

2020 EPP Annual Report

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

Section 1. EPP 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"/>

1.2 [For EPPs seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation]. Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial-Licensure Level and/or Advanced-Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

<https://usao.edu/academics/education-and-speech-language-pathology/index.html>

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 2018-2019 ?

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 21

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 2018-2019 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

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

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

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/academics/education-and-speech-language-pathology/index.html>

Description of data accessible via link: Teacher Education and Community Resources, Teacher Education Details, Community Connections

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?

After reviewing our Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years, recruitment will continue to be a focus for our entire EPP. We have planned opportunities for increasing our recruitment options through increased advertising for USAO as a whole and recruitment videos, increased college and career fair participation, and visits with local and surrounding area high schools. USAO's Deaf Education program is now the only one in the state of Oklahoma and one of the few in the region, and their recruitment efforts continue to expand despite enrollment still being lower than desired. Our Annual Reporting Measures do show a slight trend upwards in our total number of program completers. As a comparison benchmark, our total number of program completers for September 1, 2018 – August 31, 2019 was 21 program completers. This is up from 17 total program completers in 2017-2018. We will be increasing our efforts to assist our candidates through to program completion increasing our advising and support resources. Changes that are being implemented and planned to support candidates through to successful program completion include purchasing and sharing additional certification exam preparation materials, continuing our candidate and faculty training for implementation of the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT), and increasing our electronic resources available on our website and on our course Learning Management System, Canvas.

We have continued concern over the low pass rate for the Early Childhood OSAT for our candidates and candidates statewide. Early Childhood faculty members from USAO have met with other EPP Early Childhood faculty members and members of the Oklahoma Office of Educational Quality and Accountability in focus group discussions on the revised Early Childhood OSAT in

order to discuss potential test deficiencies and how to better assist candidates in passing this certification exam. Our pass rate on the Early Childhood OSAT for 2018-2019 was 41.7% compared with the statewide pass rate of 67.4%. In 2017-2018, our pass rate on the Early Childhood OSAT was 50% compared with the statewide pass rate of 75%. The pass rate for USAO candidates on the Early Childhood OSAT in 2016-2017 was 92.9% and the statewide pass rate was 69.3%. USAO Early Childhood Education program faculty meet annually and have intensified our focus on identifying areas of weakness in order to better prepare candidates to successfully pass the Early Childhood OSAT.

Review of our First Year Teacher Survey data continues to show that our teachers do well during their first year as evidenced by ratings and comments by mentor teachers and administrators. From administrators and mentor teachers, the few comments of concern centered around classroom/time management and experience. Our program completers and first year teachers filling out this First Year Teacher Survey also express overall positive responses in regards to the preparation they received in our program. From our first year teachers themselves, one area that received lower ratings than other areas was the item on preparation for implementation of technology. These items have been noted, and we will continue to emphasize them in relevant course assignments and experiences. We have increased candidates' use of the Swivl and iPad technology in some of our methods courses as well as in our clinical experience courses. We have also continued the transition to the electronic portfolio through the use of Portfolium. Although the transition has proven to be more complicated than initially expected, we are moving ahead, and candidates have expressed appreciation of this use of technology.

All Teacher Education faculty continue to meet together annually for our Fall Work Day to review these Annual Reporting Measures and additional EPP and program data. Following this annual meeting, program-specific faculty meet together again to review more detailed data for their program candidates and completers. Each certification program has a faculty member designated to serve as the compiler of the Program Assessment Report. These reports are then shared with the Director of Teacher Education and reviewed for future response. Our Teacher Education Committee meetings allow us an opportunity to share these data, trends, updates, thoughts, and concerns with fellow faculty, student representatives, and a representative public school superintendent and teacher representative. We send a representative to the monthly local county superintendents' meeting in order to learn and share current information. We also post data and information on our Division of Education and Speech-Language Pathology webpage along with an e-public forum for sharing with and receiving feedback from candidates, stakeholders, and the public.

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.

