# 2022 Annual Accreditation Report

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

## Section 1. EPP Profile Updates in AIMS

Please review the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS and update the following information for: Contact Persons, EPP Characteristics, Program Listings. [See the Annual Report Technical Guide for additional guidance.]

### 1.1 Update Contact Information in AIMS:

1.1.1 I confirm that the EPP has listed and updated the contact information for the individual(s) designated as "EPP Head."

[The individual(s) identified as the EPP head should have authority over the EPP. This contact may receive time-sensitive communications related to the accreditation of the EPP.]

Agree Disagree
◉ ○

1.1.2 I confirm that the EPP has listed and updated the contact information for the individual(s) designated as "CAEP Coordinator".

[The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in coordinating accreditation activities. This contact may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.]

Agree Disagree
◉ ○

1.1.3 I confirm that the EPP has provided updated contact information for two distinct people for these roles.

[CAEP requires that EPPs provide information for two distinct contact persons to ensure that automatic communications sent from AIMS are received by the EPP in the event of personal turnover.]

Agree Disagree
◉ ○

### 1.2 Update EPP Information in AIMS:

1.2.1 *Basic Information* - I confirm that the EPP's basic information (including mailing address and EPP name) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS.

[The individual(s) identified as the EPP head should have authority over the EPP. This contact may receive time-sensitive communications related to the accreditation of the EPP.]

Agree Disagree
◉ ○

1.2.2 *EPP Characteristics and Affiliations* - I confirm that the EPP characteristics and affiliations (including Carnegie classification, EPP type, religious affiliation, language of instruction, institutional accreditation, and branch campuses/sites) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS

[The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in coordinating accreditation activities. This contact may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.]

Agree Disagree
◉ ○

1.2.3 *Program Options* - I confirm that EPP's program listings (including program name, program

review level, certificate level, program category, and program review option) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS for all EPP programs that fall within CAEP's scope of accreditation; (programs outside of CAEP's scope of accreditation should be archived and not listed in AIMS).

Agree Disagree

## Section 2. EPP's Program Completers [Academic Year 2020-2021]

**2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in P-12 settings during Academic Year 2020-2021?**

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to <u>initial</u> teacher certification or licensure[1]

`19`

2.1.2 Number of completers in <u>advanced</u> 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]

`0`

**Total number of program completers**  19

---

[1] For a description of the scope for Initial and Advanced programs, see Policy II in the CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

Please report on any substantive changes that have occurred at the EPP/Institution or Organization, as well as the EPP's current regional accreditation status.

**Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2020-2021 academic year?**

3.1 Has there been any change in the EPP's legal status, form of control, or ownership?
○ **Change** ◉ **No Change / Not Applicable**

3.2 Has the EPP entered a contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach out agreements?
○ **Change** ◉ **No Change / Not Applicable**

3.3 Since the last reporting cycle, has the EPP seen a change in state program approval?
○ **Change** ◉ **No Change / Not Applicable**

3.4. What is the EPP's current regional accreditation status?

Accreditation Agency:

Higher Learning Commission (HLC)

Status:

Accredited 2022

Does this represent a change in status from the prior year?
○ **Change** ◉ **No Change / Not Applicable**

3.5 Since the last reporting cycle, does the EPP have any other substantive changes to report to CAEP per CAEP's Accreditation Policy?
○ **Change** ◉ **No Change / Not Applicable**

# Section 4. CAEP Accreditation Details on EPP's Website

Please update the EPP's public facing website to include: 1) the EPP's current CAEP accreditation status with an accurate listing of the EPP's CAEP (NCATE, or TEAC) reviewed programs, and 2) the EPPs data display of the CAEP Accountability Measures for Academic Year 2020-2021.

