

**Summary of the Case (from the Inquiry Brief)  
Long Island University - Brooklyn Campus  
Teacher Education Program<sup>1</sup>  
Audit Dates: September 12-15, 2004**

*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 Cecelia Trough, Ofelia Garcia, and Susan Zinar. The TAL faculty approved the *Brief* at a department meeting on December 4, 2003.

**Introduction:**

Long Island University is a multi-campus, highly diverse, private doctoral level university with total enrollment of 30,000 (the nation's 8th largest private university). The School of Education (SOE) at the Brooklyn campus of the university is distinguished by its focus on, and commitment to, a complex urban environment in downtown Brooklyn, with 80% of the enrollment being students of color. About 82% of the students are women, most are married and/or have children. As working class students, many also hold jobs. The undergraduate students in the program work as paraprofessionals in NYC schools, in offices, and stores. About 85% of the graduate students in the program are NYC teachers, mostly uncertified. The SOE enrolls approximately 1700 students, and of these about 600 are enrolled in the TAL program, which has 19 full-time faculty and 45 adjunct faculty members.

The TAL program has three formats (undergraduate, graduate, and a dual degree) which lead to licenses in approximately 19 areas serving students at the elementary and secondary levels and/or in special education. The TAL program is unified in mission, pedagogy, inquiry methods, grounding in field practice, and in its absorbing commitment to urban education. Every feature of the program reinforces the development of what the faculty call a *third-space* or a safe *borderland* between *all* the cultures participating in the program. The program welcomes and accepts the rich diversity of the surrounding community, preserving the differences in it, driving a process of collective inquiry, which engages all parties associated with the program, to a set of values and understandings that will allow the program's graduates to create the very same inquiry and pedagogical processes in the new and reformed urban schools envisioned by the TAL faculty.

**Claims:**

The TAL faculty make 27 claims about their students accomplishments,

organized in the acronym, KEEPS, as the five goals of the program. The claims for their students align with the TEAC *Quality Principle I* components as depicted in Table 1 below. For this reason the case for accreditation is made entirely in regard to the evidence that the graduates have acquired knowledge (K), enquiry skills (E), empathy (E), acceptance and commitment to pluralism (P), and an enduring commitment to social betterment for all members of the community (S).

**Table 1**  
**The Alignment of the Components of Quality Principle I (1.1-1.3) & the Cross-Cutting Themes of Multicultural Learning (ML), Learning to Learn (LL) and Technology (T) with the LIU/Brooklyn’s 27 KEEPS Claims (1.0-5.0)**

| TEAC QP1.0 | 1.0 Knowledge | 2.0 Inquiry | 3.0 Empathy | 4.0 Pluralism | 5.0 Social Commitment |
|------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| QP 1.1     | 1,2,10,11,12  |             |             |               |                       |
| ML         |               |             | 1           | 1             |                       |
| LL         | 3             | 1, 3, 5     |             |               |                       |
| T          | 3             |             |             |               |                       |
| QP 1.2     | 5, 6, 7       | 4           |             |               |                       |
| ML         | 8             |             | 2           | 2, 3          |                       |
| LL         |               | 2           |             |               |                       |
| T          |               |             |             |               |                       |
| QP 1.3     | 4             |             |             |               | 1, 2, 3               |
| ML         | 9             |             | 3, 4        |               |                       |
| LL         |               |             |             |               |                       |
| T          |               |             |             |               |                       |

**Evidence Supporting the Claims:**

In addition to the faculty’s on-going inquiry (as part of its own participation in KEEPS and the program’s reform components), the faculty engaged in six *knowledge-making* processes specifically for their *Inquiry Brief*.

Process 1. Collection/compilation of course notebooks containing descriptions of each course, syllabi, assignments, and samples of evidence for each of the claims the course intends to educate toward.

Process 2. The Longitudinal Study of Graduates (LSG). This is a study of the longitudinal collections of all the work completed by five representative students in the undergraduate Childhood Education option. The students are now completing their first year of teaching and are paired with teams of researchers.

Process 3. Examination of six sources of evidence from the first cadre of undergraduate students [N=10] in their final student-teaching semester. The sources of evidence were rated by faculty by criteria which indicated the presence of confirming evidence for one or more of the 27 KEEPS' claims.

