

Northwestern Oklahoma State University
Teacher Education Assessment Management System
T.E.A.M.S
Annual Report
2014-2015

Table of Contents

Introduction.....3

Evaluation of Data.....Sections A to EE

Assessment of Candidates (Initial and Advanced)Sections A to Q

Unit Effectiveness.....Sections R to Y

Unit Governance.....Sections Z to EE

Committee Recommendations.....4

TEAMS Summary.....5

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 January 25, 2016, and then made the recommendations that are the basis of this report. Those in attendance were: **Community Members**--Todd Holder (Alva Businessman); Rhonda Cook (Retired Educator); Tim Argo (Alva Public Schools Principal); Absent--Darrin Slater (Northwest Technology Center) **Student**--Kendall Hadsell (NWOSU Graduate Student); **NWOSU Administration/Personnel**--Dr. Bo Hannaford (Dean, School of Professional Studies); Dr. Shawn Holliday (Associate Dean, Graduate Studies); Brooke Taylor (Director of Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness); Rebekah Wagenbach (Coordinator of Graduate Studies); **Division of Education**--Dr. Martie Young (Director of Student Teaching); Mrs. Christie Riley (Director of Teacher Education); Mrs. Natalie Miller (Assistant Certification Officer); Mrs. Melissa Brown (Secretary, Division of Education); Dr. Christee Jenlink (Chair, Division of Education)

2014-2015 TEAMS Committee Recommendations for Program Improvement

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

To the Teacher Education Committee

For Improvement in Candidate success:

1. Continue to advise if ACT scores were below 21 initial candidates should complete all General Education courses and study guides for OGET before taking the OGET
2. Convey to the General Education Committee the general education courses teacher education candidates need. Share scores with the General Education Committee and seek suggestions pertaining to the OGET
3. Provide additional information about student teaching placement during advisement and professional education courses
4. Monitor program rotations for needed changes
5. Continue to use the matrix of course equivalencies

For Improvement in Initial Program:

1. Revise the rubric for Benchmark 1, InTASC standard 2 artifact
2. Review the current admission interview questions to determine if there is alignment with the CAEP standards
3. Continue with inter-rater reliability training
4. Analyze and recommend the completion of specific courses in each program as pre-requisites for taking the OSAT
5. Focus on Constructed Response (writing) portion of state certification exams. Add writing component to professional education courses
6. Disaggregate disposition data by program. Consider adding a self-assessment as part of Benchmark 4 and requiring comments for scoring at the "acceptable" level (2) in addition to the "target" (3) and "unacceptable" (1) levels. Develop a process to track additional faculty dispositions completed outside the standard submissions

7. Review data after full implementation of the Assessment Design course at the initial level to determine impact on candidate's ability to assess student learning.
8. Collect data from the new 3.0 assessment of student teachers as aligned in InTASC standards
9. Place more emphasis on areas of instructional design, analysis of assessment, and reflection
10. Develop a recruitment plan to grow number of candidates in initial level program
11. Align program data with CAEP standards and eliminate any assessments that do not lend themselves to the alignment

To the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies

For Improvement in Advanced Program:

1. Compare GPA of conditional candidate data with OSAT when data is available
2. Analyze and recommend the completion of specific courses in each program as pre-requisite for taking OSAT
3. Add focus on preparation for Constructed Response (writing) portion of state certification exams, i.e. add writing component to education courses
4. Disaggregate disposition data by program. Consider adding a self-assessment as part of Milestone 3 and requiring comments for scoring at the "acceptable" level (2) in addition to the "target" (3) and "unacceptable" (1) levels. Develop a process to track additional faculty dispositions completed outside the standard submissions.
5. Develop strategies to increase participation in surveys by employers of M.Ed. graduates.
6. Design a recruitment plan for advanced levels programs. Explore fast-track options for the M.Ed. Curriculum and Instruction option and establish new cohorts in different areas of Oklahoma. Continue school visitations for recruitment and marketing purposes by the associate dean of Graduate Studies and the graduate faculty.
7. Address appeals on a case-by-case basis.
8. Monitor program rotations for needed changes.
9. Align program data with CAEP standards and eliminate any assessments that do not lend themselves to the alignment

To the Director of Assessment

For Improvement in Initial & Advanced Program:

1. Working with the Office of Educational Quality & Accountability, implement strategies to have more administrator's complete survey(s) to determine school administrators' level of satisfaction with NWOSU teacher education graduates.
2. Develop strategies to increase participation in surveys by employers of M.Ed. graduates.