## 4.1. EPP's current CAEP (NCATE/TEAC) Accreditation Status & Reviewed Programs

*4.1 Provider shares a direct link to the EPP's website where information relevant to the EPP's current accreditation status is provided along with an accurate list of programs included during the most recent CAEP (NCATE or TEAC) accreditation review.*

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

## 4.2. CAEP Accountability Measures (for CHEA Requirements) [2020-2021 Academic Year]
Provider shares a direct link to its website where the EPP's display of data for the CAEP Accountability Measures, as gathered during the 2020-2021 academic year, are clearly tagged, explained, and available to the public.

CAEP Accountability Measures (for CHEA Requirements) [2020-2021 Academic Year]

- **Measure 1 (Initial): Completer effectiveness. (R4.1)**Data must address: (a) completer impact in contributing to P-12 student-learning growth **AND** (b) completer effectiveness in applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
- **Measure 2 (Initial and Advanced): Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement. (R4.2|R5.3| RA4.1)**
  Data provided should be collected on employers' satisfaction with program completers.
- **Measure 3 (Initial and Advanced): Candidate competency at completion. (R3.3)**
  Data provided should relate to measures the EPP is using to determine if candidates are meeting program expectations and ready to be recommended for licensure. (E.g.: EPP's Title II report, data that reflect the ability of EPP candidates to meet licensing and state requirements or other measures the EPP uses to determine candidate competency at completion.)
- **Measure 4 (Initial and Advanced): Ability of completers to be hired** (in positions for which they have prepared.)

CAEP Accountability Measures (Initial) [LINK] https://usao.edu/academics/education-and-speech-language-pathology/index.html

CAEP Accountability Measures (Advanced) [LINK] No Link Provided

# 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. The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.

**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. EPP's Continuous Improvement & Progress on (advanced level) Phase-in Plans and (initial-level) Transition Plans

Please share any continuous improvement initiatives at the EPP, AND (if applicable) provide CAEP with an update on the EPP's progress on its advanced level phase-in plans and/or initial level transition plans.

**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 two major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

Our 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, program standards, and consider our progress towards improvements for our candidates, our programs, our EPP, our institution, our partnering schools, and our society. For our Teacher Education Fall Work Day, we review available data on our candidates' pass rates and Mean Total Scores on Certification Exams for Oklahoma Educators (CEOE) from Pearson and on the newest certification exam requirement, the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT) from ETS, in comparison with statewide 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. 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 improving programs and preparation of our teacher candidates. Our 2021 Fall Work Day was again conducted virtually due to the continued concerns and uncertainties of the pandemic. Each Teacher Education Program Report Compiler was provided with the following data (if applicable for their program during the years reviewed):
1. Attachment A - Major GPA of your program graduates by year
2. Attachment B – OSAT Pass Rates of your program candidates by year
3. Attachment C – PPAT Pass Rate for 2020-2021
4. CEOE OSAT Scores for your program candidates
5. CEOE OSAT Scores and Subscores 20-21 USAO Verified Examinees & Statewide Verified
6. Demographics Data 2020
7. Admission to Teacher Education by program 2017-2021
8. Graduation Rate 20-21
9. PPAT Breakdown USAO EPP Fall 2020 – Spring 2021 Candidates
10. PPAT Scores by program area
11. Teacher Education Grads Summary Data F18-Sp21
12. Copies of USAO Professional Trimester Candidate Teacher Preparation Surveys completed by your program graduates

Fall Work Day 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, new legislative or certification requirements, or needs from candidates, faculty, programs, the EPP, the institution, our partnering schools, or society.
For the 2020-2021 Academic Year, the EPP is most proud of the successful implementation of the new certification exam, the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT). Although this certification exam was not to be an Oklahoma statewide requirement for certification until beginning in September 2021, USAO decided to implement the PPAT as a program requirement beginning in the fall of 2020. Our pass rate was a success in both Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 semesters. We had all but one candidate pass the PPAT each semester. Since the pass rate cut score is the highest at 38 (with only one other state, North Carolina, currently requiring a 38), we feel that this is a notable accomplishment for our EPP, especially so early on in our implementation of this new certification exam requirement.

