2011 Part C of the AACTE / NCATE Annual Report

Institutional Information

NCATE ID:	15831	**AACTE SID:**	3658
Institution:	Oral Roberts University		
Unit:	School of Education		

Section I - Completer

The total number of candidates who completed education programs within NCATE's scope (initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs) during the 2010-2011 academic year?

43

Please enter numeric data only.(Include the number of candidates who have completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2010-2011 academic year. They should include all candidates who completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license. It also includes licensed teachers who completed a graduate program and candidates who completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, school psychologist, reading specialist, and other specialties in schools. These include the candidates who have completed a bachelor's, post-bachelor's, master's, specialist, or doctoral program. The programs are not tied to a state license.)

Section II. Substantive Changes

Describe any of the following substantive changes that have occurred at your institution or unit during the past year:

1. Changes in program delivery from traditional to distance learning programs in which more than 50 percent of the courses are not delivered face-to-face.

No Change / Not Applicable

2. Change in control of institution. Please indicate any changes in control or ownership of the institution such as a merger with another institution, separation from an institution, purchase of an institution, etc.

No Change / Not Applicable

3. Increased offerings for the preparation of education professionals at off-campus sites and outside the United States.

No Change / Not Applicable

4. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in budget

No Change / Not Applicable

5. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in candidate enrollment

No Change / Not Applicable

6. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in size of the full-time faculty

No Change / Not Applicable

7. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in significant changes as the result of a natural disaster

No Change / Not Applicable

8. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in delivery of a program in while or in significant part by a non-profit or for-profit partner

No Change / Not Applicable

9. Addition or removal of a level of preparation(e.g., a master's degree).

No Change / Not Applicable

Section III. Areas for Improvement

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1.	The unit has inadequate assessment data for some of its programs.	(ADV)

II.1 Summarize activities, assessments and outcomes toward correcting AFI(s) cited in the last Accreditation Action Report, if applicable.

The Graduate School of Education continues to employ a multi-layered, ongoing assessment system that is aligned with the unit institutional and ELCC standards. Primary sources of data collection includes tracking and analyzing three rounds of master and doctoral level comprehensive exams annually, and use of electronic portfolios, or the Advanced Program Assessment System (APAS).

Since the implementation of the assessment system in spring 2002, the graduate department has continuously collected, analyzed, and utilized assessment data using a four point scale with 1 = Unacceptable, 2 = Acceptable, 3 = Competent, 4 = Exemplary. As of May 13, 2011, 605 artifacts had been collected from candidates, of which 88 percent have been assessed by the graduate faculty.

The data generated from the assessments are reviewed multiple times a year, with the most recent assessment meeting being held April 19-20, 2011. Topics included:
• Reviewing core course post assignments as they relate to ELCC aligned assessments
• Reviewing protocols and processes, past findings and recommendations
• Revision of the unit's institutional standards based on the new InTASC standards
• Establishing the preliminary steps for the redesign of the APAS 2011-12, which will include fewer artifacts, alignment with the revised unit IS and ELCC standards, and a transition year to move from APAS 2007 to APAS 2011-12.

Section IV: Units with Regular/Continuous Improvement Accreditation Option

C.1. Summarize evidence indicating progress toward target level performance on the standard(s) selected by the unit

⊖ Std. 1	♭ Std. 2	⊖ Std. 3	⊖ Std. 4	⊖ Std. 5	⊖ Std. 6

The unit is committed to moving toward the target level by continuously monitoring, evaluating, and improving an assessment system that is fully operational and used to inform changes at the unit, program and candidate levels. Data are gathered from multiple internal and external sources, and the unit has begun collecting data related to candidate competence beyond program completion, into the classrooms and schools. While data are regularly and systematically compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and disaggregated, the unit continues to investigate possible means, including use of information technologies for reporting data publically in ways that are mutually beneficial to our public and the unit.

