Northwestern Oklahoma State University

Teacher Education Assessment Management System

T.E.A.M.S

Annual Report

2015-2016

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.

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 recommended on January 25, 2016, for the 2015-2016 data review, a sub-committee analyze and make recommendations to the full TEAMS committee. The sub-committee met on January 23, 2017, to complete the charge of the full committee. Those in attendance at the sub-committee meeting

were: Dr. Christie Riley, Ms. Roxann Clark, Dr. Sheila Brintnall, Mrs. Natalie Miller, Mrs. Melissa Brown, and Dr. Christee Jenlink. The full committee reviewed data on February 8, 2017, making recommendations that are the basis of this report. Those in attendance were: **Community Members**--Rhonda Cook (Retired Educator); Tim Argo (Alva Public Schools Principal); Absent-Darrin Slater (Northwest Technology Center); Absent-Todd Holder, Alva Businessman; **Student**--Andrea Long (NWOSU Graduate Student); **NWOSU Administration/Personnel**--Dr. Bo Hannaford (Vice President, Academic Affairs); Dr. Shawn Holliday (Associate Dean, Graduate Studies); Brooke Fuller (Director of Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness); Lydia Campbell (Coordinator of Graduate Studies); **Division of Education**--Dr. Martie Young (Director of Student Teaching); Dr. Christie Riley (Director of Teacher Education); Mrs. Natalie Miller (Assistant Certification Officer); Mrs. Melissa Brown (Secretary, School of Education); Dr. Christee Jenlink (Associate Dean, School of Education)

<div align="center">

2015-2016 TEAMS Committee Recommendations for Program Improvement

</div>

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 score is 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. Work with general education course faculty, particularly those who teach writing courses, to improve the success rate of the OGET subarea test in writing.

4. Continue to provide policy and procedures information to candidates.

5. Further work needed with faculty to ensure cohesive academic terminology is used within the EPP.

6. Monitor program rotations for any needed changes.

7. Continue to use the matrix of course equivalencies.

8. Faculty will counsel candidates of expectations for portfolio benchmark requirements including the ability to demonstrate both understanding and application InTASC standards through artifacts and reflective commentary.

9. Review the results of the OPTE to determine the impact of curriculum revisions targeting OPTE competencies.

For Improvement in Initial Program:

1. Review data after full implementation of the Assessment Design course at the initial level to determine impact on candidates' ability to assess student learning.

2. Revise the current admission interview questions to align with the CAEP standards.

3. Continue with inter-rater reliability training.

4. Compare benchmarks data of artifacts aligned with InTASC standards to determine the candidate's' ability to differentiate understanding of standards from application of standards.

5. At benchmark one, the faculty member who assesses must counsel with any initial level candidate whose personal assessment is an "unacceptable." A copy of the assessment will be placed in the candidate's file. Any time a faculty member assesses a candidate as "unacceptable" on the disposition, the form must be printed, signed by the candidate and turned in to the Division of Education office to be placed in the candidate's folder. During the student teaching semester, two dispositions will be required, one at mid term and on at the end of the term.

6. Program coordinators will analyze and recommend the specific courses completed as a pre-requisite for taking the OSAT.

7. Collect data with the 3.0 scale for assessment of student teaching. Use data to analyze reliability of assessment of the student teacher by the assessors. Also review alignment of the student teaching assessment to InTASC standards.

8. Develop a recruitment plan to increase the number of candidates in initial level programs (CAEP Standard 3.0).

9. Continue to revise course rotations so programs are offered in a time frame that is reasonable to advanced candidates.

10. Design a vigorous recruitment plan for initial level enrollment that includes early outreach to high school students.

11. Review first year teacher survey results (teacher and administrator/mentor) after full implementation of the educational technology class and the assessment design class as part of the preparation program. Emphasize the importance of involvement in professional development activities to initial level candidates, particularly during the student teaching experience.

To the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies

For Improvement in Advanced Program:

1. Compare GPA of conditional candidate data with OSAT when data are available.

2. Analyze and recommend the completion of specific courses in each program as pre-requisite for taking OSAT.

3. Implement writing across the curriculum in advanced level courses to improve constructed response scores on the OSAT.

4. Track trends in future years. Check CAEP standards to determine if any program data not aligned with P-12 students can be eliminated.

5. Continue to develop strategies for increased participation by employers of M.Ed. graduates. Continue tracing data to ensure the M.Ed. programs are viewed as excellent by candidates, graduates, and employers.

