

2021 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 2019-2020 ?

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 19

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 2019-2020 academic year?

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

USAO's institutional mission and objectives were updated and approved by the USAO Board of Regents in November 2019. USAO's mission statement and objectives can be found on the USAO website at the following web address: <https://usao.edu/about/mission-objectives.html>.

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: Accreditation tab with dropdown menu with relevant SPA and OEQA links, CAEP website link, links for CAEP Annual Reports, OEQA/State Annual Reports, Title II Annual Reports; Community connection links; Teacher Education resources and informational links

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?

Upon review of our Annual Reporting Impact Measures over the past three years, the EPP recognizes trends of indicators of positive impact on P-12 learning, teaching effectiveness, and satisfaction of both employers and program completers. The First Year Teacher Surveys administered annually by the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA) to both administrators/mentors and our graduates/First Year Teachers directly show an overall positive response to our teacher preparation program. There was only one "Strongly Disagree" and only one "Disagree" rating from administrator/mentor surveys of FYT in 2019-2020 on the question item, "Overall, the First Year Teacher's preparation/route to certification effectively prepared him/her to have a positive impact on P12 student learning and development." The EPP feels that is important to note that the one "Strongly Disagree" rating was for an individual who graduated a decade ago and only recently completed and entered the teaching profession. The EPP recognizes that the delay in direct application and experience of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions learned through the Teacher Education program contributed to this rating. The one "Disagree" rating on this same

Survey Item Q16 was for an individual who has struggled with confidence for contextual reasons and continued experience and opportunity for growth will be important. The EPP also recognizes that the COVID-19 pandemic and the sudden switch to online and remote learning only in the spring of 2020 placed unprecedented challenges on all teachers and especially on first year teachers. While the Teacher Leader Effectiveness evaluations were not reported to the state or to EPPs for 2019-2020, previous years show overall positive indicators of teaching effectiveness. The EPP recognizes that the satisfaction expressed in surveys and the positive impact assessment trends for 2019-2020 also serve to provide a connected and holistic view of positive teaching effectiveness of our completers. Over the past few years, surveys indicate that administrators and program completers both have an interest in additional preparation for classroom management. We are considering additional opportunities for enhancing the preparation of our candidates for classroom management issues, but we also recognize that this skill is most enhanced throughout the years of teaching experience in your own classroom.

Recruitment will continue to be a focus area for improvement for our entire EPP. Our recruitment plans and traditional in-person high school visits were halted by the COVID-19 pandemic, but we have since picked back up on our efforts for increased advertising through recruitment videos and meetings with Admissions and Communications & Marketing. USAO's Deaf Education program is the only one in the state of Oklahoma and one of the few in the region, and we are particularly increasing our efforts for recruitment of teacher candidates for this unique program. Our Annual Reporting Measures show our total number of program completers as down from last year's report. As a comparison benchmark, our total number of program completers for September 1, 2019 – August 31, 2020 was 19 program completers. In the previous academic year of 2018-2019, we had 21 total program completers and 17 total program completers in 2017-2018. The EPP recognizes that this trend is down from the 35 program completers we had in 2016-2017. This drop could be related to the public recognition of concerns with the lack of funding and support of education in Oklahoma raised by the teacher walkout in April of 2018. Our annual reports for CAEP, OEQA, and Title II are posted for the public on our webpage, and we share trends in data with Teacher Education faculty, P-12 superintendents, P-12 teachers, and EPP teacher candidate representatives at our regularly scheduled Teacher Education Committee meetings and at our annual Fall Work Day and annual Program Assessment Meetings. We also have other collaborative opportunities through faculty membership on various community and state advisory boards, committees, and organizations. We have plans to enhance our website display of data sharing for the public in the upcoming academic year.

The EPP is also increasing our efforts to assist our candidates through to program completion through additional advising and support resources. USAO recently appointed new positions of Enrollment Coordinators for each academic division. The Enrollment Coordinator will serve as an extra support and resources for recruitment, advising, retention, graduation, and program completion efforts. We have also added a specific test preparation study session for the Early Childhood Education Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) that has had low pass rates statewide in recent years. We have an Early Childhood Education faculty member continuing to serve on a state focus group for review of concerns with the Early Childhood OSAT. The EPP also continues efforts to increase our candidate and faculty training for implementation of the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT) which is required of all of our student teachers beginning in the fall of 2020. The COVID-19 pandemic quickly forced an increase of our technology resources available to our candidates and faculty through Zoom, Panopto, and our course Learning Management System, Canvas. The EPP plans to continue to use these technology resources to our advantage and create additional spaces and tools for support, collaboration, and overall enhancement of Teacher Education at USAO.

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 evaluation rubrics, the EPP reviewed the rubrics and the following changes were 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.

Feedback from stakeholders was considered in the revisions of the rubrics. As addressed above, the rubric level descriptor terms were revised to be more understandable according to mentor teachers. Clinical Experience rubrics are reviewed by mentor teachers and candidates during Co-Teaching training sessions and with candidates in Clinical Experience courses.

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?

