

 **Task 27:** Would you sample more students for any of the three outcomes above in your efforts to verify your policy of a C in ED4030? If so, how many more would you investigate in each program?

Outcome 1 _____
 Outcome 2 _____
 Outcome 3 _____

  **Task 28: Addressing your audit findings.** Team up with three other workshop participants and imagine that you are members of a group that has just completed an internal academic audit. How would you deal with the following findings?

a. What if you found, as this faculty did, that many of the program’s students saw only adjunct or part-time faculty instructors?

Table 28a
Overview of individual audits for the curriculum and instruction program

Student	Major	Hours Major	Hours educ	GPA	FT faculty	Adjunct Faculty
1.CHD1	Science	32	39	2.99	66%	33%
2.CHD2	NA	39	39	4.00	0	100%
3.AES1	Social Stud	48	30	3.81	0	100%
4.AES2	Social Stud	18	24	3.80	0	100%
5.AES3	Social Stud	48	30	2.67	0	100%
6.AES4	Social Stud	18	24	3.59	0	100%
7.ECL1	Social Sc	32	36	3.61	66%	33%
8.ECL2	NA	39	39	3.95	66%	33%
9.AEE1	English	18	24	3.67	66%	33%
10.AEE2	English	18	24	3.60	0	100%
11.AER1	Earth Sc	46-49	30	3.83	100%	0
12.AER2	Earth Sc	18	24	3.60	0	100%

b. What if you found, as did the faculty in the program represented in the table below, that there were significant differences in the ways faculty and cooperating teachers evaluated the students in the program?

Table 28b
Mean GPAs, MoStep I, overall teacher and faculty ratings for students
in elementary and secondary teacher education program [sample N=15]




<i>Measure</i>	<i>Elementary N=10</i>	<i>Secondary N=5</i>	<i>P values</i>
GPA	3.47	3.54	.77
A&S GPA	3.71	3.70	.37
ED GPA	3.71	3.70	.37
MoStep I	3.80	3.80	1.00
Cooperating	38.60	33.00	.004
Supervisor	36.30	37.40	.60

c. What if you found that the correlations between the clinical part of the program and the rest of the program indicators were like those in the table below (actual data)?

Table 28c
Correlations among the clinical measures and grades and SAT scores

N=170	GPA spring	GPA 3 sem	GPA final	Math 251	SAT Sum	SATv	SATm	Clinical
PGI (hs+)	.62*	.63*	.62*	.36*	.67*	.60*	.54*	.02
GPA spring		.96*	.84*	.53*	.48*	.45*	.36*	.16
GPA 3 sem			.89*	.54*	.47*	.36*	.45*	.16
GPA final				.57*	.41*	.57*	.37*	.26*
Math 251					.37*	.19*	.43*	.14
SAT sum						.83*	.87*	-.07
SATv							.45*	-.06
SATm								-.06

* significant at the .01 level or lower

   **Task 29: Following up on the findings.** With the key question of the internal academic audit in mind (*Did the mechanism make things better, improve quality?*), consider the case below. What line of investigation would you recommend to the faculty in this program so that, over the next few years, they could establish and document connections between their findings and their program's quality?

CASE: The faculty members in a teacher education program were concerned that their admission standards, while functioning as designed, were not yielding the outcomes they should.



In their internal audit they had examined the relationship between GRE scores and program grade point averages and found the correlation was too low to justify the continued use of the GRE as a predictive measure of success in the program. They then undertook an examination of a sample of students who had completed the program and who had the various undergraduate indices reported in the table below.

How should they use the undergraduate index, if at all, in their admission procedure?



Table 29
Number of master's students above and below at graduate GPA of 3.5
as a function of various undergraduate grade point indices (2.4, 2.5, 2.75, 3.0)



Undergraduate GPA	Program GPA Below 3.5	Program GPA Above 3.5	Total
Above 3.0	8	74	82
Below 3.0	9	28	37
Above 2.75	11	87	98
Below 2.75	6	15	21
Above 2.5	13	96	109
Below 2.5	4	6	10
Above 2.4	14	99	113
Below 2.4	3	3	6
Totals	17	102	119

Claims

  **Task 30:** Study the claims below. Are they appropriate to the TEAC framework?

Claim	Acceptable	Perhaps acceptable	Not acceptable
1. Our graduates know their subject matter.			
2. Our graduates score above the state average on the Praxis II test.			
3. Our graduates have a deep understanding of the Christian philosophy that forms the basis of this religious school.			
4. Our graduates almost always know the answers to any question about content asked by their pupils.			
5. Upon graduation, our students will have a deep and abiding understanding of the subject matter they are prepared to teach.			
6. Because our graduates all major in the subject matters they intend to teach, they are well prepared as teachers in subject matter knowledge.			
7. We recommend for certification only those persons among our program completers who score above the state cut-score on the state subject matter tests.			
8. Based on ratings provided by university supervisors and by cooperating teachers, our graduates know their subject matter.			
9. Our graduates are familiar with ways of using technology to locate information about subject matter pertinent to planning and implementing lessons.			

  **Task 31:** Discuss with your colleagues how you might organize your claims in the *Brief*. Will you use state or national frameworks, or develop your own set of statements? If you use “borrowed claims” or standards from another source (like INTASC) be sure you understand the standard (e.g., what are the essential concepts and tools of a discipline?) Use this space for notes.

  **Task 32:** With your colleagues, use the pages below to draft a set of claims, aligning them with each of the three components of TEAC's *Quality Principle I*: student learning in the areas of subject matter, pedagogical knowledge, and caring and effective teaching skills for teacher preparation, and student learning in the areas of professional knowledge, strategic decision-making, and caring leadership skills for educational leadership.

If you are using state or national standards, map those standards against the three components of *Quality Principle I*.

1.1 Subject matter knowledge (or Professional knowledge)

1.2 Pedagogical knowledge (or Strategic decision-making)

1.3 Caring and effective teaching skills (or Caring and effective leadership skills)