

# 2012 Part C of the AACTE / NCATE Annual Report

## Institutional Information

<b>NCATE ID:</b>	15831	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	3658
<b>Institution:</b>	Oral Roberts University		
<b>Unit:</b>	School of Education		

## Section I. Program Completer

How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2011-2012 academic year (September 1, 2011-August 31, 2012) ?

39

Include candidates who

- completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license,
- are licensed teachers who completed a graduate program, and
- completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, reading specialist, and other specialties in schools.

Include the candidates who have completed a bachelor's, post-bachelor's, master's, specialist, or doctoral program. Programs may or may not be tied to a state license or credential.

## Section II. Display of Candidate Performance Data

Where is candidate performance data displayed on your institution's website?

Title II Reports:

[http://www.oru.edu/academics/college\\_of\\_education/title\\_reports.php](http://www.oru.edu/academics/college_of_education/title_reports.php)

Oklahoma Certification Test Results:

[http://www.oru.edu/academics/college\\_of\\_education/graduate\\_program/pdfs/cert\\_exam\\_scores\\_201112.pdf](http://www.oru.edu/academics/college_of_education/graduate_program/pdfs/cert_exam_scores_201112.pdf)

## Section III. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your institution or unit during the 2011-2012 academic year?

1. Addition or removal of a preparation program at any level (e.g., a master degree).

No Change / Not Applicable

2. 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

3. 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

4. Increased in program offerings for education professionals at off-campus sites both within and outside the United States.

No Change / Not Applicable

5. Significant changes as the result of a natural disaster or other unforeseen circumstances.

No Change / Not Applicable

6. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in Delivery of a program in whole or in significant part by a non-profit or for-profit partner

No Change / Not Applicable

7. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in Budget

The budget increased substantially because we added the endowment income and private gifts, private grant and private contract to this year's budget.

8. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in Candidate enrollment

No Change / Not Applicable

9. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in Size of the full-time faculty  
No Change / Not Applicable

## Section IV. Areas for Improvement

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

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)

During the 2010-2011 school year the unit revised its assessment system to better reflect the ELCC standards. The newly designed assessment systems has been fully implemented.

The assessment system data reflects distinctive rubric defined criterion. Many of the artifacts address multiple ELCC standards / elements and are assessed multiple times with ELCC element specific rubrics. Each criterion assessment is based on a 1-4 point scale. The scale is defined by an ELCC element specific rubric with the 4 delineation points being: 1 = Unacceptable, 2 = Acceptable, 3 = Competent, 4 = Exemplary.

The data are reviewed twice a year. These reviews inform the unit leadership of artifact quality, program related issues, and identify program strengths and weaknesses. The data from each review is discussed as part of a Graduate Counsel meeting. This assessment data is analyzed systematically and informs the Graduate Counsel of needed areas for program improvement as well as often suggesting program improvement strategies.

## Section V: Continuous Improvement Pathway

1. Check the standard your unit has selected to move toward target level for your next onsite visit.

☐ Std. 1

☒ Std. 2

☐ Std. 3

☐ Std. 4

☐ Std. 5

☐ Std. 6

2. Summarize progress toward target level performance on the standard(s) selected.

The unit has completed its ninth year having fully implemented the new assessment system using electronic portfolios at the initial program level and the fifth year at the advance level for full implementation and data evaluation.

The unit revised the entire assessment system in order to align it with the new InTasc Standards and to eliminate unnecessary assessments. Additionally, a new section (Intermediate Level – Part II) was created to better reflect assessments needed at the program level. Unit faculty worked together to revise the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) to reflect current language and research.

The unit continues to work to improve its assessment system. The unit has fully implemented the newly revised assessment system and was able to pull data for the 13 program reports submitted for review. The unit is piloting the an electronic student teaching evaluation system with the goal of working out the bugs and fully implementing the new systems for all teacher candidates fall 2013. The electronic form will allow the unit to aggregate and disaggregate data by criterion and by major.

3. Summarize data to demonstrate that the unit continues to meet Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation in the area of unit operations. Submit sample data/evidence/exhibits, one or two samples.

The unit utilized data from its assessment system to prepare 13 program reports submitted February 15, 2013. Examples of summarized data are as follows:

In mathematics education, all candidates complete the Teacher Work Sample During the first student teaching placement, ORU students must complete a Teacher Work Sample (TWS). This research involves seven components and is 50% of a senior seminar course in education. The teacher work sample has been divided into two parts for this report: Assessment #3 (Factors 1 – 3) and Assessment #5 (Factors 4 – 7), with a focus on Factors 1-3. Factors 1 through 3 of the Teacher Work Sample are aligned with NCTM NCATE Standards (2012) 3-Content Pedagogy (3a, 3b, 3c, 3e, 3f, 3g), 4-Mathematical Learning Environment (4b, 4c, 4d, 4e), and 5-Impact on Student Learning (5b). The data from program completers shows consistent achievement at the exemplary and competent level demonstrating the ability of the candidates to meet NCTM NCATE Standards 3-Content Pedagogy (3a, 3b, 3c, 3e, 3f, 3g), 4-Mathematical Learning Environment (4b, 4c, 4d, 4e), and 5-Impact on Student Learning (5b) at a high level. Candidates can plan instruction effectively by applying knowledge of curriculum standards, including multiple instructional strategies, creating developmentally appropriate learning opportunities, incorporating knowledge of individual differences, and

planning multiple means of assessment so that all students' have the opportunity to develop mathematical understanding and proficiency.

An example of assessment data used to inform unit level changes is the Teacher Work Sample. Data for the TWS is summarized across all programs to look for trends. In looking at the data, candidates scored worse on Factor 5: Technology. Fourteen percent of those assessed scored at the unacceptable level. Given that the assessment is administered for seniors, this was quite alarming for the unit. As a result, the unit has redesigned its program to include a technology seminar earlier in the program in addition to the course taken during the senior level. Data reports will be reviewed again this fall to see if the scores are better (see TWS Data).

Exhibits that support the narrative:  Unit Teacher Work Sample  Math TWS Factors 1-3

## Report Preparer's Information

Name: Dr. Kim Boyd

Phone: (918) 495-7108

E-mail: kboyd@oru.edu