Audit Opinion

The Inquiry Brief from Brigham Young University was accurate with 97% of the targets investigated verified and only 20% of the targets overall containing trivial and inconsequential errors. Owing to 97% verified targets, the Brief received a clean audit opinion and was found to be accurate and trustworthy.

The auditors also concluded that the evidence supports the view that Brigham Young University is committed to the Educator Preparation Program.

Summary of claims and evidence

Program claims: The program’s four claims are embedded in framework of the four Moral Dimensions of Teaching [developed from the work of John Goodlad and others] with expectations for how students will demonstrate their mastery of these broad goals.

1. **Enculturation for democracy:** Candidates design instruction and create learning environments to engage students in critical thinking, problem solving, communicating respectfully, and modeling civility.

2. **Access to knowledge:** Candidates know the subject(s) they will teach and design instruction to promote learning for all students.

3. **Nurturing pedagogy:** Candidates know how to design and implement lessons to support the intellectual, social, and personal development of students; how to assess students on their learning and progress; and how teach in a caring manner.

4. **Stewardship for schools:** Candidates collaborate with colleagues, parents, and community representatives to improve teaching and learning.
The program claims align with TEAC’s quality principles and cross-cutting themes, the INTASC standards, and Utah licensure requirements.

Evidence supporting the claims: Evidence that candidates meet the EPP claims comes from five sources.
(1) **Clinical Practice Assessment System (CPAS)** Claims 1, 2, 3, and 4; QP1.1, 1.2, 1.3, Learning How to Learn, Multicultural Perspectives, and Technology
(2) **Teacher Work Samples (TWS)** Claims 2, 3, and 4, QP1.1,1.2, 1.3, Learning How to Learn, Multicultural Perspectives, Technology
(3) **Candidate Disposition Scales (CDS)** Claims 2 and 4, QP1.3, Multicultural Perspectives
(4) **Praxis II licensure tests** Claim 2, QP 1.1
(5) **GPA in the major** Claim 2, QP1.1

Indirect measures of candidate work include completion of program requirements, responses to the BYU Senior Survey, BYU Alumni Survey, and the Employer Survey created by Educational Benchmarks Inc. (EBI). In addition, the Professional and Interpersonal Behavior Scale (PIBS) is required in some classes and alerts faculty to potential problems that may initiate remediation.

Evidence in support of the claims:

**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 (Claim 2: Access to Knowledge)
- **Table 13** (early childhood, elementary education, secondary, and special education) and **Tables 16-22** (content specific secondary) on pages 39-59 of the Inquiry Brief provide evidence (from the Clinical Practice Assessment System, Teacher Work Sample, Candidate Disposition Scale, Praxis, and grades) of students meeting Claim 2, Access to Knowledge.
- GPA in the major met program standards of 2.85 and above (see Audit Task A7).
- While the auditors’ calculations differed from the program’s in terms of the “frequency of percentages of candidates passing Praxis II” (Audit Task A8), most of the students in the various program options passed the Praxis II licensure test. See also Audit Task B13 for an analysis of Praxis II passing scores for students in the special education option.
- Results from the TEAC on-site survey (Audit Task A1) corroborated the program’s claim that candidates had subject matter knowledge; however, TEAC did not receive student email addresses and could not administer an on-line version of the survey and only 59 students (out of a total of 2,553) participated in interview sessions with the auditors and completed the paper surveys.

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with subject matter knowledge
The tables featured in the Results section (pages 39-59 of the Inquiry Brief) show that there were 17 instances in which a program option did not have 90% of its completers pass the Praxis II licensure test (see Audit Task B20).

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 supports pedagogical knowledge (Claim 3: Nurturing Pedagogy)

- **Table 14** (early childhood, elementary education, secondary, and special education) and **Tables 16-22** (content-specific secondary) on pages 42-59 of the Inquiry Brief provide evidence (from the Clinical Practice Assessment System, Teacher Work Sample, Candidate Disposition Scale, Praxis, and grades) of students meeting Claim 3, Nurturing Pedagogy.