To the TEAMS Committee

1. Compile ACT/SAT and OGET data to reflect the number of individuals who took the OGET in addition to the pass rate
2. Review inter-rater reliability practices to ensure reliability of data at all levels, all programs

Data Collection Point	Recommendation
I.A ACT or SAT	<i>Continue to advise that if ACT score were below 21, they should complete all General Education courses and study guides for OGET before taking the test. If passing scores continue to reflect lower ACT score correlation, consider lowering score of 21. On the data sheet, put the number of individuals who took the OGET in addition to the pass rate (i.e. 3/4).</i>
I.B Portfolio Benchmark 1	<i>Revise the rubric used to assess the artifact to provide clarification to the candidates of how the artifact demonstrates InTASC standard 2.</i>
I.C Teacher Education Interview	<i>Review the current interview questions to determine if there is alignment with the new CAEP standards</i>
I.D Portfolio Benchmark 2	<i>Continue with inter-rater reliability training.</i>
I.E OGET	<i>The focus needs to continue to be on subarea 6 (writing) for intervention with candidates to improve the success rates as that test has more failing scores than any of the other subarea tests. Continue to convey to the General Education Committee the general education courses needed by teacher education candidates. Share scores with the General Education Committee and seek suggestions.</i>
I.F OSAT	<i>Programs coordinators will analyze and recommend the specific courses completed as a pre-requisite for taking OSAT.</i>
I.G Disposition	<i>Disaggregate the data by program at both the initial and advanced levels. Consider adding a self-assessment as part of Benchmark 4 and Milestone 3 and requiring comments for all scores. Develop a process to track additional faculty dispositions completed outside the standard submissions.</i>
I.H Student Teaching Evaluations	<i>Continue to collect data with the new 3.0 scale in order to have reliability of data using the revised form aligned with InTASC Standards for 2015-2016.</i>
I Portfolio Benchmark 3	<i>Carefully monitor future data to determine trends.</i>
I.J OPTE	<i>Collect data on the revised curriculum that added an assessment course and incorporate candidates writing constructive responses in all education courses.</i>
I.K Portfolio Benchmark 4	<i>Disaggregate data by InTASC standards to determine areas in need of improvement.</i>
I.L Follow Up Surveys of Graduates	<i>Continue to prepare candidates for implementation of new InTASC standards. Compare the Office of Educational Quality and</i>

	<i>Accountability survey to NWOSU survey. Track data with the implementation of the assessment design course.</i>
I.M Internship/Residency Year Evaluation Data from Employer, Cooperating Mentor Teacher, University Personnel	<i>Consider and implement means by which to have more administrator's complete survey(s) to determine level of satisfaction with NWOSU teacher education graduates by school administrators.</i>
I.N Grade Point Average (GPA)	<i>Of the four candidates conditionally admitted to Graduate Studies, none have OSAT scores available for correlation at this time. Once such OSAT scores become available, the Graduate Office will correlate conditional candidate data with OSAT scores.</i>
I.O Portfolio Milestone 3	<i>Track trends in future years. Check CAEP standards to determine if any program data that does not align with P-12 students be eliminated.</i>
I.P Follow up Survey of Gradates-Advanced	<i>Continue attempts to get increased participation by employers of M.Ed. graduates. Continue tracking data to make sure that the M.Ed. programs continue to be viewed as excellent by candidates, graduates, and employers.</i>
II.A NWOSU Education Programs	<i>Review data after full implementation of the Assessment Design course at the initial level to determine impact on candidates' ability to assess student learning. Implement writing across the curriculum in advanced level courses to improve constructed response scores on the OSAT.</i>
II.B Graduate and Undergraduate Enrollment Data	<i>Design a recruitment plan for initial and advanced levels. Explore new fast-track options for the M.Ed. Curriculum and Instruction option as well as attempt to establish new cohorts in different areas of Oklahoma. The Associate Dean will continue school visitations for recruitment and marketing purposes. Education faculty members will become more involved with recruitment.</i> <i>The Curriculum and Instruction M.Ed. program is being changed to attract Alternative Certification candidates. New cohorts should be established for those seeking Standard Certification.</i>
II.C Undergraduate Candidate Appeals	<i>Provide additional information about student teaching placement during advisement and professional education courses.</i>
II.D Graduate Candidate Appeals	<i>Continue with addressing appeals on a case-by-case basis.</i>
II.E Course Rotation	<i>Program rotations will continue to be monitored for needed changes.</i>
II.F Number of Substitutions	<i>Continue to use the matrix of course equivalencies.</i>
II.G P-12 Student Learning	<i>Place more emphasis on areas of Instructional Design, Analysis of Assessment, and Reflection for initial candidates.</i>

II.H University Faculty Surveys	<i>None at this time.</i>
II.I Alumni Surveys	<i>Consider and implement means by which to have more administrator's complete survey(s) to determine level of satisfaction with NWOSU teacher education graduates. Work in partnership with OEQA on this process.</i>
III.A Minutes of TEF Meetings	<i>Continue meetings and documentation. Note: There was no January, 2015, TEF meeting due to a number of illnesses on the part of the committee members.</i>
III.B Minutes of TEC Meetings	<i>Continue meetings and documentation.</i>
III.C Graduate Committee Meetings	<i>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.</i>
III.D Faculty Appeals Data	<i>NA</i>
III.E Faculty Grievance Data	<i>NA</i>
III.F Resources	<i>Budgets are within university guidelines. No recommendations.</i>

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

Visitor Pass: 91DB978A