

Summary of the Case (from the Inquiry Brief Proposal)
Georgian Court University
Administration and Leadership Program¹
Audit Dates: September 15-17, 2008

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 Proposal*:

The *Inquiry Brief Proposal* was written by Jacqueline Kress, Robert Andrews, MaryLee Batesko, Joseph Cino, Jack Conklin, Christine Davis, Len Kelpsh, and Amuhelang Magaya, and was unanimously approved by the School of Education faculty at a special meeting of the faculty on May 8, 2008.

Introduction:

Georgian Court University, located in Lakewood, NJ near the Jersey shore, was founded by the Sisters of Mercy of New Jersey as a Roman Catholic women's liberal arts college, originally called Mount St. Mary's until the college moved in 1924 to the George Jay Gould property in Lakewood and took the name of the estate. Today Georgian Court serves 3000 students, including nearly 2000 undergraduates, and offers coeducational programs while maintaining a special focus on women.

The mission of the School of Education references the Mercy core values of justice, respect, compassion, integrity, and service, and emphasizes inclusive education as evidenced by the focus on inclusion throughout the Master of Arts in Administration and Leadership Program (ALP) curriculum. The SOE, which became a separate unit of the university in 2000, has seen a number of organizational and personnel changes in recent years. The SOE administration has been structured in a number of ways in its short history. At the time the *Inquiry Brief Proposal* was written, the SOE administration consisted of a dean and two chairs. It currently has a dean and one chair. The current dean is the third in three years, and two of the four administration faculty members have been hired since 2004.

During the academic year of 2007-08, the program served 153 ALP students, including 67 in six off-campus locations and 2 students taking the program online.

Program claims:

With reference to TEAC Component 1.1 (**professional knowledge**), the faculty claim that program completers acquire content knowledge (Claim 1).

With reference to TEAC Component 1.2 (**strategic decision-making**) and the TEAC cross-cutting themes of **learning how to learn** and **technology**, the

faculty claim that program completers create effective learning environments (Claim 3), and become professionals who facilitate a shared vision of learning (Claim 4).

With reference to TEAC Component 1.3 (**caring leadership skills**) and the TEAC cross-cutting theme of **multicultural perspectives and accuracy**, the faculty claim that program completers focus on learners (Claim 2).

Evidence supporting the claims:

- **Praxis II (Claim 1)**
Praxis II is the Educational Testing Service content-area examination for school leaders. Over the past three years, 208 Georgian Court program completers have taken Praxis II with a 100% pass rate.
- **Course Grades (Claims 2, 3, 4)**
Students must take courses whose goals align with each claim. Average course grades for the sample of 59 students ranged from 3.77 to 4.00.
- **Internship Ratings (Claims 1, 2, 3, 4)**
The faculty looked at ratings by cooperating professionals of students in 2005-06 at end of the year-long internship experience, and ratings by internship advisors using a pilot instrument of students in spring 2008 at the end of their internship experience. The cooperating professional final assessments rated 50% to 69% of students as exemplary (on a scale of “unable to judge,” “evident in activity experiences,” and “exemplary”) across the items for each claim, and internship advisor end of term assessments rated 68% to 78% of students as exemplary or highly proficient (on a scale of “emerging,” “proficient,” “highly proficient,” and “exemplary”) across the items for each claim.
- **Ratings of Course-Embedded Artifacts (Claims 1, 2, 3, 4)**
The faculty have identified between three and six course artifacts that align with each claim. Average ratings of these artifacts by course instructors, using a common rubric, exceeded 3.5 on a scale in which 3 signifies highly proficient and 4 signifies exemplary.
- **Post-program survey (Claims 2, 3, 4)**
The faculty plan to survey recent completers about their preparation for school leadership, with three to seven survey items associated with each of the three associated claims. This survey has been implemented since the writing of the IBP.

