



Teacher Education Accreditation Council

May 15, 2013

TO: Mark LaCelle-Peterson, President, Teacher Education Accreditation Council

FROM: James Shuman, Accreditation Panel Chair

RE: TEAC Accreditation Panel Recommendation for the Richard Stockton College Teacher Education Program

On Thursday, May 9, 2013, the TEAC Accreditation Panel met in Philadelphia, PA at the Doubletree Hotel to consider the *Inquiry Brief* submitted by Richard Stockton College for accreditation of its Teacher Education Program.

Members of the TEAC Accreditation Panel participating in the deliberation and making this recommendation included:

- James Shuman, Chair, Department of Education, and Coordinator, Graduate Program in General Studies in Education, St. Lawrence University, Canton, NY
- Donna Cooner, Director, School of Teacher Education & Principal Preparation, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO
- Jo Anne Deshon, Teacher, Christina School District, Newark, DE
- Kurt Geisinger, Director, Buros Center for Testing and W. C. Meierhenry Distinguished University Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE
- Mara B. Huber, Special Assistant to the President for Educational Initiatives, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY
- Joseph Lubig, Associate Professor, School of Education, Northern Michigan University, Marquette, MI (lead auditor and non-voting member of the panel)

Kim Lebak, Norma Boakes, and Claudine Keenan, representing the Richard Stockton College Teacher Education Program, observed the deliberations and answered questions from the Panel about the program's case for accreditation.

TEAC staff members Diana Rigden and Christine Carrino Gorowara also observed the Panel's deliberations.

1. Recommendation. The Accreditation Panel reviewed the *Inquiry Brief*, the Audit Report, and the Case Analysis and confirmed by a vote of five (5) in favor and zero (0) opposed, with zero (0) abstaining, to forward the following recommendation to the TEAC Accreditation Committee:

Richard Stockton College should be granted Accreditation (7 Years) for its Teacher Education Program.

2. Weaknesses.

None

3. Stipulations.

None

4. Justification for the accreditation status recommendation. In reaching this conclusion and recommendation, the Accreditation Panel evaluated the *Inquiry Brief* and Audit Report and assessed whether the evidence presented in the *Brief* satisfied TEAC's requirements for accreditation as outlined in TEAC's *Guide to Accreditation*.

The panel found that the program's faculty members are deeply involved in an on-going culture of assessment and program improvement. The types of data used by the program to monitor program effectiveness, both for student learning and for faculty learning, were impressive. In addition, essentially all of the concerns raised by the panelists were topics that the faculty was already investigating; many were listed in the program's future plans in the *Inquiry Brief*. The panel was particularly impressed that the faculty had chosen to limit use of the Danielson rubric only to its supervisors, a seemingly counterintuitive decision. The faculty representatives explained that the supervisors had completed the extensive training needed to understand and use the rubric in the manner in which it was constructed, but the cooperating teachers had not. The decision demonstrated both the faculty understanding of the sophistication of the rubric as well as the importance of proper training in its use. The faculty representatives highlighted their plans for extending the training to cooperating teachers in the coming years, at which point they planned to correlate ratings on the rubric between supervisors and cooperating teachers.

5. Feedback about the program's performance with respect to student achievement.

Section §602.17(f) of the U.S. Department of Education's recognition of accreditors regulations requires that each accreditor recognized by the Secretary of Education, as TEAC is, provide the program with a detailed written report that assesses—

- (1) *The institution's or program's compliance with the agency's standards, including areas needing improvement; and*
- (2) *The institution's or program's performance with respect to student achievement.*

TEAC complies with the first requirement through the citation of weaknesses and stipulations below as well as its recommendation for an accreditation status.

TEAC complies with the second requirement with the TEAC Case Analysis, previously sent to the program, that gave a detailed account of the evidence in the *Brief* and audit report that was consistent and inconsistent with the program claims of student achievement in the areas of subject matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and caring teaching skill and the embedded themes of learning to learn, multicultural understanding and technology, as well as any alternate accounts of the evidence.

TEAC also conducts an independent survey of the students, faculty and cooperating teachers with regard to their assessment of the adequacy of the program students' understanding of the topics above. The results of these surveys were provided to the program in the TEAC Audit Report.