

2018 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10624	AACTE SID:	3635
Institution:	The University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma		
Unit:	Teacher Education		

Section 1. AIMS Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)²

Total number of program completers 35

¹ For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

² For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2016-2017 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.
No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
No Change / Not Applicable

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4 A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

Link: <https://usao.edu/division/education-and-speech-language-pathology/facts-and-numbers-about-teacher-ed>

Description of data accessible via link: Title II assessment reports, Teacher shortage areas, average GPA's of program completers

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

Over the past three years, data has shown that our candidates continue to be successful in passing CEOE exams, in gaining employment upon graduation and in being successful first year teachers. Our follow-up graduate studies are 93% positive and we have continually high stakeholder involvement. As a result of data analysis, additional recruiting through AVID and engineering classes took place at our local high school as well as additional focus on recruitment of Native American students. Our teacher candidate enrollment has increased slightly, from 27 to 35 completers, and interest is beginning to increase as well with incoming freshmen. We have adapted some of our recruiting efforts and expanded our areas of recruiting. Our deaf education department has reached out to surrounding states with scholarship offers for students to attract them to one of the few deaf education programs in this area of the United States.

A major change on the horizon as requested in candidate data is a digital portfolio. Students have requested this move and the University is moving in this direction for all students on our campus. As we adopt the PPAT, we will be including the use of tablets and Swivl as a way to capture video for the exam. This is seen as a technology growth. It will be used in our EDUC 3343 Educational Technology class for an introduction to the technology, used in our EDUC 3211 Clinical II class as a test run prior to the EDUC 4305 Professional Trimester submission. Not that the PPAT was requested or shown as a need by students, but a better use of technology and an upgrade was clearly shown as a need by students. USAO is responding to that need. Also, many

students have requested that the paper portfolio be upgraded to a digital format. In the early childhood and elementary coursework, additional constructed response essays have been added to assessments as requested by students to assist with the constructed response questions on the OSAT and OPTE. The Art department has shifted focus from state to national standards since the OSAT in Art is focused on national standards. Art also added a research paper to the requirements in ART 3262 Teaching Art in the Public School course to assist with the concerns of not having enough writing skills for the OSAT and OPTE. Deaf Education has added writing prompts to assignments to help with this same concern. In response to prior year data, an IEP case study has been added to the DFED 2133 Aural Oral classes that focus on strategies for students using case study methodology in DFED 4153 Curriculum and Instruction. Science courses have stressed inquiry and OSAT scores have been higher. Elementary faculty discussed having candidates use scenarios in EDUC 4442 Classroom Management to further their skills in behavior management. Another major change will be analyzing first year teacher data from the state TLE data that was recently upgraded and released. The goal is to increase the response rate to the OEQA survey thereby eliminating the need for individual EPP surveys. OGET scores show that Critical Thinking Skills: Math remains the high score for our candidates with Critical Thinking Skills: Writing being the low score. Some of the candidate comments were focused on our IDS 1113 Writing I and IDS 1213 Writing II classes including more sentence structure and grammar in coursework. Candidates also recommended use of the OGET study guides for future test takers. OPTE scores showed use of a variety of instructional strategies as being the highest area with meeting special needs of students as the lowest area. Some of the recommendations from candidates included practice with constructive response questions in coursework. Strengths of the program reported included practice in planning lessons and classroom management. Recommendations again focused on use of OPTE study guides for future candidates. As for our student teacher preparedness, comments from candidates were positive as far as feeling trained in observation, classroom management, co-teaching and benchmark testing. Some areas of concern were feeling ill prepared in certain subject matter, and wanting more university supervisor visits. These surveys are aligned with InTASC standards as well as state and EPP values. This survey supports that USAO completers contribute to the expected level of student growth. Options considered as indicators of teaching effectiveness of program completers were the following: 1) student surveys; 2) results from state assessment evaluation system; 3) results from OEQA Administrator Survey; 4) results from USAO Teacher Preparation Survey. InTASC aligned questions from administrator surveys conducted by USAO reveal favorable ratings regarding the ability of USAO completers to effectively demonstrate professional knowledge, skills and dispositions. Our graduate follow up studies show that most graduates felt prepared to teach. Some candidates replied that their administrator could not tell they were a first year teacher, and they received excellent and positive feedback from peers. Some of the concerns noted included incorporating special needs children into a regular classroom. Other concerns from first year teachers included budget cuts, classroom interruptions, stress, and utilization of standards. Administrators reported that our graduates work well with students and families and do a phenomenal job. Our first year teachers take suggestions and use feedback, and show great growth according to administrator surveys. Most of the concerns from administrators are with classroom management, as would be the case with most first year teachers. All candidates take two courses specifically targeting classroom management (EDUC 4442 Classroom Management/Evaluation Theory prior to Professional Trimester and EDUC 4542 Applied Professional Studies during Professional Trimester.) Benchmarks are available for comparison over the prior five years. Fall Work Day program compilers are provided with disaggregated data and Program compilers are asked to meet with area faculty to analyze and provide comments and recommendations for each of the following: 1) state licensure exams; 2) results of surveys pertaining to candidate perception of readiness for licensure exams; 3) results of the follow-up study; 4) the most useful aggregated/disaggregated data; 5) additional aggregated/disaggregated data that would be helpful; 6) description of any program or course changes that are to be made or any that have been made in the past academic year; and recommendations for the teacher education program in general or specifically about the area program. Measures are widely shared with faculty at Fall Work Day and they meet as area teams to discuss growth and needs. Data is shared with teacher education members which includes faculty from all areas of teacher certification, candidates, public school teachers and administrators; Vice President of Academic Affairs and the President. Some data is available in Nash Library. This data is also provided in several classes including EDUC 2002 Orientation to Teaching, EDUC 4442 Classroom Management, and EDUC 4542 Applied Professional Studies.

Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

Rubrics for Clinical Level Evaluation (Clinical 1, 2, and 4) lack consistency between the proficiencies and rubric levels in the evaluations.

Rubrics for Clinical Level Evaluation (Clinical 1, 2, and 4) lack consistency between the proficiencies and rubric levels in the evaluations.

Clinical 1 and 2 are dispositional evaluations completed by mentor teachers. They follow alignment with our dispositional growth statement for EPP programs. They are not meant to be aligned with clinical 4. Updating of clinical 1 and 2 rubrics was completed to provide mentor teachers with a more defined descriptor for each level of the rubric and each disposition noted. Level headings were changed to Unacceptable, Progressing, Meets Expectations and Exceeds Expectations as per requested by mentor teachers. They commented that Emerging was not determinable and Progressing was more understandable. Headings now

match all other assessment rubric headings for the EPP.

Our rubric for clinical 4 was immediately changed for our addendum to our unit review. The inconsistency was in InTASC standard number 10. A discrepancy happened when designing the rubric and standard number 9 and 10 were similar in the rubric. Since that time, number 10 descriptors have been aligned with InTASC standard 10.

The rubric level headings were changed to Unacceptable, Progressing, Meets Expectations and Exceeds Expectations as per requested by mentor teachers. Mentors commented that Emerging was not determinable and Progressing was more understandable.

Each standard and each level were given more defined descriptors. Descriptors align with the standard. Example: Unacceptable level of Standard 6 descriptor says Candidate does not use assessments to guide daily instruction nor do they demonstrate a connection between assessment and learning. Progressing level descriptor says Candidate understands and uses methods of assessment to monitor learner progress. Meets Expectations level descriptor says Demonstrates evidence of knowledge and skill in using assessments effectively and directly calls for the candidate to display "Teacher uses, designs or adapts a variety of classroom formative assessments." Exceeds level descriptor says Demonstrates knowledge and skill to assess higher order skills and directly calls for the candidate to display "teacher uses formative classroom assessment to maximize development of knowledge, critical thinking and problem solving skills."

