

# 2019 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	10624	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	3635
<b>Institution:</b>	The University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma		
<b>Unit:</b>	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 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup> 17

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.)<sup>2</sup> 0

**Total number of program completers 17**

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

<sup>2</sup> 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 2017-2018 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/division/education-and-speech-language-pathology>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Teacher Education Details, Teacher Shortage Areas, State Minimum Teacher Salaries

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"/>

2

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

**Description of data accessible via link:** Average GPA's of Program Completers, Title II Assessment Reports

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"/>

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 generally positive and we have continually high stakeholder involvement. We continue to recruit at local and area high schools although our completer rate dropped this past year. Our deaf education department continues to reach 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. This year we have implemented the digital portfolio. Students have been pleased with the move and the handbook has been

rewritten to reflect the change. This has been a request by students for a while to move to a digital format for the portfolio. Implementation of the PPAT is taking place with additions of projects and changes in vocabulary to assist in this move. Our EDUC 3343 Educational Technology class has implemented the use of Swivl and tablets for a project to show teacher candidates how to prepare the videos for the PPAT. EDUC 3211 Clinical II students will utilize this technology in their course as a test run prior to EDUC 4305 Professional Trimester. Although students did not request the change to PPAT, they did request an upgrade in technology and better use of technology in their coursework. Elementary standards were updated and courses were realigned to reflect those updates. Early childhood has met with the State Department of Education about the OSAT constructed response to assist students with a better passing rate and coursework reflects those changes too. Analysis of TLE first year teacher data revealed that our teachers do well during their first year as evidenced by mentor teachers and principals. One area that received lower ratings than other areas was the item on preparation for assessment. There was also one lower rating on preparation of working with families. These items are noted, and we will continue to emphasize them in relevant course assignments and experiences. Secondary English will offer a course in Young Adult Literature. This course will have a significant amount of technology incorporated and will focus on non-traditional texts such as graphic novels, and digital narratives. For Music, the statewide OSAT Vocal Music scores are considerably lower than the Instrumental Music scores. Much technology has been added to the music department this past year. Social Studies reports a 100% pass rate on OSAT. Changes to make the Earth Systems course include areas related to Physical Geography are in the works. Changing the Political Geography of the Modern World course to the Age of Imperialism and Decolonization to incorporate the political geography will take place as well. The Science department is considering changing the Natural Science degree to include an environmental studies emphasis. The OGET scores show that Math and Math Computation are high areas for our students with Writing being a low. USAO had a failure rate of 21% which is higher than years past. This same trend showed to be true on the OPTE with a pass rate of 68% on the PK-8 but a pass rate of 100% on the 6-12 OPTE. OSAT scores showed that on Elementary Subtest 1 we have 91% pass rate compared to the State's 88% and on Subtest 2 we had 100% pass rate compared to the State's 88%. Early Childhood showed a 93% pass rate compared to the State's 69%. Some of the comments from students were about including more grammar and sentence structure in Writing I and Writing II courses. USAO has implemented a rubric for Writing I and Writing II and will have data available in the summer of 2019. OGET study guides were recommended for future test takers and a new version of this study guide was purchased and placed in the library. OPTE scores, according to candidates, could be improved by having more practice with constructed response in their coursework. Strengths reported included lesson planning, and classroom management skills.

First year teachers reported being prepared in classroom management, co-teaching and working with families. Some felt unprepared in certain coursework.

Options used 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 reported that their administrator could not tell they were a first year teacher and they received excellent feedback from mentors and peers. Some of the concerns expressed were about including special needs children into the regular classroom, budget cuts, classroom interruptions, stress, and utilization of standards. Administrators report that our graduates work well with other teachers and families. Administrators also report that our graduates take suggestions and use feedback well. Concerns centered around classroom management as would be expected for 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 year period. 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 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.

Measures are widely shared with faculty annually at Fall Work Day and faculty 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 on campus. This data is also presented in several classes including EDUC 2002 Orientation to Teaching, EDUC 4442 Classroom Management/Evaluation Theory 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.**

Clinical I 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 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. 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?








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 field experience scores; c) analysis of portfolio scores. We discuss characteristics of candidates by groups such as ethnicity, gender, full or part time. We talk about candidate attrition and reasons that could be occurring. Student impact projects are discussed and how students scored. Graduate Follow up studies are analyzed, mentoring

experiences, first year principal ratings of recent graduates are analyzed as well. After the Fall Work Day, each area (elementary, early childhood, deaf education, science, math, PE, music, English) meet to discuss specific strengths and weaknesses and how to make adjustments. After each area looks at their specific data, they report to the Division Chair what changes they plan to make and assess for the following term. These will be the focus of the Fall Work Day for the following year. Some examples of linking evidence/data back to program modifications include recommending that students wait to take the OPTE until they have taken classroom management, updates to the test prep sessions as the elementary standards were released, English is designing a course for Literature for Young Adults to address a need identified by secondary majors, music majors have been exposed to more technology, Social Studies is redesigning a course to better suit the physical geography requirements of some of the testing. 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. Another data point that arose from data is to add more checkpoints throughout a candidate's progress. We plan to add additional checkpoints in Orientation to Teaching, additional requirements in Classroom Management and new checkpoints in Educational Psychology. As we move forward from a notebook and filebox portfolio to a digital format, the 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. The portfolio handbook has been rewritten to indicate the changes from print to digital format. 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 in 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 environment and engages students in learning can be measured by including these items in a digital portfolio. This portfolio conveys to 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
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 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

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  CEOE\_OGET\_Results.doc
-  CEOE\_OPTE\_612\_Results1.doc
-  CEOE\_OPTE\_PK8\_Results.doc
-  Fall\_Work\_Day\_2018.docx
-  Program\_Assessment\_Worksheet\_F\_18\_Deaf\_Ed.doc
-  Program\_Assessment\_Worksheet\_Original.doc
-  Portfolio\_Handbook\_Fall\_2018\_192019.doc

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 2019 EPP Annual Report.

**I am authorized to complete this report.**

### Report Preparer's Information

Name: Donna Gower

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

Phone: 405-574-1253

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 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 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**