- **Audit Task B14** examines the faculty’s conclusion that students in the secondary areas have lower scores in the four items of the Clinical Practice Assessment System (CPAS) that measure Nurturing Pedagogy (Claim 3) than do students in the other program options. The auditors’ analysis showed that the statement was inaccurate, but over two semesters the mean scores (reported in Table 14 of the Inquiry Brief) for students in all four options ranged, in a 5-point scale, from 4.50 to 3.88 for CPAS 2, 4.52 to 3.85 for CPAS 4, 4.77 to 3.95 for CPAS 7, and 4.31 to 3.71 for CPAS 8 – above “competent” (3.0) for even the lowest scores.

- Statements from CPAS narratives support data results (page 42). See also Audit Task B4.

- Results from the TEAC on-site survey (Audit Task A2) corroborated the program’s claim that candidates had pedagogical knowledge; however, TEAC did not receive student email addresses and could not administer an on-line version of the survey and only 59 students (out of a total of 2,553) participated in interview sessions with the auditors and completed the paper surveys.

Evidence available to the panel that is not consistent with pedagogical knowledge
None

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence supports pedagogical knowledge
No rival explanations.

**Component 1.3: Caring teaching skills**

Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with caring teaching skills (Claim 1, Enculturation for Democracy, and Claim 4, Stewardship for Schools)
Mean scores for early childhood, elementary education, secondary, and special education reported in Table 12 (Claim 1, p. 38) and Table 15 (Claim 4, p. 43) and Tables 16-22 for content-specific secondary (pages 45-59) provide evidence (from the Clinical Practice Assessment System, Teacher Work Sample, Candidate Disposition Scale, Praxis, and grades) of students demonstrating caring teaching skills.

Statements from CPAS narratives support data results (pages 38 and 44). See also Audit Task B4.

Results from the TEAC survey (Audit Task A3) corroborated the program’s claim that candidates had caring teaching skill; however, TEAC did not receive student email addresses and could not administer an on-line version of the survey and only 59 students (out of a total of 2,553) participated in interview sessions with the auditors and completed the paper surveys.

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

Rival explanations for the claim that the evidence supports caring teaching skills
No rival explanations.

1.4 Crosscutting themes for Quality Principle I

Evidence available to the panel for the crosscutting themes
- The majority (63%) of those who responded on TEAC surveys (Audit Task A4) thought students exhibited strong skills in incorporating technology into lessons. The program’s use of technology is evident in the presence of assignments and course requirements dependent on good technological skills, specific courses in how to use technology in education, and reliance on Blackboard, LiveText, and other vehicles for posting assignments and grades (see Audit Task A10).
- Results from the TEAC survey (Audit Task A4) corroborated the program’s claim that candidates were competent with respect to the cross-cutting themes; however, TEAC did not receive student email addresses and could not administer an on-line version of the survey and only 59 students (out of a total of 2,553) participated in interview sessions with the auditors and completed the paper surveys.

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with the acquisition of the cross-cutting themes
- As the program reported on pages 61-62 of the Inquiry Brief, student scores on Item 3 of the Clinical Practice Assessment System, Diverse Learner, are statistically lower than other scores (see Audit Task A15).

Component 2.2: Evidence of valid assessment
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with reliable and valid assessment of student learning

- Based on statistical testing and data analysis performed by students as a class project, the Candidate Dispositional Scales (CDS) was redesigned to gain better data (see Audit Task A11 as well as the discussion on page 35 of the Inquiry Brief).
- Faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers used videotape lessons to calibrate the use of the Clinical Performance Assessment System (CPAS), page 30 and page 32 and Audit Task A14.
- The program reports high correlations between the university supervisor and mentor teacher scores for the Clinical Performance Assessment System (CPAS) in Tables 7-10 (pages 33-34).
- The validity of the Praxis II tests is supported by link to ETS (see page 36 of the Brief).

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 supports reliable and valid assessment of student learning

No rival explanations.