Internal audit:

Four faculty members tested the quality control system, using a 33% random sample of 28 2006-07 program completers, and 3 representative courses relative to the experiences of 15 of the 28 sampled students, looking at requirements at three gateways:

- 4.1 Curriculum:** One full-time faculty member had course syllabi on file, accounting for 3 of the 27 sampled courses, so the faculty plans to communicate the syllabus policy more clearly in the future. Curricular requirements at each gateway could be verified for the sampled students, either through the use of progress sheets, which the audit found was inconsistent, or through transcript analysis.
- 4.2 Faculty:** All sampled faculty were certified administrators and 80% held doctorates. In a sample of 40 courses offered, roughly 65% were taught by full-time faculty.
- 4.3 Facilities:** The audit found that 62% of ALP classes were assigned to original estate buildings, which offer limited instructional equipment relative to other GCU classrooms.
- 4.4 Fiscal & Administrative Capacity:** Development and travel funds are available to both full-time and adjunct faculty, as evidenced by the inclusion of adjunct faculty in recent TaskStream training.
- 4.5 Student Support Services:** Campus-wide services are available to Lakewood students, and advising is available to program students in off-campus sites.
- 4.6 Recruiting and admissions practices, academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading and advertising:** There was evidence for most sampled students for satisfaction of the GPA and teaching certification admission requirements, and letters of recommendation were on file for almost all students but most letters were dated after admission had been granted. There were no records kept regarding interview or essay requirements. The faculty have discussed ways of documenting this information.
- 4.7 Student Feedback:** GCU faculty are required to submit evaluations for some, but not all, courses. The internal audit found evaluations for 9 of 27 sampled sections.

Plan for program improvement:

The faculty identified areas for program improvement, and plan to do the following:

- Maintain candidate records on file in the School of Education.
- Discuss ways in which course grades can provide more, and more consistent, information.
- Revise performance tasks and assessment instruments to be more representative of the professional knowledge or skill of interest.
- Analyze Praxis II subtest scores to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses.
- Revise internship assessments and guidelines to ensure that candidates participate in and are rated on all standards-related activities.
- Determine relationship between TaskStream archives and internship report evidence.

- Develop ways to address candidate dispositions.
- Update and clarify public information about the program.
- Conduct orientation and training sessions for all faculty on the use of assessment instruments.
- Consider establishing an advisor council to aid in program improvement and monitoring.
- Review admissions criteria to determine which elements add value.
- Enhance record-keeping at gateways to ensure consistent application of standards.

Evidence of commitment:

4.1 Curriculum: The total number of credit hours required for a degree meets or exceeds those for GCU degrees in general.

4.2 Faculty: The SOE has a more even gender balance and a similar ethnic balance to the GCU faculty as a whole. A greater percentage of SOE faculty hold doctorates, although fewer are tenured due in part to the high number of recent hires.

4.3 Facilities: The SOE space is non-contiguous and isolated from the rest of the GCU campus, and SOE buildings are old and unlikely to be renovated. University administration is aware of these issues and will develop strategies to address them.

4.4 Fiscal & Administrative Capacity: The SOE operating budget is on par with those of other units relative to student credit hour contribution, but a large portion of the budgeted funds are used for the special expenses of the education programs including cooperating teacher stipends and supervisor travel reimbursements limiting resources for general operations of the programs.

4.5 Student Support Services: SOE are eligible for all GCU student services, although evening students have limited access.

4.6 Recruiting and admissions practices, academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading and advertising: SOE students are subject to the same admission and grading policies and academic schedule as all GCU students, and the SOE is represented in and supported by university publications such as the academic catalog and the website.

4.7 Student Feedback: The Academic Standards Committee report indicates no significant problems among SOE students.

The faculty concluded that Georgian Court University is committed to the Administration and Leadership Program.

¹ **The program includes options in the following areas and New Jersey, following to its own policies and regulations, may grant teaching licenses in these areas to the program's graduates:**

Master of Arts in Administration and Leadership

Summary of the Case: Georgian Court University

©TEAC ♦ One Dupont Circle ♦ Suite 320 ♦ Washington, DC ♦ 20036 ♦ 202/466-7236 ♦
www.teac.org