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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 Eleanor Abrams, Elizabeth Arcieri, Cindy Glidden, Kathryn McCurdy, Michael Middleton, Sharon Oja, Joseph Onosko, Lauren Provost, Thomas Schram, and Judy Sharkey, and it was approved by the Teacher Education faculty on July 18, 2013.

Introduction:
The University of New Hampshire was founded in 1866 as one of the nation’s first land-grant institutions and has since become a land, sea, and space grant institution. As the State of New Hampshire’s flagship institution of higher education, UNH offers a broad array of academic programs at its main campus in Durham, at its partner campuses in Concord and Manchester, and throughout other parts of the state, including hybrid and online coursework. Over 1000 full-time and part-time faculty conduct research and offer degree programs of instruction leading to the bachelors, masters, doctoral, and certificate levels to more than 15,000 enrolled students annually on the undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, and graduate levels. UNH is non-denominational, focusing on enhancing the state’s economic, cultural, environmental, and social well-being.

The UNH Teacher Education program is housed in the College of Liberal Arts, where faculty from the disciplines partner with Teacher Education faculty to prepare students for certification. In 1973, UNH became the first public institution in the nation to offer a five-year undergraduate/post-baccalaureate teacher education curriculum in which undergraduates major in a discipline for the bachelor’s degree and then complete a mandatory full-year of student teaching at the graduate level for the master’s degree and teaching certification. A Post-baccalaureate-only option was added later, based essentially on the same curricular requirements. The faculty’s goal is “to produce competent, caring, and qualified educators who are not only excellent practitioners but also teachers who will work toward improving education in and beyond their own classrooms” (p. 3), and they believe that their approach with the five-year program underscores their commitment to selecting and supporting high-quality candidates for the program and for the teaching profession.

Currently, the UNH Teacher Education Program (officially called “The Five-Year and Post-baccalaureate Teacher Education Program”) includes 19 full-time faculty and 44 part-time faculty. Approximately 140 students complete initial teaching certification requirements annually in one or more of 21 certificate categories recognized by the State of New Hampshire. The program graduated 136 students in 2011-2012 and enrolled 165 students in 2013-1014 in the following options:

Table 1
### University of New Hampshire Teacher Education Program Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Name</th>
<th>Number of completers in previous academic year 2011-2012</th>
<th>Number of students enrolled in current academic year 2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>(97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education, K-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Science (Middle School Science)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Science (formerly Biology)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math (Secondary)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math (Middle School)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education, K-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education, K-12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater &amp; Dance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program claims:
Based on the faculty’s commitment to the five core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS, 2002), and based on their deliberations culminating in faculty approval in 2008, the faculty makes seven claims regarding their program completers. They claim to prepare caring, competent, and qualified teachers who:

1. are knowledgeable in the subjects they teach
2. are committed to knowing their students and cultivating a community of learners
3. know how to teach subject matter to students
4. effectively monitor student learning
5. are thoughtful and reflective practitioners who learn from experience
6. understand the nature of school reform and their roles as agents of change
Evidence supporting the claims
To investigate their claims, the faculty uses 8 types of evidence:

1. Grades in the Major (Claim 1)
   A GPA of 3.0 in the major is required for admission to the Teacher Education Program. In its self-study, the faculty proposed to demonstrate that the mean of candidates’ GPAs in each major is comparable to the mean GPA of other UNH students in the same major. The validity of the major GPA is supported by a study by Andrew, et al. (1996) that indicates that grades are a moderately good predictor of intern success (\(p = 0.41\)). For the secondary candidates, the faculty computed mean GPAs for all teacher education students in 2010-2011 and every third non-teacher education UNH major in the same subject. The mean GPAs of teacher education candidates in subject areas met or exceeded the 3.0 standard in all cases, and the mean GPAs in the major were higher for education candidates than for the university in biology, English, and mathematics. Assuming equal variance of populations, the majors in education were significantly better at the p<.10 level in history and Spanish, but not significantly higher for the other majors sampled. For the elementary candidates, the faculty computed mean GPAs in Psychology and Family Studies (the two primary majors for elementary education students). In both cases, the TE candidates’ mean GPAs were slightly higher (but not significantly higher) than the mean GPAs of the non-teacher education UNH students in the two majors.