6. Address appeals on a case-by-case basis.

7. Monitor program rotations for needed changes.

8. Align program data with CAEP standards and eliminate any assessments that do 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 administrators' 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	Continue to recommend if ACT score is below 21, completion of 80% of the General Education courses and use of study guides for OGET prior to taking the test. Monitor the impact of the new English lab courses in conjunction with the general education English Composition courses. CAEP has approved a waiver for institutions in Oklahoma stating ACT scores requirements for candidate cohorts in teacher education will not have to be followed and used as criteria for admission. CAEP has accepted the OGET in lieu of ACT to determine candidate admission

I.B Portfolio Benchmark 1	Further training in use of the scoring protocol. Compare assessment results of the <u>understanding</u> of InTASC 2 assessed in Benchmark 1 versus <u>application</u> in Benchmark 4.
I. C Teacher Education Interview	Revise interview questions for alignment with CAEP standards
I.D Portfolio Benchmark 2	Faculty continue counseling candidates of the expectations of Benchmark 2. Compare assessment results of <u>understanding</u> of InTASC standard 1 versus <u>application</u> of the standard in Benchmark 4.
I.E OGET	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, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and seek suggestions.
I.F OSAT	Program coordinators will analyze and recommend the specific courses completed as a pre-requisite for taking OSAT.
I.G Disposition	At benchmark one, the faculty member who assesses must counsel with any initial level candidate whose personal assessment is an "unacceptable." A copy of the assessment is placed in the candidate's file. Any time a faculty member assesses a candidate as "unacceptable" on the disposition, the form must be printed, signed by the candidate and turned in to the Division of Education office to be placed in the candidate's folder. During the student teaching semester, two dispositions will be required, one at mid-term and on at the end of the term.
I.H Student Teaching Evaluations	Collect data with the 3.0 scale for assessment of student teaching. Use data to analyze reliability of assessment of the student teacher by assessors and alignment to InTASC standards.
I Portfolio Benchmark 3	Monitor future data to determine trends.
I.J OPTE	In 2016-2017 review the results of the OPTE to determine the impact of curriculum revisions targeting OPTE competencies.
I.K Portfolio Benchmark 4	Monitor future data to determine trends. Reiterate the importance of successful completion of Benchmark 4 in order to graduate.
I.L Follow Up Surveys of Graduates	Review survey results after full implementation of the educational technology class and the assessment design class as part of the preparation program. Continue to emphasize the importance of involvement in professional development activities to initial level candidates, particularly during the student teaching experience. Survey results from 2016-2017 will provide pertinent data for candidates' ability to implement InTASC standards as candidates will have matriculated through the full program as aligned with InTASC by that time.
I.M Internship/Residency Year Evaluation Data from Employer, Cooperating Mentor Teacher, University Personnel	Review first year teacher survey results from administrator/mentor. Note trends in quantitative and qualitative responses and forward to faculty within programs.
I.N Grade Point Average (GPA)	Continue to monitor GPA admission requirements for initial level candidates to ensure accreditation requirements, specifically those pertaining to CAEP Standard 3, are being followed. A recruitment plan will be designed and implemented for the 2017-2018 academic year and will include GPA requirements as set by CAEP. Advanced candidates conditionally admitted meet established criteria for full admission. Grade point averages and OSAT

	scores of advanced candidates will be analyzed to determine if there is a correlation with conditionally admitted candidates.
I.O Portfolio Milestone 3	Track trends in future years. Check CAEP standards to determine if any program data not aligned with P-12 students can be eliminated.
I.P Follow up Survey of Gradates-Advanced	Continue to develop strategies for increased participation in the survey by employers of M.Ed. graduates. Continue tracing data to ensure the M.Ed. programs are viewed as favorably by candidates, graduates, and employers.
II.A NWOSU Education Programs	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.R
II.B Graduate and Undergraduate Enrollment Data	Design a vigorous recruitment plan for initial level enrollment that includes early outreach to high school students. Inform potential advanced candidates the quality of programs at NWOSU. Continue to revise course rotations so programs are offered in a time frame that is reasonable to advanced candidates.
II.C Undergraduate Candidate Appeals	Continue to provide policy and procedures information to candidates.
II.D Graduate Candidate Appeals	Continue with addressing appeals on a case-by-case basis
II.E Course Rotation	Program rotations will continue to be monitored for any needed changes.
II.F Number of Substitutions	Continue to use the matrix of course equivalencies.
II.G P-12 Student Learning	Further work needed on using cohesive academic terminology within the EPP.
II.H University Faculty Surveys	NA
II.I Alumni Surveys	NA
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	NA
III.E Faculty Grievance Data	NA
III.F Resources	NA

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

Visitor Pass: 91DB978A