- Videotaped lessons conducted by students in their student-teaching placements (N=6).
- Observation reports by student-teacher supervisors.(N=8)
- Student-teacher evaluations by cooperating teachers (N=8).
- Unit plans implemented by student teachers in their student-teaching placements. (N=4)
- Critical issues papers (N=7).
- Transcripts of focus group discussions (N=11).

Process 4. Examination by three raters of evidence from the two cadres of twenty-five masters students contained (1) in letters graduates wrote in their final inquiry seminar about 12 selected claims, (2) in studies of children's gesture, disposition, sociability, preferences, modes of thinking and learning, (3) in teacher-researcher studies, (4) in materials from the collections of work that the students name in their letters as being particularly important, and (5) observations of students in classrooms when available. Six representative students of the twenty-five were selected for discovery of evidence in their materials for all 27 claims.

Process 5. Examination of evidence from the first two cadres of graduate students in the TESOL format and in thirteen of fourteen TESOL and bilingual education papers was undertaken by three faculty members who achieved a 93% agreement on the presence of 25 of the 27 claims in the first two papers before examining the rest on their own.

Process 6. Examination of the reliability and validity of the traditional indicators used for assessing student performance: standardized test scores (LAST scores and ATS-W scores) and undergraduate and graduate students' grades.

In the end, the case based primarily on five categories of evidence -- student grades, ratings of portfolios, student scores of standardized license tests, case studies, and ratings by cooperating teachers.

**Results:**

The overall GPAs, education GPAs, LAST and ATS-W scores of the 10 students in the first cadre of undergraduates were 3.53/4.00, 3.67/4.00, 237/300, 246/300, respectively, all at a sufficient magnitude to indicate accomplishment. The course grades are also evidence for the KEEPS claims as each course is organized around them.

The balance of the evidence for the 27 claims consists of the proportions of each sample of students whose material record showed, in the collective opinion of the faculty, evidence of each claim. There is considerable variation in the proportions achieving each claim in the samples across all the sources of evidence and the processes, but overall there is at least one category or source of evidence that yields a proportion of 1.00 for students for each of the 27 claims.

The Collective Description Inquiry methodology, as part of the on-going study of the program yielded a number of case histories of student accomplishments. Three of these are presented about student teachers or those in their first teaching positions. Each case deals with how the teacher began to teach in a system that was not hospitable to the BC/LIU vision, but following the lessons learned in the program eventually found ways to hold to the KEEPS vision and pedagogy.

**Discussion and conclusions:**

The faculty concluded that their quality control system, which at heart is the on-going collective descriptive inquiry methodology, functions well, one sign being that did uncover weaknesses in procedure and evidence that are being addressed (as also described in part in the supplement). The faculty concluded that LIU was committed to the TAL program and that they program had the capacity overall to achieve its goals. There were weaknesses uncovered in the integration and support of technology in the program and institution overall.

The faculty concluded that the program met the KEEPS claims “very well”, but that the challenge of finding persuasive evidence of the KEEPS claims remains an on-going project of the TAL faculty. The intellectual challenge for the program, was expressed as an on-going question in the *Brief* as “*are we as educators able to value heterogeneity and at the same time recognize and value children’s and our desires for common interests and experiences*”?

---

<sup>1</sup> The program includes options in the following areas and New York, following to its

---

**own policies and regulations, may grant teaching licenses in these areas to the program's graduates:**

Urban Childhood Education 1-6, Middle Childhood Extension 7-9, Urban Adolescence Education, 7-12 (Biology, Chemistry, English, Math, Social Studies, Spanish), Middle Childhood and Adolescence, 5-12, Bilingual Education Extension, Teacher of Special Subjects (Physical Ed, Art Ed, Dance Ed, Music Ed), Urban Childhood Education, 1-6, Urban Early Childhood/Childhood Education, B-6, Urban Adolescence Education, 7-12 (Biology, Chemistry, English, Math, Social Studies), Teaching Urban Children with Disabilities, 1-6, Teaching Urban Adolescents with Disabilities, 7-12, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, Bilingual Education, Teaching Literacy (B-6), Teaching Literacy (5-12), Teaching Literacy (B-6), (5-12), Extension Middle Childhood 5-7 or 7-9, Advanced Certificate Bilingual Education, Advanced Certificate Early Childhood, B-2, Inclusive Urban Childhood and Special Education, 1-6