2023 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

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

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 be authorized to receive time-sensitive CAEP-accreditation related communications.]

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 is primarily assigned the role in coordinating accreditation activities. This contact may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head and should be authorized by the EPP to receive CAEP-accreditation related communications.]

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 at least two distinct contact persons to ensure that automatic communications sent from AIMS are received by the EPP in the event of personnel 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 licensure area listings (including program title, licensure level, degree or certificate level, licensure(program) category, and program review option) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS under Program Options, for all licensure areas that fall within CAEP's scope of accreditation; (programs outside of CAEP's scope of accreditation should either be marked as non-CAEP review or archived, as applicable, in AIMS).

Agree Disagree

Section 2. EPP's Program Graduates [Academic Year 2021-2022]

2.1 What is the total number of candidates who graduated from programs that prepared them to work in P-12 settings during Academic Year 2021-2022?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

`26`

2.1.2 Number of graduates 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 graduates 26

---

[1]In Section 2 of the Annual Report, the EPP will provide the total number of graduates who finished the program and licensing requirements in the academic year specified.

[2] 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 2021-2022 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

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 2021-2022.

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) [2021-2022 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 2021-2022 academic year, are clearly tagged, explained, and available to the public.

CAEP Accountability Measures (for CHEA Requirements) [2021-2022 Academic Year]

- **Measure 1 (Initial): Completer[3] 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.)

---

[3]For the CAEP Accountability Measures, the EPP will share information on the website pertaining to completer data per CAEP's definition of the term completer: "A candidate who successfully satisfied all program requirements of a preparation program at least six months previously and who is employed in a position for which they were prepared for state licensure."