The EPP's data-driven modifications, innovations, and planned changes are often initiated during our annual review of data each fall semester. 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 (CEOE) 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. 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) admission to Teacher Education data along with efforts made and/or ideas for improving efforts to address recruitment, retention, and successful completion; 7) opportunities for increased direct contact public school hours for Teacher Education faculty; 8) 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.

Fall Work Day 2020 had to be conducted virtually and thus was held through a series of Fall Work Zoom Sessions instead of just on one day. The EPP first worked to ensure alignment of required courses and Student Learning Outcomes to program specific standards. Programs seeking state accreditation prepared initial program reviews for submission to OEQA in October of 2020. Data was reviewed for the overall EPP unit during one of the sessions with analysis of the data listed above for the follow-up Program Assessment Worksheet attached to this report as a reference.

One particular data-driven focus that we would like to highlight for Section 6. Continuous Improvement is our Deaf Education recruitment efforts. Recruitment is a focus for our entire EPP as referenced earlier in this report in Section 4, with data for 19 Program Completers overall in 2019-2020, down from 35 Program Completers a few years ago in 2016-2017. We are specifically focusing on recruitment efforts for our Deaf Education program right now. USAO is now the only Deaf Education program in the state of Oklahoma, and we recognize this unique program and its opportunity to contribute to the need for Deaf Education teachers. In these efforts, we had celebrity and Deaf Culture activist, Nyle DiMarco, visit USAO in the fall of 2019 as a guest speaker for our USAO Giles Symposium. This event brought great attention to USAO's Deaf Education program and served as a recruitment opportunity for Deaf Education candidates. We continue to seek opportunities for promoting this program and recruiting potential candidates. Deaf Education faculty and students have put together promotional recruitment videos that are posted on our USAO YouTube channel and shared through social media and the USAO website. We had plans to create recruitment videos for all of our EPP programs in May of 2020, but the COVID-19 pandemic delayed those efforts that we are now revisiting for all programs. A document with Deaf Education recruitment and promotional video links is posted in the attachments below.

The EPP regularly shares efforts, seeks input, and involves stakeholders in discussions of current efforts, concerns, changes, and successes through the Teacher Education Committee with partnering school administration and teacher representatives, student representatives from Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, PK-12 Education Programs, and Secondary Education Programs, and faculty representatives from all Teacher Education program areas. The Teacher Education Committee also submits an annual report to USAO's President and Vice President of Academic Affairs. EPP faculty have also shared recent focused recruitment efforts with various institutional offices and entities. We are hopeful that these efforts will show notable increased Deaf Education and Teacher Education enrollment and completion numbers within the next five years.







As a result of preparing for a statewide transition from the Oklahoma Professional Teaching Examination (OPTE) to the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT) and after analyzing results of Professional Trimester Candidate Surveys who completed the mock PPAT in 2019-2020, we have increased efforts to train faculty and prepare candidates for success on 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 that is now being required of all of our candidates in student teaching since Fall 2020. Data on our candidates PPAT scores will be collected and reviewed as those resulting scores are reported to us. We are assessing progress on the PPAT for all EPP candidates who take it during the 2020-2021 academic year, and data will be reported in the 2022 Annual Accreditation Report.

After review of surveys of First Year Teachers from administrators/mentors and First Year Teachers themselves, the EPP noted the comments on a desire for additional preparation in classroom management. We are currently discussing opportunities for increasing the credit hours allotted for our EDUC 4442 Classroom Management and Evaluation Theory course. EPP faculty have discussed enhancement of the curriculum in that course and addition of enhanced classroom management experiences and content in other Professional Education and major courses as possible. We are also seeking the opportunity to add an offering of the course in the summer trimester, pending the ability to hire additional qualified faculty following pandemic-related hiring restrictions.

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

- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
- x.1 Diversity
- x.2 Technology

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  **Program_Assessment_Worksheet__Fall_2020.docx**
-  **Deaf_Ed._Program_Assessment_Worksheet__Fall_2020(1).docx**
-  **Recruitment__Promotional_Video_Links__USAO_Deaf_Education.docx**
-  **FYT_Mentor_Admin_Survey_Report_2020_USAO_from_OEQA.pdf**
-  **FYT_Survey_Report_USAO_2020_from_OEQA.pdf**
-  **CAEP_8_Annual_Reporting_Measures_2021_Report_(AY1920).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

Note - The EPP realized that there was a date error in this comment section on the 2020 Annual Accreditation Report. The report incorrectly stated that USAO closed campus in March 2019 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. It should have stated that USAO closed campus in March 2020. Courses were offered online only for the remainder of the Spring 2020 and Summer 2020 semesters. In Fall 2020, USAO re-opened campus and resumed most in-person classes with exceptions for faculty health safety and class size social distancing considerations.

The EPP noticed that not all Program Options were correctly listed in AIMS. I have sent a request to the email indicated for CAEP technical support on this matter. We will correct the listing of Program Options as soon as we receive guidance from CAEP in the appropriate editing process. Please, contact Dr. Sarah Layman at 405-574-1253 or slayman@usao.edu with additional questions and feedback on Program Options.

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 2021 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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 reviews.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount complete 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 review 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