

Summary of the Case
Barnard College
Barnard Department of Education¹
September 24-27, 2013

The Summary of the Case is written by the auditors and approved by program faculty on October 22, 2013. 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 the faculty of the department: Lee Anne Bell (Program Chair), Maria Rivera Maulucci, and Lisa Edstrom. It was approved after revisions on September 17, 2013.

Introduction:

Barnard College, located on the Upper West Side of Manhattan, is a highly selective liberal arts college serving approximately 2400 undergraduate women. The college, through its 375 faculty, offers 50 academic majors. Since its founding in 1889, Barnard has been known for its distinctive academic culture, with a commitment to the liberal arts at its core. The interdisciplinary foundation of a Barnard education is formed by its signature Nine Ways of Knowing—lenses that create a framework for understanding the world: Reason and Value, Social Analysis, Cultures in Comparison, Language, Laboratory Science, Quantitative and Deductive Reasoning, Historical Studies, Literature, and the Visual and Performing Arts. Although the College is an independent institution, it has a special relationship with Columbia University; students at each institution can take courses at the other, live in the same residence halls, share access to libraries, and participate in each other's extracurricular activities. Students attending both Barnard College and Columbia University complete teacher preparation through Barnard's program.

Teacher education at Barnard is viewed as an all-college responsibility, and the mission of the program is closely aligned with the mission of the college through its commitment to social justice. The conceptual framework of the Education Program and its mission of preparing teachers who are committed to fairness and justice, recognizing and acting on patterns of inequality in their teaching, is a central claim throughout the program's *Brief*.

The Barnard Education Program (BEP) is a unit within the Division of Social Sciences, and Education faculty are considered regular members of the Arts and Science faculty. The BEP currently has three full time faculty members and one half time faculty member. In addition, the BEP employs one doctoral student from Teachers College to assist in student teaching supervision. During 2011-2012, the last group of students whose performance is summarized in the *Brief*, eleven students completed the program. Table 1 displays information on the number of students who completed the program in 2012-2013; 20 students overall were enrolled in teacher education in that year.

Table 1
Barnard College Program Completers

Teaching Area/Grade Levels	Number of completers in previous academic year 2012-2013
Childhood Education (K-6)	3
Secondary (7-12)	
English Language Arts	1
Mathematics	0
Spanish	1

Program Claims:

In its *Brief* the faculty make three claims that program completers meet TEAC's quality principles.

Claim 1: Our graduates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the liberal arts and sciences and the content they teach. (QP 1.1, QP 1.4.1, QP 1.4.2, QP 1.4.3)

Claim 2: As part of an ethic of care, graduates of our program learn effective ways to get to know their students in order to construct responsive and relevant learning experiences for them and engage all students in learning. (QP 1.2, QP 1.3, QP 1.4.1, QP 1.4.2, QP 1.4.3)

Claim 3: Our graduates demonstrate a capacity for self-awareness and self-reflection and understand how their experiences inform their evolving teaching vision and practice. (QP 1.3, QP 1.4.1, QP 1.4.2, QP 1.4.3)

Evidence supporting the claims:

Faculty provide data from seven different measures to support these claims. Data are from the group of 46 student teachers in 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 (Cohorts I, II, and III). For one measure, the Student Teaching Evaluations, data for Cohorts II and III were reported. Faculty also sampled data from 11 student teachers from Cohorts II and III to determine more in depth patterns of performance during student teaching.

1. New York State Liberal Arts and Science Test (LAST) (Claim 1)

The LAST is a test of knowledge in Science and Math, History and the Social Sciences, the Arts and Humanities, Communication and Research Skills, and Written Expression required by the state for certification. Minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation scores were reported, as well as mean scores disaggregated by program level (elementary and secondary). Of the 46 students whose data are reported for each area, 100% passed the test and only five scored below the mean score for students in the state. All mean scores exceeded the state averages.