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 annually reviews data for our entire unit and for individual programs specifically during a focused EPP-wide meeting to review this data each fall during our Fall Work Day. We also hold follow-up Program Assessment Meetings and report on program-specific considerations based on data. We summarize these changes annually for our EPP Annual Report to the Oklahoma Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA). A summary of these changes that have occurred or are in progress is provided here. Additional EPP-wide efforts continue in regards to enhancement of data collection, analysis, and the reporting process.
All Programs – 2021-2022
Our EPP continues to seek enhancement opportunities for preparing all candidates for the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT) in their Professional Trimester. USAO's 2021-2022 EPP PPAT pass rates (100% in Fall 2021 and 85.71% in Spring 2022; thus 89.47% or 17 out of 19 candidates passing in 2021-2022) continue to show success in these efforts with only two candidates not meeting the cut score after resubmission (Note – one of these candidates scored a 37, just one point below the passing score of 38). Candidate feedback continues to be more positive in connection with the PPAT preparation and support.
Our EPP continues to seek additional experiences in candidates' preparation for classroom management knowledge, skills, and dispositions. We have incorporated some enhancements in our Classroom Management and Evaluation Theory course. Our First Year Teacher Surveys graduates still express a recommendation for increased preparation in the area of classroom management, but that was marked as a concern from only one of our three program completers completing the survey. One area of concern noted by these three program completer FYT surveys is the area of increased preparation in working with children with exceptionalities. Two of the three program completers noted a desire to have increased preparation in working with students who are English language learners. The EPP is considering opportunities for enhancing our preparation in these areas as well. Curriculum in our Classroom Management course has recently been revised and enhanced to address concerns noted on previous years' FYT surveys, and the EPP will monitor these surveys to see if that continues to decrease as an area of concern. We are still carefully navigating potential options for increasing the credit load hours for this course since it has implications for the total number of hours for all programs.
Although technically occurring within the next annual reporting year, all EPP program areas with the exception of Deaf Education (CED recognition) and Music (NASM recognition) submitted program data for continuing approval through the State Program Review Report Process in Fall 2022. All programs were approved with the only condition being the additional submission of data in Fall 2023 for three programs without any current candidate data to submit (Math, P.E., and Science). Three programs were approved with distinction (Elementary Education, English, and Social Studies). Each program area's faculty members review program data and needs annually following our Teacher Education Fall Work Day, and recent areas of focus or changes for each program area are discussed and noted. Program-specific changes are also noted in each program area's report and highlights are noted in the following sections.
Art – Our Art with Teacher Certification degree program annually reviews candidate data as available and makes adjustments as needed. Both art candidates in 2021-2022 passed the PPAT. Our Art TE faculty member has made updates to assist candidates in preparing for the PPAT. The Art with Teacher Certification State Program Review with data for continuing approval was accepted and approved in October 2022.
Deaf Education – Deaf Education developed and received approval for the addition of a minor in Deaf Education and a minor in American Sign Language. They also made some course name changes and pre-requisite adjustments for several of the courses to better reflect what was taught and introduced in the courses and in these two new minors. Adjustments have been made to support candidates in the PPAT, and all but one candidate passed the PPAT in 2021-2022. Recent recruitment efforts have been enhanced since the pandemic.
Early Childhood – Our Early Childhood Education program continues to seek opportunities for increasing our pass rate on the Early Childhood Education OSAT. We have had some struggle to pass with just barely missing the cut score. We continue to offer OSAT prep sessions and hope to continue to see improvement. Our Early Childhood candidates have a 100% pass rate for 2021-2022, and we continue to seek enhanced preparation for this PPAT success. Adjustments and updates to classes are also in discussion as we continually seek improvement. Our Early Childhood Education State Program Review with data for continuing approval was accepted and recognized as approved in Fall 2022.
Elementary – Our Elementary Education continues to enhance preparation for the Elementary Education OSAT with more explicit preparation opportunities in classes and available study materials and prep sessions. Our OSAT pass rate has been at or above 80%, but we would like to see that percentage increase. Our PPAT pass rate for 2021-2022 was 100% for our Elementary Education candidates. We are also seeking opportunities to adjust some of our courses to better fit the needs of the program and candidates. Our Elementary Education State Program Review with data for continuing approval was approved with distinction in Fall 2022.
English – Our English with Teacher Certification program continues to seek enhancements to courses in order to better prepare candidates for certification exams and the teaching profession. With the elimination of OSAT scores from a candidate long ago who did not complete the program, our English OSAT pass rate for the last two years 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 with two candidates total would be 100%. Our PPAT pass rate for these candidates is also 100%. We hope to see this trend continue. Enhanced recruitment and advisement efforts are also underway with hopes for increasing the number of candidates seeking

certification in teaching English at the secondary level. Our English Education State Program Review with data for continuing approval was approved with distinction in Fall 2022.

Math – No major changes have been made to the Math with teacher certification program in the past year. Course description and number for Foundations of Geometry and Measurement are being updated to better align to the description on the CEP (Course Equivalency Project) and course number of equivalent courses at other state schools. There are plans to look at updating the requirements for both the general Math major and Math with teacher certification major to better align with similar majors at other institutions. We also have a goal of increasing enrollment in and completion of the Math with Teacher Certification degree program. Partnering school districts continue to express a concern with challenges in fulfilling Math teaching positions with traditionally and comprehensively prepared and certified individuals. We have not had a Math with teacher certification program completer in recent years and hope to change that. Our Math Education State Program Review was approved with conditions to submit data in Fall 2023 since data was not available.

Music – Our Music programs (Vocal and Instrumental) continue to seek enhancements to preparation for the OSAT and the PPAT with success in 100% pass rates for 2021-2022. The programs were recognized and received continued accreditation through Fall 2029 through the National Association of Schools of Music in July 2022.

Physical Education – Our recently hired Teacher Education faculty representative for the P.E. program has made updates and improvements to courses during her short time at USAO. She has also sought additional opportunities for candidate experiences in Pk-12 schools including developing a connection for adapted P.E. opportunities. It continues to be a concern that the number of P.E. candidates completing a full program is limited. Two candidates decided just before planned student teaching to switch to an alternative certification route due to job offers in coaching their desired sport within districts they desired. We have focused efforts to retain our candidates through full program completion and will have one completer from Fall 2022 to report. We hope that we can continue to increase the numbers moving forward. Our P.E. State Program Review without any data to report was approved with conditions of submitting data in Fall 2023.