Quality Principle III: Institutional learning

Component 2.1: A rationale for linking the assessments and claims

Evidence available to the panel that supports the rationale for the program’s assessments

- Pages 18-22 of the Inquiry Brief include a discussion of the faculty’s rationale for using its assessments.
- Courses, requirements, and assignments in the Educator Preparation Program are grounded in the four Moral Dimensions of Teaching, its Claims (see Audit Task B3).
- Each teacher licensure program has a Learning Outcomes Webpage that lists outcomes, aligns them with appropriate standards, and describes the assessments that measure the outcomes (see Audit Task B11).

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

None

Component 3.1: Program decisions based on evidence

Evidence available to the panel that supports the program’s decisions based on evidence
Data are collected in LiveText for each assessment and analyzed at the end of the semester (see Audit Task B1).

The Educator Preparation Program (EPP) completes an annual data analysis report and shares information with each program option. Minutes of faculty meetings of the EPP as well as the individual program options reveal changes made to program courses, assignments, requirements, and assessments based on findings (see Audit Task B6, Audit Task B7, and Audit Task B15).

The various program options of the Educator Preparation Program adapted the instructions and rubric of the Teacher Work Sample to align with the goals and requirements of the option (see Audit Task B8 and Audit Task B9).

Faculty in the Educator Preparation Program have worked on addressing the lack of diversity among faculty and students and have introduced a number of strategies to offer students the opportunity for field experiences in settings with students from different backgrounds and with diverse needs (see Audit Task B12).

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 3.2: An influential quality control system

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

The Educator Preparation Program (EPP) Executive Committee is committed to “purposeful, systematic, and ongoing evaluation” of candidates and of the EPP itself (page 72 of the Inquiry Brief). It completes an annual data analysis report and shares information with each program option. Minutes of faculty meetings of the EPP as well as the individual program options reveal changes made to program courses, assignments, requirements, and assessments based on findings (see Audit Task B6, Audit Task B7, and Audit Task B15).

Field-based instructors serve as district liaisons and clinical faculty associates, strengthening collaboration between the university and the schools (see Audit Task B10 and Audit Task B18).

Each teacher licensure program option has a Learning Outcomes Webpage that lists outcomes, aligns them with appropriate standards, and describes the assessments that measure the outcomes (see Audit Task B11).

The Educator Preparation Program uses the Professional and Interpersonal Behavior Scale (PIBS) as an early warning system to alert faculty and students to potential “red flags” in students’ academic, professional, and personal behavior (see Audit Task B16).
- Admission requirements are monitored with FileMaker Pro and student files are complete (see Audit Task B17).
- The Educator Preparation Program (EPP) was reorganized to strengthen collaboration and facilitate communication (see Audit Task B18).

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with an influential quality control system
- Interviews with students and faculty revealed some inconsistency in how the Teacher Work Sample assessment was implemented among the various options (see Audit Tasks B5 and B8).

Rival explanations for the evidence about an influential quality control system
No rival explanations.

Element 4.0: Capacity for Program Quality
Evidence available to the panel that is consistent with the capacity for program quality
See Brief, Appendix B, and Table III.1 and Table III.2 in the audit report.

Evidence available to the panel that is inconsistent with capacity for program quality
None

Suggested Weaknesses and Stipulations
None

Suggested Accreditation Recommendation (shaded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0 (new and old) Candidate Learning</th>
<th>2.0 (new)/3.0 (old) Faculty Learning</th>
<th>3.0 (new)/4.0 (old) Capacity &amp; Commitment</th>
<th>Accreditation status designations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Accreditation (5 years) for an initial Inquiry Brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Accreditation (10 years) for a successive Inquiry Brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Below standard</td>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Accreditation (2 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below standard</td>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Accreditation (2 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Below standard</td>
<td>Accreditation (2 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below standard</td>
<td>Below standard</td>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Deny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below standard</td>
<td>Above standard</td>
<td>Below standard</td>
<td>Deny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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