In response to the cited Area for Improvement on the lack of consistency between the proficiencies and rubric levels in the Clinical 1, 2, and 4 rubrics, we have reviewed the rubrics and the following changes have been considered and implemented. 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 the level heading of "Emerging" was not determinable and the level heading of "Progressing" was more understandable. Level headings for Clinical 1 and 2 now match Clinical 4 rubric level 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 standards numbers 9 and 10 were similar in the rubric. Since that time, number 10 descriptors have been aligned with InTASC standard 10. Each standard and each level were given more defined descriptors. Descriptors align with the standard. For 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 appearance, attitude, confidentiality, written or verbal communication. Progressing level: Candidate shows inconsistent professionalism in appearance, attitude, confidentiality, written or verbal communication. Meets Expectation level: Candidate demonstrates professionalism in appearance, attitude, confidentiality, written or 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's Teacher Education faculty from all program areas meet annually each fall for our Fall Work Day in order to review data, discuss, and assess EPP's performance in connection with CAEP standards, SPA standards, and our EPP and program goals. During Fall Work Day, we review data on our candidates' pass rates and Mean Total Scores on Certification Exams for Oklahoma Educators (GEOE) in comparison with statewide pass rates and previous years' pass rates. We also look at enrollment data, demographic data, admission to Teacher Education data, and data on candidate attrition across checkpoints. We review data from Clinical 1, 2, and 4 evaluations. We assess our candidates' performance on their Professional Portfolio competencies by reviewing scores on Portfolio evaluations. Data from the Student Impact Project is reviewed. To further assess our candidates' performance on impact measures, we review data from the Oklahoma Teacher Leader Effectiveness (TLE) evaluations of our recent graduates teaching in Oklahoma. We review and discuss First Year Teacher surveys from our graduates themselves, their mentor teachers, and their administrators. We also review data on our Teacher Education Faculty Development Reports. During Fall Work Day, faculty members who serve as program report compilers are provided with disaggregated data and are asked to hold a follow-up meeting with their program 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 useful; 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. Fall Work Day also provides the EPP an opportunity to plan for implementation of any changes, innovations, or transitions that result from analysis of data and regular assessment and discussion of candidate and EPP performance or needs. For example, Fall Work Day 2019 served as an opportunity for us to discuss and prepare for improving the accuracy of our Faculty Development Report Forms and the data collected. We also reviewed our progress on the implementation of the electronic version of the Professional Portfolio through the somewhat challenging transition to Portfolium. As the utilization of Portfolium increases, we will have data and feedback on the success of its implementation. Candidates already utilizing Portfolium have expressed appreciation for the ease of the electronic version. As a result of preparing for a statewide transition from the Oklahoma Professional Teaching Examination (OPTE) to the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT), we have continued to review guidelines, requirements, and examples of the PPAT. We have increased our implementation of PPAT components in various courses so that candidates will be better prepared for the new certification exam once it is required of all of our candidates who are student teaching beginning in Fall 2020. Data on our candidates PPAT scores will be collected and reviewed as those resulting scores are reported to us. We will assess progress on the PPAT for all EPP candidates who take it during the 2020-2021 academic year, and we will compare data during subsequent Fall Work Days. As a result of low pass rates for our candidates taking the Early Childhood OSAT, we have purchased new certification exam preparation materials and began implementing additional efforts directly related to the Early Childhood OSAT in our courses. We will continue to review the pass rates to look for progress or upward trends in test scores. We are also asking Early Childhood










candidates taking the OSAT to complete a survey providing us with feedback that might help us to know what we are doing well and what we still need to improve.

We will continue to enhance our recruitment efforts for the entire EPP with the addition of new opportunities for recruiting. USAO has recently implemented new advertising methods such as billboards and digital advertising in the airport. Teacher Education faculty and faculty in the Division of Education and Speech-Language Pathology have been discussing new recruitment possibilities regularly at monthly Teacher Education Committee and/or Division meetings. Faculty have also increased their presence in recruitment fairs and opportunities at high schools, vocational schools, and community colleges in the surrounding area. We have met with Communications and Marketing in order to prepare new recruitment materials and plan for producing recruitment videos. We will continue to review our enrollment during our annual Fall Work Day in order to assess the impact of these new recruitment efforts.

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
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
- x.2 Technology
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses
- x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  **Fall_Work_Day_Agenda.docx**
-  **USAO_Teacher_Education_Faculty_Development_Recording_Form_UC_added_(3).docx**
-  **CEOE_OGET_Results_CAEP.doc**
-  **CEOE_OPTE_612_Results1_CAEP.doc**
-  **CEOE_OPTE_PK8_Results_CAEP.doc**
-  **CEOE_Verified_Examinees_Only_(1).pdf**
-  **CEOE_Statewide_Verified_Examinees.pdf**
-  **Program_Assessment_Worksheet_2019.docx**
-  **Program_Assessment_Worksheet_2019_Early_Childhood.docx**

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

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

USAO closed campus following Spring Break in March 2019 due to COVID-19. We requested and received an extension to complete this report by the end of May 2019. Despite the challenges presented in this situation, we have completed this report for submission on May 29, 2019. Please, contact us with any additional information needed.

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 2020 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Sarah Layman

Position: Chair, Division of Education and Speech-Language Pathology & Director of Teacher Education

Phone: 405-574-1253

E-mail: slayman@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 completer 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