2. New York State Content Specialty Test (CST) (Claim 1)

The CST is a test of knowledge in the content area required by the state for certification. Minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation scores were reported, as well as

mean scores disaggregated by program level (elementary and secondary) and content area. Barnard students had a 100% passing rate on the CST and on average scored 21.5 points above the state averages. Of the 46 scores reported, five Elementary candidates and three Secondary candidates scored below the state average on the CST exam. All mean scores exceeded the state pass rates in all content areas.

3. New York State Assessment of Teaching Skills–Written (ATS-W) (Claims 2 and 3)

The ATS-W, which is taken by candidates either at the elementary or secondary level, is required by the state for certification. Multiple choice and constructed response items assess pedagogical knowledge in student development and learning, instruction and assessment, and the professional environment. All 100% of the 46 program completers in the Barnard Education Program passed the ATS-W, and, on the average, they scored 12-14 points higher than the state averages for this exam.

4. Grade Point Averages (Claims 1, 2, and 3)

Three Grade Point Average (GPA) statistics were included as evidence in the *Brief*. For program completers in the Elementary Program, the overall cumulative GPA was reported as a measure of subject matter knowledge (Claim 1). For students preparing in Secondary teaching areas, faculty included “distribution “GPAs as measures for Claim 1, i.e., grades for the courses within and outside the major that meet the content requirements for certification. A third measure, the GPA in the required 26-30 credits in Psychology and Education courses, was used as evidence for Claims 2 and 3. Minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviations were reported for all three measures. Students in the Elementary Program had a mean overall GPA of 3.4, as compared to students in the Secondary Program who had had a mean GPA of 3.6, both of which correspond to a *B+*. Three Elementary and two Secondary students had GPAs below the *B* level (Claim 1). On average, Barnard students had an Education GPA of 3.74 (*A-*). Only two Elementary students had Education GPAs below a *B*.

5. Student Teacher Evaluations by Cooperating Teachers and College Supervisors (Claims 1-3)

Cooperating Teachers and College Supervisors complete a 25-item evaluation of student teachers' performance at the end of the student teaching semester. Items on the evaluation aligned with claims were summed (two items for Claim 1 and all items on the evaluation for Claims 2 and 3). The minimum, maximum, and mean total score for all items related to a Claim were included, disaggregated by student teaching level. Differences were found between Cooperating Teacher (CTE) and Supervisor (STSE) ratings. Cooperating Teachers consistently rated student teachers as *adequately to well-prepared*. Mean scores of subject matter knowledge by Cooperating Teachers were 7.20 (out of 8 possible) for Elementary student teachers and 7.67 for Secondary student teachers, while Supervisors rated students in the *developing to proficient* range (means 5.64 and 6.33). Data reported for overall scores on the entire instrument (Claims 2 and 3) showed a similar pattern. Mean ratings by Cooperating Teachers

ranged from 91.1 for Elementary student teachers to 91.9 for Secondary student teachers (100 pts. were possible), while University Supervisors' mean ratings were 75.9 and 74.8 for the same student teachers. In addition, faculty reported four randomly selected responses out of a pool of 210 responses to four open-ended questions on the CTE which focused on influence of the ST on student learning, the effectiveness of the ST with ELL and special needs students, the influence of the ST on CT learning, and how the ST would likely perform in the first year. Strengths and areas in need of improvement were reported. Item analyses of the scores for Cohorts I-III on CTEs and for Cohorts II-III for STSEs were reported, identifying strengths and weaknesses for individual items on the evaluations by the Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors. Finally, written comments for 11 subsample students were reported for one open-ended question on the CTE (how students would likely perform in the first year) to illustrate the range of responses addressing the strengths and areas in need of development.

6. Collaborative Assessment of Lesson (CAOL) (Claim 2)

Results of three faculty raters independently scoring the third (of three) lesson plans completed by 11 student teachers in Cohorts II and III were presented. Faculty used a program-designed rubric to evaluate the lessons and presented the mean score of the three ratings for each of the 11 students. From a possible score of 30 points, scores ranged from 12.5 to 27.7 for 6 students in Cohort III and 15 – 27.3 for 5 students in Cohort II. An item analysis identified strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the program rubric.