2. Comparison of GPA with GRE scores (Claim 1)
   Admission into the teacher education program requires candidates’ scores to be at or above the top middle 50% (scale prior to Fall 2011- V=410-510, Q= 450-610 and Writing =4.0-5.0). In its self-study, the faculty proposed to demonstrate that students’ GRE scores correlate with their mean GPAs in the major, hypothesizing that different mean GRE scores would expectably vary among the different majors (e.g., math and science majors higher in GRE Quantitative, English majors higher in GRE Verbal and Writing, etc.). The faculty sampled all program completers in 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 in elementary (n = 177); Art (n = 12); biology (n= 7); English (n = 54); foreign language (n = 9); mathematics (n = 19); physical education (n = 23); and social studies (n=50). Results of the investigation were as expected: English majors scored higher on GRE Verbal than Math or Physical Education (p <0.001); Math and Biology majors scored higher on GRE Math than English (p<0.001); and English, Foreign Language(s), and Social Studies majors scored higher on GRE Writing than Biology or Physical Education majors (p<0.05).

3. Comparison of Praxis II Scores to State qualifying scores and ETS average score range (Claims 1, 4)
   In the self-study, the faculty proposed to demonstrate that UNH students’ mean Praxis II scores meet or exceed the New Hampshire state qualifying score, and that their program completers’ mean scores are within or above the range of the ETS
average score range for the various Praxis II examinations. To establish validity of the measure, the faculty states that the Praxis II is a “nationally accepted assessment” of candidates’ subject-matter knowledge in the certificate areas (p. 15). They sampled all program completers in biology, elementary education, English, mathematics and social studies in years 2008-2012. Pass rates among sampled students varied from 80.00% (low) to 97.18% (high) among the different sets of test-takers, and the program completers’ mean scores were near the high end of the ETS range for every cohort sampled.

4. **Portfolio Evidence of the 7 Goals (Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
   In its self-study, the faculty investigated the number of artifacts included as evidence in each student teacher’s electronic portfolio at the close of the 2-semester internship in the 2010-2011 academic year. The faculty set a minimum of 3 artifacts per claim (i.e., per program goal) as acceptable. While the number of artifacts varied between 2 and 20 for each Claim, the mean of the number of artifacts for Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 ranged between 5.5 and 6.2, and the median for each was 5. The mean for Claim 6 (“understand the nature of school reform and their roles as agents of change”) was 4.2 and the median was 4. The median for Claim 7 (“active members of learning and professional communities”) was 5.9 and the median was 6. (Note: 2010-2011 was the first year in which student teachers were to develop an electronic portfolio at UNH. The faculty also stated that it was developing a future rubric to evaluate the quality of the artifacts, rather than merely to count them.)

5 & 6. **End of Internship Program Evaluation Survey for Interns and Cooperating Teachers (Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
   In its self-study, the faculty proposed to demonstrate that at least 75% of the ratings on an “End-of-Internship Program Evaluation” survey were either “very good” or “excellent” for each of the items on a survey covering all seven claims (i.e., program goals). The faculty developed the current version of the survey in 2008 by re-revising the survey that it had been using for decades, establishing a scale of 1 to 6 (1 = not enough experience to form opinion; 2 = poor; 3 = acceptable; 4 = good; 5 = very good; 6 = excellent). The faculty claimed that the survey had face validity due to its voluntary use and continual revision by experts. They compiled data from all surveys from 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 for both of the years’ student interns (average n=77) and cooperating teachers (average n=68). The number of ratings for “very good” and for “excellent” were combined for each item and reported as frequencies of the total number of responses to the item. Overall, cooperating teacher ratings were positively correlated with student intern ratings on the 31 items (r=0.90; p<0.001), and the percentage of interns rating each item 5-6 ranged from 60.55% to 98.37% and the percentage of cooperating teachers rating each item 5-6 ranged from 46.66% to 96.66%. For all seven program claims, at least 75% of the student interns and the cooperating teachers rated the program completers as “very good” or “excellent” on the survey.

7 & 8. **Five-Year Study of Principal Ratings and Graduates’ Self-Assessment (Two related measures for Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
UNH has undertaken studies of principal ratings and graduates’ self-assessments every five years since the mid-1980s. The study asks two matched sets of respondents (alumni who are teaching and their principals) to rate their perceptions of program completers’ teaching effectiveness on two aligned surveys covering three broad dimensions: instruction, interpersonal/professional, and leadership qualities. The two surveys were aligned in accordance with the 7 claims and 31 sub claims. The validity of the surveys has been established through correlational studies ($r>0.9$) throughout the 25-year existence of the studies. In 2010, follow-up interview protocols were refined to further investigate the survey results and look more deeply into the graduates’ and principals’ perceptions of the teaching effectiveness of UNH alumni. For the current iteration of the surveys, the faculty surveyed graduates from 2005 - 2010. Of 231 graduates who were located and participated in the survey, slightly less than 50% gave permission to survey their principals, resulting in a total of 33 alumni-principal matches. These were sampled both to provide a range of years taught (1-5 years) as well as a mix of grade levels taught (K-4, 5-8, and 9-12), resulting in a total of 17 pairs to be interviewed. To align with the “End-of-Program Survey” (above), the faculty proposed to demonstrate that 75% of the survey responses to the Five-Year Study of Principal Ratings and Graduates’ Self Assessment were either “very good” or “excellent.” Results of the 2010 study indicate that at least 75% of survey respondents (program completers and principals) rated UNH alumni as “very good” or “excellent” in all seven claims (i.e., program goals). The percentages for Claim 3 (“know how to teach subject matter to students” - 92%) and Claim 5 (“are thoughtful and reflective practitioners who learn from experience” - 85%) are particularly high. The 2010 study also revealed that 88% of the alumni feel more prepared in terms of overall program effectiveness than their peers from other programs and that 74% of the principals rated UNH teachers in the top 20% in comparison to their peers, as caring, qualified and competent professionals.