The unit regularly involves its professional community to evaluate the capacity and effectiveness of its assessment system to ensure it reflects the conceptual framework and incorporates candidate proficiencies outlined in professional and state standards. The unit held an advisors' luncheon during the 2011 ORU Homecoming to give alumni an opportunity to provide feedback on the unit's conceptual framework as it relates to the ORU vision and its alignment to the state and national standards. Alumni were asked to review the conceptual framework in light of current practices in the field.

The unit examines the validity and utility of the data produced through assessments and makes modifications. Each semester unit faculty participate in Assessment Week activities. During the first half of the week faculty finish assessing artifacts that have been uploaded in electronic portfolios. By midweek, data are downloaded from the assessments, and the last two days of the week, faculty engage in discussions around the validity and utility of the data. Discussions also include updates on assessment technology and how to best utilize technology to better develop the assessment system, and what changes to make in light of the new InTASC standards .

The unit utilizes data from multiple sources and at multiple points in the program to evaluate and make decisions about candidate performance, its practices, and to inform changes. Data are generated primarily from candidate electronic portfolios at both the initial and advanced levels and comprehensive exam data at the advanced level. The Initial Portfolio Assessment Sheet (IPAS) and the Advanced Portfolio Assessment Sheet (APAS) provides a description of documents candidates upload into their ePortfolio to submit to faculty to be assessed. Data reports are then generated from the electronic portfolio database and analyzed by faculty members during Assessment Week, by candidates during Senior Day Activities, and by professional stakeholders during Cooperating Teacher Orientations (See IPAS Data Report, APAS Data Report).

C.2. Summarize data that demonstrate continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality in the area of content knowledge

Results from licensure exams, comprehensive exams, and follow-up surveys indicate continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality in the area of content knowledge.

The ORU College of Education teacher candidates consistently have had high passing scores on the Oklahoma Subject Area

Tests (OSAT). Testing results from the 2010-2011 school year revealed that 100 percent of program completers passed all components of the certification examination for initial teacher licensure, including the OSAT (See Title II Report).

Eleven advanced candidates took the Master's of Arts Comprehensive exams for the first time in the 2010-11 exam cycle. Three of the responses failed to pass. Three exams were taken as retakes. All of the retakes earned passing scores. Ten doctoral candidates took the exam for the first time in the 2010-11 exam cycle. Two of the candidates failed to pass. Six exams were taken as retakes. All of the retakes earned passing scores (See Comprehensive Exam Scores).

Data show a strong relationship of performance assessments to candidate success throughout their programs and later in classrooms or schools. The Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation (OCTP) conducts a survey of program completers and their administrators to provide feedback to the state department and to units regarding alumni and administrators' perceptions of the preparedness of teachers. While the return rate for the ORU is low in comparison to larger institutions, it is representative of the teachers who are employed in Oklahoma schools. This information has been invaluable to institutions. The results indicate that while candidates perceive they are very well prepared for the classroom, and 80 percent of administrators rated ORU first year teachers as excellent in the area of competence, 50 percent administrators rated ORU teachers at a level of adequately prepared using a rating scale of Not At All Prepared; Inadequately Prepared; Adequately Prepared; Well Prepared; Very Well Prepared, in the following category: Understands the State teacher evaluation process, "Oklahoma Criteria for Effective Teaching Performance," and how to incorporate these criteria in designing instructional strategies. Since the state has adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), and candidates are expected to be familiar with them, faculty have been making the transition from teaching the Oklahoma Criteria for Effective Teaching Performance to the CCSS; therefore it is logical that our candidates are less prepared to incorporate their instructional strategies (See ORU Administrators Survey Report - Page 7).

Exhibits that support the narrative: NCATE Part C Data Reports ORU Administrators Survey Report

Notes on C.2: Standard 1 will be the focus of the 2010-2011 Annual Report. Please submit sample data/evidence/exhibit(s) - no more than two - that demonstrate continuing to meet standard 1 related to content knowledge only. The sample can be from a single program but should be representative of the unit as whole. For selection of exhibits, please use NCATE's Exhibit List provided as a guide.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Dr. Kim Boyd
Phone: (918) 495-7108
E-mail: kboyd@oru.edu