7. Lesson Plan VITAL Essay (Claim 3)

Reflections of teaching included mean scores on two reflective essays for all student teachers in Cohorts I-III (20 Elementary and 24 Secondary students) Essays were part of an assignment requiring student teachers to evaluate video clips of their teaching. Minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviations were reported for both Elementary and Secondary student teachers. The average score for Elementary student teachers was 13.1 (of 15 points); the average score for Secondary student teachers was 13.97. Faculty also reported the results of a qualitative analysis in which faculty classified reflections as technical, interpretive, and critical for six student teachers. All six included technical and interpretive examples of reflection of their teaching, and two of the six included critical reflections.

Evidence of reliability & validity:

Faculty evaluated the validity of their measures by using a purposive stratified sampling process to identify a subsample of 11 students, representing 25% of the total number of students in all three cohorts. Students were ranked based on their final grade in student teaching, with the highest, mid-high, middle, mid-low, and lowest student selected in each group. Various measures were determined for each of these students to determine whether rankings based on the grade in student teaching were similar to the rankings of other data (GPA, ratings of Cooperating Teachers, CAOL, and VITAL scores). Qualitative analyses of data for subsample students were used to support claims about the quality of program graduates. In addition, faculty calculated

correlations between measures used to support the claims. Given the small sample sizes, correlations were reported for all students and then disaggregated by program option: 1) student scores on the LAST and overall GPAs of students (yielded a significant positive correlation overall; moderate correlation for EP students; and a strong correlation for SP students), 2) student scores on the CST and GPA (yielded a strong correlation overall; moderate for EP students and weak for SP students), 3) ratings of student teachers' performance by Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors (yielded non-significant correlations), and 4) student scores on the ATS-W and GPAs in Education courses (yielded a moderate correlation overall and a low correlation for EP students (n=9) and SP students (n=15)).

Internal audit:

All program faculty participated in examining their quality control system and reviewed a number of targets related to program quality (course offerings, course syllabi, program assessment, course evaluations, faculty qualifications) and institutional parity (facilities, equipment, and supplies). Audits of the Quality Control System related to student quality probed quality control at four checkpoints in the program – program application, end of methods courses, end of student teaching, and certification and degree completion). Entry points for the audit related to student quality included 11 files of student teachers/program completers in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 (the sample included in additional assessment activities described above).

The faculty found that overall the system was functioning as it was designed. The faculty found that the College policies and procedures were being followed and documented appropriately. Analysis of program policies and procedures for students yielded a few refinements of the QCS to ensure the quality of future graduates.

Plans for program improvement:

Based on their self-study, the faculty have formulated plans for improvements including:

- Exploration of changes in the curriculum to better prepare Elementary teachers in Mathematics content knowledge and to strengthen distribution requirements for Social Studies teachers.
- Design of similar forms for Cooperating Teachers, Student Teaching Supervisors, and Subject Matter Specialist Observers.
- Development of a webinar for raters to view prior to using the new evaluations to improve reliability and validity of evaluations.
- Improvements in preparation for Barnard students to meet the needs of ELL students (currently being implemented).
- Development of relationships with more Cooperating Teachers and schools that match the BEP's philosophical and pedagogical approach.
- Improved assessment of technology use during student teaching.
- Implementation of new strategies to encourage and enhance critical reflection.
- Development of new approaches to recruit Barnard students into teacher education.

Statement regarding commitment and capacity:

The faculty concluded that Barnard College is committed to the Barnard Education Program and that there is sufficient capacity to offer a quality program.

¹The Barnard Education Program offers teacher preparation in Childhood Education: (Grades 1-6) and Adolescence Education (Grades 7-12) in the subject areas of English, Foreign Languages (French, German, Greek, Italian, Latin, Russian or Spanish), Mathematics, Science (Biology, Chemistry, Physics or Earth Science) and Social Studies. New York State, at its discretion, offers licensure to program completers in these option areas.