Northwestern Oklahoma State University

Teacher Education Assessment Management System

T.E.A.M.S

Annual Report

2012-2013

Table of Contents

Introduction

The mission of the unit is to positively impact the P-12 schools in its service area through a program of applied professional pedagogy which leads to effective teachers and thus effective schools. The Unit believes that multiple assessments are necessary to determine whether it is accomplishing that mission. The assessment system has been developed through a process involving faculty, candidates, and the community at varied stages of its design, development, and implementation. During the spring of 2000, a committee was formed to align instruction, curriculum, and assessment with national, state, and institution standards. New APPLES competencies were identified based on national and state standards. Courses were then redesigned so that instruction and performance assessments were aligned with the APPLES competencies.

In the spring of 2002, a Standard 2 Committee was formed to develop an assessment system that was consistent with our Conceptual Framework (CF) and that complied with NCATE standards. The committee identified assessments that were currently being used and recommended additional assessments that would provide a holistic view of the Unit's candidates, faculty, and program. As a result of the work completed by the Standard 2 Committee, the Teacher Education Assessment Management System (TEAMS) committee was formed from the membership of the Teacher Education Committee to monitor and adjust the system as data continues to be collected and analyzed. One of the TEAMS committee key responsibilities is to provide continuous verification of the validity, reliability, and utility of the data and to ensure all candidate assessments are fair and free from bias. The system is designed to evaluate data regarding: (1) the assessment of candidates at the initial and the advanced levels, (2) Unit effectiveness, and (3) Unit governance.

The TEAMS committee meets annually to review the data and make recommendations to the appropriate entity. The committee reviewed data on September 28, 2012 and then made the recommendations that are the basis of this report. Appendix A is a copy of the instrument used to review data and record concerns and recommendations.

Committee Recommendations

The Teacher Education Assessment Management System (TEAMS) Committee on the basis of the review and subsequent evaluation of the data makes the following recommendations:

For the Teacher Education Committee

1. Complete revisions to teacher education admission interview questions.
2. Recommend to Teacher Education Faculty to advise candidates that a score of 22 on ACT may indicate additional studies prior to OGET, Academic Success Center is prepared to assist
3. Discuss issues of recruitment and advisement of incoming freshman with V. P. of Student Services

For the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies

1. Recommend ADGS work with graduate faculty to develop a performance assessment to demonstrate the candidate's impact on student learning
2. Examine the Curriculum & Instruction, M. Ed. course rotation for possible improvements to improve enrollment

For the Director of Assessment

1. Request University Director of Assessment system re-institute an Alumni Survey.
2. Work with the LiveText consultant to develop a method of gathering employer satisfaction data.

For the TEAMS Committee

1. Instruct appropriate personnel, i.e. program coordinators, to revise the scoring protocols for all key assessment to reflect a 3 point scale, rather than a 4 point scale.
2. Replace GRE/MAT as a key assessment with GPA
3. Replace graduate portfolio milestone data with data for program standards

2013 TEAMS Summary Information

Data Collection Point	Recommendation
I.A ACT or SAT	Continue making recommendations to continue advisement and study sessions that are offered by the Teacher Ed Faculty and the Academic Success Center. Consider adding GPA data to the

	comparison.
I.B Portfolio Benchmark 1	Include percentage pass rates in data for easier comparison.
I.C Teacher Education Interview	Data will need to be carefully scrutinized with the new piloted interview questions.
I.D Portfolio Benchmark 2	Continue with faculty advisement to reach a higher percentage.
I.E OGET	Begin tracking candidates who fail multiple times to see if they are taking advantage of the resources provided by NWOSU to prepare for the test. Analyze the sub scores of candidates completing general education classes at NWOSU.
I.F OSAT	Make data comparable to state data parameters. Suggest to program coordinators and all faculty to implement study sessions within coursework. Pilot study session in one program.
I.G Disposition	None at this time
I.H Student Teaching Evaluations	None at this time
I.I Portfolio Benchmark 3	Continue with faculty advisement to reach a higher percentage.
I.J OPTE	Continue with current practices.
I.K Portfolio Benchmark 4	Continue with faculty advisement to reach a higher percentage.
I.L Follow Up Surveys of Graduates	Prepare candidates for implementation of new InTASC standards when approved.
I.M Internship/Residency Year Evaluation Data from Employer, Cooperating Mentor Teacher, University Personnel	Move forward with implementing a survey of our own to have better results.
I.N Grade Point Average (GPA)	Use conditional candidate data to compare with OSAT test scores to see if there is a correlation. This correlation will be completed by the Graduate Studies Office.
I.O Portfolio Milestone 3	Track trends in future years.
II.A NWOSU Education Programs	Submit remaining data. Determine consistent way to report data for testing purposes to alleviate discrepancies.
II.B Graduate and Undergraduate Enrollment Data	
II.C Undergraduate Candidate Appeals	Ask TEF to advise candidates to take the OGET test in a timely manner.
II.D Graduate Candidate Appeals	Continue with addressing substitutions on a case by case basis.
II.E Course Rotation	
II.F Number of Substitutions	
II.G P-12 Student Learning	The rubric for initial candidates needs to be revised to the 3.0 scale to be consistent with all others.
II.H University Faculty Surveys	Clarify in the survey questions to emphasize the change from candidate to faculty member. Add a "comments" section to the survey.
II.I Alumni Surveys	
III.A Minutes of TEF Meetings	Continue meetings and documentation.

III.B Minutes of TEC Meetings	Continue meetings and documentation.
III.C Graduate Committee Meetings	None. The Graduate Committee works effectively to handle issues on a case-by-case basis that confront the Office of Graduate Studies and should continue on the same course.
III.D Faculty Appeals Data	
III.E Faculty Grievance Data	
III.F Resources	

Data can be viewed at https://www.livetext.com/

Visitor Pass: 91DB978A