



Teacher Education Accreditation Council

TEAC Case Analysis for The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey Teacher Education Program *Inquiry Brief*

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

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

Audit Opinion

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

Summary of claims and evidence

Program claims:

Claim #1: Our novice teachers demonstrate competence in the subject matter they will teach.

Claim #2: Our novice teachers understand and apply appropriate pedagogy.

Claim #3: Our novice teachers demonstrate caring teaching practices in diverse settings.

Evidence in support of the claims:

Claim #1:

Admission Scores (PPST, ACT and/or SAT); Content field and specialization course completion; Praxis II Scores; Stockton Entrance GPA; Stockton Exit GPA; Cumulative GPA (all institutions); STCRF (Student Teaching Competency Rating Form) & STEF (Student Teacher Evaluation Form ESTEDU (Exit Survey for TEDU); Alumni Surveys

Claim #2

Education/ Pedagogy Course Grades; ESTEDU; Alumni Surveys; Student Teaching Artifacts (STCRF, STFOF-Student teaching formal observation form ,STEF- Mid & Final forms)

Claim #3

Education Experiential Course Grades; Teaching Placements and Performance in Diverse Field Experiences; Alumni Survey; ESTEDU; Student Teaching Artifacts (STFOF, STCRF, Mid & Final STEF)

Quality Principle I: Evidence of student learning

Component 1.1: Subject matter knowledge

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with subject matter knowledge

- GPAs at entrance: Stockton content in all program areas exceeded the 2.75 minimum set by the program. GPAs ranged from 2.83 – 3.67.
- GPAs from all schools: with the exception of a Spanish candidate who entered the program when the GPA requirement was 2.5, all program area GPA means range from 2.68 – 3.91.
- GPAs at exit: 2.92 – 3.93 means all above 2.75 threshold.
- Praxis II cut score means range from 146 – 177.71 (cut score 141) in all program areas.
- ACT, PPST and SAT mean scores all above the program threshold (ACT 21, SAT 1100, PPST 171/171/171 pre 2010 and 175/174/173 post 2010).
- Student Teaching Ratings: the program rates candidates' student teaching experience using Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching as aligned to the New Jersey Standards for Teaching. Candidates earned a mean rating of 2 (out of 3), a novice level of performance (referred to as "basic" in Danielson rubric) by the final evaluation for both years reviewed. Variations in the final STEF ratings are moderate ranging from 0.45 to 0.56. For the older STCRF, program completers also rated high with all earning a mean above 3 (out of 4) by the final STCRF.
- Alumni and Exit Surveys: mean scores and frequencies indicate graduates are prepared to teach their subject matter.
- [Audit Task A11](#) indicates that TEAC survey results corroborate the program's assessment results.

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

None.

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

No rival explanations.

Component 1.2: Pedagogical knowledge

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with pedagogical knowledge

- Student teaching ratings: See description under Claim 1 above.
- Alumni and Exit Surveys: mean scores and frequencies indicate graduates are prepared in pedagogy.
- Pedagogy course grades: mean grades and standard deviations meet or exceed the Program standard of B- or better for all courses in the Professional Education Sequence.
- Student Teaching Artifacts: lesson plans for formal observations were submitted via the Taskstream submission system. Faculty found that the number of required formal observations were met 100% of the time by the cooperating teachers and college supervisors. The program utilizes rubrics and the mentoring process to assess the quality of the artifacts.
- [Audit Task A12](#) indicates that TEAC survey results corroborate the program's assessment results.

Evidence available to the panel that is not consistent with pedagogical knowledge

None

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

No rival explanations.