Science – Our Science with Teacher Certification State Program Review was approved with conditions of reporting data in Fall 2023. There should be three completers to report on by that time. For 2021-2022, faculty have enhanced preparation for the PPAT. We also have hopes that recruitment efforts and the new Inspired to Teach Program stacked with the TSEIP for Math and Science Education majors will help to increase the number of Science Education program completers in coming years.

Social Studies - Additional emphasis has been placed on reviewing expectations of the PPAT and related terminology during the first two weeks of the Teaching Social Studies in Secondary School course. In addition, slight modifications were made to the 17 assessments used in this course that better reflect the new emphasis on the PPAT. We had a PPAT pass rate of 80% with only one out of five Social Studies candidates not passing the PPAT in the 2021-2022 academic year. Our Social Studies Education State Program Review with data for continuing approval was approved with distinction in Fall 2022.

6.1.2 Optional Comments

Our EPP does not have advanced level programs. Our EPP SSR was submitted in February 2023, and we are planning to receive our FFR sometime in June with our virtual Site Visit scheduled for early November. Our EPP faculty leading these accreditation reporting efforts are new to this role and are learning an immense amount during the process. We apologize for any errors resulting in a lack of awareness of the process, the expectations, or the technology in AIMS. Please, reach out to us with any questions or concerns so that we may learn and engage in continuous improvement in the accreditation reporting process.

R1.3 Instructional Practice
R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.3 Clinical Experiences
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 progress on phase-in/transition plans if applicable (This is optional and for the EPP's records as it prepares for the next CAEP review).

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 Questions: Does the EPP have any questions about CAEP Standards, CAEP sufficiency criteria, or the CAEP accreditation process generally?

The EPP had some questions and challenges with the AIMS reporting system during our SSR submission. Some standard language reflected the previous CAEP standards and reporting expectations. We are concerned that we may have reporting errors in relation to this confusion. We know that it is recommended to work outside of AIMS, and we followed that recommendation but encountered challenges during our time entering documents into the system. Is there grace given in errors in utilizing AIMS? We will definitely have more questions about the accreditation process once we receive our FFR. We are seeking options for easing the challenges and extensive time required for the reporting process. We have had discussions about how we would love to have direct templates or additional proprietary assessments with established validity and reliability checks by CAEP in order to ease some of the uncertainties and reporting time burden for EPPs. wishing to implement additional already approved direct review options much like PK-12 school districts are often required to utilize through their SDE. Our state has implemented data support options, but data can be delayed and hinder our cycle of review. The CAEP Workbook does offer detailed suggestions that we definitely appreciate, but if direct assessment or reporting template options would be possible for CAEP to implement or even require, we feel that EPPs would be able to more efficiently review and improve their programs in order to even more comprehensively prepare future teachers for excellence and sustainability in the teaching profession. Easing the time spent determining how to collect or report the data in an approved manner would allow for even more improvements and outstanding differences to be made in our programs. These are just thoughts coming out of discussions from faculty newbies to this accreditation reporting process. We absolutely believe that reviewing our programs and always reflecting on potential opportunities for improvement is essential, and we appreciate CAEP's continued efforts in this goal!

8.2 Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2023 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: Dean of the School of Education and Speech-Language Pathology, Director of Teacher Education

Phone: 405-574-1253

E-mail: slayman@usao.edu

Secondary Contact Person for Annual Report Feedback*(Notification of Annual Report Feedback will be sent to the report preparer and the secondary contact person listed to ensure receipt of feedback in the event of EPP turnover.)*

Name: Eileen Thomas

Position: Administrative Assistant for the School of Education and Speech-Language Pathology

Phone: 405-574-1328

E-mail: ethomas@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.

See CAEP Accreditation Policy

☑ **Acknowledge**