The overall rubric is called OTHER—and is for (questions not contained in InTASC) It is no longer an overall rubric.

Descriptors include (as an example): Unacceptable level: Candidate does not show professionalism in appearance, attitude, confidentiality, written or verbal communication. Progressing level: Candidate show inconsistent professionalism in appearance, attitude, confidentiality, written or verbal communication. Meets Expectations level: Candidate demonstrates professionalism in appearance, attitude, confidentiality, written and verbal communication. Exceeds Expectations level: Candidate consistently demonstrates professionalism in all areas. All descriptors are determinable and measurable.

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

USAO had a CAEP visit in the Fall of 2016. Collection of data and preparation for that accreditation meeting was all consuming. USAO Division of Education and Speech Language Pathology decided to focus on the CAEP accreditation and the necessary update of the requirements for the Professional Portfolio only.

Commitment to assessment may not be natural, but commitment to an assessment system fosters reflection and growth.

Disaggregated data is the mainstay of the USAO Assessment System. At each Fall Work Day, disaggregated data is provided for the following: a) CEOE (OGET, OSAT, OPTE) score analysis; b) analysis of data from mentor teachers, principals and university supervisors about student teachers and c) analysis of portfolio scores.

During the summer of 2014 the Oklahoma State Legislature, in conjunction with a request from the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation and the Oklahoma State Department of Education, approved a change from the 15 Oklahoma General Competencies for Teacher Licensure and Certification to a "new" 10 General Competencies for Licensure and Certification. The "new" 10 competencies are the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards released in 2011. During the 2016 Fall Work Day, consistency and "new" InTASC Standards led USAO to alter its portfolio requirements.

During 2014-15, committees of teacher education faculty were formed consisting of early childhood, elementary and secondary representation to update the USAO Professional Portfolio Handbook. During the 2016 Fall Work Day the Chairperson of the Committee discussed how to assist student candidates in making the transition to the InTASC standards, reorganize their notebooks, and understand the new scoring rubrics. As for scoring the portfolios, faculty were instructed to check for organization, carefully read the legal reflections that were different and use the new scoring rubrics.

Scoring of the portfolios was changed to include a blind triangulation of scorers for better reliability and validity. The Division Chair then reads all of the prior evaluations to check for outliers prior to returning the portfolio to the student to make corrections. Once corrections have been made, the student returns the portfolio to the Division Chair for the last submission prior to certification.

The 2017 Fall Work Day portfolio data showed both valid and reliable scoring data from all faculty. The Division Chair reported consistency and no apparent bias in the blind triangulation of scores.




Selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion is shown through multiple checks of the portfolio beginning in Orientation to Teaching and culminating in the Professional Trimester and at graduation. Each candidate has a timeline to follow and peer and faculty evaluations occur during coursework as stated in Standard 3.

As we move forward with considerations of the format of the portfolio and other changes coming in education, we are moving toward a digital format for student portfolios. This systematic assessment of a candidate's performance and the innovations a digital portfolio will bring will result in an overall positive trend of improvement for the EPP as we embrace technology. This is a holistic review of the student's growth and performance and creates context for their clinical practice so candidates understand the elements of teaching they will have to demonstrate when responding to tasks required in the portfolio. This media will assist candidates with developing reflective analysis and generating evidence of student learning. Interaction with students and how students interact with the candidate and one another as well as how the candidate creates a positive learning climate and engages students in learning can be measured by including these items in a digital portfolio. This portfolio conveys to the readers how a candidate practices the profession, the decisions one makes and the working relationship a candidate has with students.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the data or changes apply.

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
- A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
- A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
- A.3.4 Selection at Completion
- A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
- A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
- x.2 Technology
- x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  competency_alignment_614.xlsx
-  Professional_Growth_f14.doc
-  Portfolio_Assessment.pdf

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or service activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2018 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Donna Gower

Position: Director of Teacher Education

Phone: 4055741253

E-mail: dgower@usao.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completion data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP

and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

Acknowledge