Component 1.3: Caring teaching skills

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

- Student teaching ratings: See description under Claim 1 above.
- Alumni and Exit Surveys: mean scores and frequencies indicate graduates are prepared to be caring and committed professionals.
- Experiential Education Courses: The majority of grades fall in the A range. Faculty noted the upward in the mean grade earned as students move through coursework. TEDU faculty intent is to build students' abilities from semester to semester, so the incremental change is encouraging and supports the structure of the fieldwork experiences leading to student teaching. In all but one case (Spanish), the strongest mean grade earned is during the final, student teaching experience. Faculty see this as an indication that holding students to high standards of performance leading up to this semester has a cumulative impact on their student teaching experience. Faculty recognize that the data presented in Claim 2 related to unsuccessful attempters (see [Table 4.11](#)), including those who perform below Program standard (C+ or lower) and any withdraws, may also contribute to the strong mean GPAs remaining for those who succeed in educational experiential courses as a whole.

- Diverse Field Experiences: assessed through a series of structured assignments, housed in a journal. Assignments are designed to connect what is learned in the college classroom with the K-12 field experience. As verified by the audit, [Table 4.20](#) in the Brief shows that all students performed significantly higher than the 2.7.
- [Audit Task A13](#) indicates that TEAC survey results corroborate the program's assessment results.

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with caring teaching skills
None

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence is consistent with caring teaching skills
No rival explanations.

1.4 Crosscutting themes for Quality Principle I

Evidence available to the panel for the crosscutting themes

- Student teaching ratings: See description under Claim 1 above.
- Alumni and Exit Surveys: mean scores and frequencies indicate graduates are prepared to be caring and committed professionals.
- Experiential Education Courses: EDUC 4990 *Student Teaching* allows candidates, over the 15 week student teaching experience, to fully implement what they have learned by demonstrating a basic level of proficiency as a novice teacher. As noted in Claim 3 above, the coursework includes reflection on observed instruction and candidates' own teaching.
- Diverse Field Experiences: noted in Claim 3 above. Every candidate is required to have a field placement in a diverse school as identified by the New Jersey Department of Education. See [Audit Task A7](#).
- Pedagogy course grades: mean grades and standard deviations meet or exceed the Program standard of B- or better for all courses in the Professional Education Sequence.
- [Audit Task A14](#) indicates that TEAC survey results corroborate the program's assessment results.

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the acquisition of the cross-cutting themes
None

Component 1.5: Evidence of valid assessment

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

- [Audit Task A6](#), [Audit Task A8](#), and [Audit Task A15](#) indicate that assessments are aligned with frameworks, that the raters understand the assessments, and that results are internally consistent.

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

None

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

No rival explanations.

Quality Principle III: Institutional learning

Component 2.1: A rationale for the assessments

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the rationale for the program's assessments

- The faculty present a rationale for their assessments on [pages 5-12](#) of the *Inquiry Brief*.
- [Audit Task B1](#), [Audit Task B7](#), and [Audit Task B7](#) indicate that assessments were structured as reported.

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

None

Rival explanations for the evidence about the program's decisions based on evidence

No rival explanations.

Component 2.2: Program decisions based on evidence

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the program's decisions based on evidence

- The faculty indicate on [pages 65-71](#) of the *Inquiry Brief* ways in which they have related evidence to plans and recommendations, data concerns, programmatic changes, and system changes.
- [Audit Task B5](#), [Audit Task B7](#), [Audit Task B8](#), and [Audit Task B9](#) indicate that the faculty use data to modify the program.

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the program's decisions based on evidence

None

Rival explanations for the evidence about the program's decisions based on evidence

No rival explanations.

Component 2.3: An influential quality control system

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

- [Appendix A](#) on pages 77-104 of the *Inquiry Brief* indicates that the faculty found that the quality control system was working as designed.
- [Audit Task B2](#), [Audit Task B3](#), [Audit Task B4](#), and [Audit Task B6](#) indicate a strong and effective quality control system.

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

None

Rival explanations for the evidence about an influential quality control system

No rival explanations.

Element 3.0: Capacity for Program Quality

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the capacity for program quality

See *Brief*, [Appendix B](#), [Table C.1](#), [Table C.2](#), and [Table C.3](#) in the audit report.

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with capacity for program quality

None

Suggested Recommendations

Suggested Weaknesses and Stipulations

None

Suggested Accreditation Recommendation (shaded)

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