Another notable success for our EPP for 2020-2021 is our increased recruitment efforts that appear to be paying off in the 2021-2022 Academic Year. Our enrollment of students pursuing teacher certification programs has been on the rise. Our early Professional Education courses, such as Orientation to Teaching, have shown significant increases in enrollment, especially in fall of 2021. We hope that this trend continues. It has been challenging to recruit in our normal methods during a pandemic, but we have conducted many Zoom enrollment and advisement sessions.

The EPP continues to recognize a noted recommendation for increased attention and preparation in classroom management after review of 2020-2021 First Year Teacher Surveys from Administrators/Mentors. We have recently revised the curriculum for our EDUC 4442 Classroom Management and Evaluation Theory course and are still considering the possibility of increasing the credit hours of that course. We were able to add a section of the Classroom Management and Evaluation Theory course for the Summer 2022 semester as we had reported hoping for in our last year's CAEP annual report. Despite uncertainties with the pandemic and budget complications, we were able to hire an additional faculty member who will be teaching the course as an adjunct in the summer, but she will be full-time Education faculty beginning in the fall of 2022. Analysis of the First Year Teacher Surveys also indicated a recommendation for increased preparation for teaching English Language Learners and for increased preparation in

assessment. We have discussed opportunities for increasing preparation in these areas and will follow-up with these enhancement opportunities. The EPP noted that the PPAT and supports increased attention in these areas, so as we advance in our implementation of this performance assessment, we will utilize opportunities for increased preparation. We will continue to strive to reflect on data and experiences in order to make improvements to our candidates' preparation and to our EPP as a whole.

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

◉ Yes   ○ No

6.1.3 Optional Comments

The following items are attached below:
Document of USAO's EPP 4 CAEP Annual Reporting Measures for 2022
USAO's First Year Teacher (FYT) Administrator/Mentor Survey Report for 2020-2021 Academic Year
USAO's EPP Program Assessment Worksheet Template 2021 (utilized for each program area following Fall Work Day)
USAO's EPP Fall Work Day Agenda for 2021
Copy of USAO's 2022 EPP Annual Report for the Oklahoma Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA)

**R3.1 Recruitment**
**R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression**
**R3.3 Competency at Completion**
**R4.1 Completer Effectiveness**
**R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers**
**R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers**
**R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement**
**R5.4 Continuous Improvement**

**Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.**

📎 **EPP_CAEP_Annual_Reporting_Measures_2022__USAO.pdf**

📎 **University_of_Science_and_Arts_of_Oklahoma_OEQA_FYT_ADMIN_MENTOR_SURVEY_2021_Report.pdf**

📎 **Program_Assessment_Worksheet_Template_2021.pdf**

📎 **Fall_Work_Day_Agenda_2021.pdf**

📎 **USAO_2022__EPP_Annual_Report_for_OEQA.pdf**

## Section 8: Feedback for CAEP & Report Preparer's Authorization

**8.1 . [OPTIONAL] Just as CAEP asks EPPs to reflect on their work towards continuous improvement, CAEP endeavors to improve its own practices. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information to identify areas of priority in assisting EPPs.**

8.1.1 What semester is your next accreditation visit?
Fall 2023

8.1.2 Does the EPP have any questions about CAEP Standards, CAEP sufficiency criteria, or the CAEP accreditation process generally?
The EPP has recently requested (at the state level) the dates of November 5-7, 2023 for our accreditation visit, and the Oklahoma Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA) has approved availability for these dates. Will these dates also work for CAEP?

I am the current Director of Teacher Education, and this will be my first time leading the CAEP accreditation visit. I am certain that I will have questions as we progress through this process. I appreciate all of the guidance and advice CAEP can offer.

**8.2 Preparer's authorization.** *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2022 EPP Annual Report, and that the details provided in this report and linked webpages are up to date and accurate at the time of submission..*

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

**Report Preparer's Information**

Name:  Dr. Sarah Layman

Position:  Chair, Division of Education & SLP; 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.

☑ **Acknowledge**