ways to date.

Component 2.3: Evidence of an influential quality control system

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

- See Inquiry Brief pages 69-70, pages 72-102, pages 103-107
- See Audit Tasks [B8](#), [B11](#)

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

- Current Institutional financial shortfalls and reorganization have removed some of the staff positions that were responsible for part of the quality control system. Roles and responsibilities continue to shift.

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with an influential quality control system, showing that the evidence is consistent instead with something separate from the quality principle

- It is unclear if the current quality control system that is described in the Brief is actually the way in which faculty procure and rely on evidence. There is evidence that the Professional Education Council has begun to assume these responsibilities.

QUALITY PRINCIPLE 3: EVIDENCE OF INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT AND CAPACITY FOR PROGRAM QUALITY

Evidence of institutional commitment and capacity for program quality

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the capacity for program quality
See Brief, Appendix B, (page 103) and [Table C.1](#), [Table C.2](#), and [Table C.3](#) in the audit report. See Clarifying Tasks [4](#), [5](#), and [6](#) regarding the institutional reorganization and budget cutting measures.

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with capacity for program quality, showing that the evidence is consistent instead with something separate from the quality principle

- The University of Southern Maine is addressing a 16 million dollar deficit for the next

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Inquiry Brief Pathway

fiscal year. Programs have been cut and faculty attrition is occurring through both through voluntary retirement and involuntary faculty cuts. During the audit, the administration and faculty repeatedly referred to the concerns around diminished capacity to support programs, and there have been faculty cuts directly related to the teacher education program. Concerns regarding this financial crisis superseded discussion of the analysis of the evidence presented in the brief and what had been learned from that analysis.

Suggested Recommendations

Suggested Weaknesses and Stipulations

Suggested Stipulation 3.2: The teacher education program has not yet developed a plan to continue data collection and program improvement with the diminished number of faculty members as the university-wide retrenchment policies and actions are solidified in the current and subsequent years.

Suggested Accreditation Recommendation (shaded)

<u>Quality Principle 1</u> Candidate learning	<u>Quality Principle 2</u> Faculty learning and inquiry	<u>Quality Principle 3</u> Capacity & Commitment	Accreditation status designations
Above standard	Above standard	Above standard	Accreditation (7 years)
Above standard	Below standard	Above standard	Accreditation (2 years)
Below standard	Above standard	Above standard	Accreditation (2 years)
Above standard	Above standard	Below standard	Accreditation (2 years)
Below standard	Below standard	Above standard	Deny
Below standard	Above standard	Below standard	Deny