Internal audit:
The faculty of the UNH Teacher Education Program assembled an internal audit committee of four members. The Internal Audit Committee worked through Summer/Fall 2012 to review and revise the model used for the 2007 internal audit, again focusing on three program elements (student quality, faculty quality, and program quality). The revised plan was approved by the full faculty in October 2012. The committee conducted the audit according to its approved audit maps, rubrics, and audit mechanisms (each associated with a data source) throughout the Fall 2012 semester and presented its finalized report to the Teacher Education Committee in January 2013.

The committee created a stratified random sample of 20 students to initiate the internal audit, working to assure appropriate representation in the sample of various program options, levels of study, and campus locations. The sample was selected to approximate the following percentages:

- Elementary 40%; Secondary 40%; K-12 20%
- Durham campus 90%; Manchester campus 10%
The committee checked each student’s records for data regarding “student quality” and then randomly selecting courses in each student’s record to capture data regarding faculty quality and program quality. To cover the elements for student quality, the committee probed 18 targets regarding “Admission,” 31 targets on “Student Advising and Support,” and 17 targets on “Assessment.” To cover the elements for faculty quality, the committee probed 15 targets on “Hiring of Tenure-track Faculty,” 13 targets on “Promotion and Tenure Process,” 4 targets on “Tenured Faculty Review,” 9 targets for “Hiring and Promotion of Full-time Lecturers,” 5 targets on “Hiring and Reviews of Adjuncts,” 10 targets on “Professional Development,” 4 targets on “Student Evaluations,” 4 targets on “Course Assignments and Load,” and 4 targets on “Faculty Qualifications.” To cover the elements for program quality, the committee probed 9 targets on “Program vision and development,” 6 targets on “New Course Approval,” 10 targets on “Existing Course Review,” 4 targets on “Program Review,” 14 targets on “Facilities and Equipment,” and 9 targets on “Fiscal & Administration.”

Overall, the committee report found the quality control system to be working as designed. That said, the committee also recommended a total of 6 action items to improve “Student Quality,” 6 action items to improve “Faculty Quality,” 5 action items to improve “Program Quality,” and 3 action items to improve the quality of the Internal Audit itself. None of these recommendations undermine the faculty’s overall conclusion that the Quality Control System is functioning well; instead, the recommendations underscore how well the system is working to identify areas for improvement.

**Plans for program improvement**

- Based on the results of the Internal Audit, the faculty highlighted recommendations for:
  a. Improvements in the efficient and comprehensive storage and management of student and faculty files (on both the UNH and UNHM campuses)
  b. Continued support for increased (or restored) faculty positions
  c. Increased recruitment of students of color
  d. Improved review of adjunct faculty hiring and evaluation
  e. Improvements in technology

- Based on the results of the self-study of student learning reported in the Inquiry Brief, the faculty also stated recommendations for:
  a. Continued research and refinement of the Five-Year Study of Principals and Graduate Self-Assessment (While already validated, the Graduate Self-Assessment needs factor analysis, and the survey forms need to be aligned more fully with the most recent NBPTS, InTASC, and TEAC/CAEP standards.)
  b. Institution of annual or bi-annual Internal Audits (rather than once every 7 years)
  c. Ongoing examination of the 2013 departmental restructuring, which places the Teacher Education Program in a more viable position within the University
structure.

**Statement regarding commitment and capacity:**
The faculty concluded that the University of New Hampshire is committed to the Five-Year and Post-Baccalaureate Teacher Education Program and that there is sufficient capacity to offer a quality program.

---

Five-year and post-baccalaureate program options include: elementary and secondary education. Subject matter specialties include education, career and technical, chemistry, dance, earth/space science, elementary education, English language arts, English for speakers of other languages, French, German, Latin, life sciences (formerly biology), math (5-8), math (7-12), middle school science, music, physical education, physical education/health, physics, Russian, social studies, Spanish, and theater. The state of New Hampshire, at its discretion, offers teaching licenses to program completers in these the option areas.