

School of Teaching and Curriculum Leadership
Prepared by Dr. Pamela Fry

Degree Program(s) Assessed	Assessment Methods	Number of Individuals Assessed
<i>Bachelor of Science in Elementary, Secondary, and Technical and Industrial Education</i>	Performance on certification examinations for Oklahoma educators	
	OSAT	396
	OGET	351
	OPTe	214
	Performance on professional education portfolios that demonstrate the achievement of goals and competencies for beginning teachers	
	Submission I, II, & III Elementary	197
	Submission I, II, & III Secondary	212
	Student assessment of professional education preparation	55
	Performance of student teachers by cooperating teachers and university supervisors	
	Elementary level	74
Secondary level	54	
Master of Science in Teaching, Learning, and Leadership	Performance during first year of teaching (residency year)	252
	Survey of principals who recently hired program graduates	5
	Performance on advanced level, state certification examinations for Oklahoma educators	
	Reading Specialist	12
	Special Education	12
	Performance on comprehensive examinations	60
	Student assessment of graduate program preparation	57
	Performance on theses or creative component projects (master's level)	45
	Performance on qualifying examinations	11
	Student assessment of graduate program preparation	
Survey Respondents	3	
Focus-Group Interview	3	
Doctor of Philosophy in Education	Dissertations completed	11

Analysis and Findings:

Bachelor of Science in Elementary, Secondary, and Technical and Industrial Education

- (1) Performance on certification examinations for Oklahoma educators (Note: Each student may take more than one test and/or sub-areas of tests.) Tests measured pass rates of students during the July 2002 data through May 2003 period are reported.

The Oklahoma General Education Test (OGET) evaluates a) critical thinking skills in reading, communications, mathematics, writing; b) computation skills; c) liberal studies: science, art, and literature. The pass rate for OSU students (N=417) was 85%. The statewide pass rate was 79%.

The Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) evaluates content area competency of potential teachers for initial certification in elementary education, art education, foreign language education, English education, mathematics education, social studies education, and science education. The OSU pass and fail rates are as follows:

	<u>% OSU Pass Rate</u>	<u>% State Pass Rate</u>
Elementary Education (N=215)	95%	93%
Art (N=3)	100%	94%
Foreign Language (N=7)	86%	74%
English (N=39)	99%	89%
Mathematics (N=11)	82%	71%
Social Studies (N=35)	97%	82%
Science (N=43)	86%	74%
Psych/Soc (N=1)	100%	48%
Speech/Drama (N=1)	100%	88%

The OPTE (Oklahoma Professional Teaching Examination) evaluates each candidate's pedagogical knowledge.

	<u>% OSU Pass Rate</u>	<u>% State Pass Rate</u>
PK-8 (N=157)	97%	86%
6-12 (N=144)	93%	94%

The scores for OSU students on the OGET and OSAT exceeded the statewide average in each area. On the OPTE, students' performance exceeded the state average for PK-8 pre-service teachers and was within one percentage point of the state average for 6-12 pre-service teachers.

- (2) Performance on professional education portfolios

Students must demonstrate competencies related to the four core concepts of the OSU teacher preparation program (understanding of integration, diversity, professionalism, and lifelong learning) as well as the 16 Oklahoma General Competencies for Teachers. Each program requires an initial submission (Submission I), a pre-student teaching submission (Submission II), and a submission at the time of program completion (Submission III). Faculty and external reviewers, who were trained public school personnel, evaluated portfolios. Below, a summary of evaluations of Submission I for Spring 2003 is based on a scale as follows: 3=exceeds expectations, 2=meets expectations, and 1=needs improvement. Submission I requires students to write a philosophy of education essay and goals essay which discuss students' individualized ideas about their future teaching. Submission II and Submission III are also listed, and the same evaluative scale was utilized.

Elementary (N=67); Submission I	Percentage of Students By Scores		
Overall portfolio=2.41;	3-43%	2-55%	1-2%
Philosophy essay=2.15;	3-19%	2-78%	1-3%
Goals essay=2.27;	3-30%	2-69%	1-1%

Elementary (N=64); Submission II

Overall portfolio=2.75;	3-64%	2-34%	1-2%
Integration essay=2.33;	3-50%	2-36%	1-14%
Professionalism essay=2.29;	3-42%	2-41%	1-17%
Life-long Learning essay=2.29;	3-44%	2-38%	1-18%
Integration artifact=2.43;	3-47%	2-42%	1-11%
Diversity artifact=2.56;	3-53%	2-41%	1-6%
Professionalism artifact=2.42;	3-42%	2-52%	1-6%
Life-long artifact=2.38;	3-42%	2-48%	1-10%

Elementary (N=66); Submission III**(Note: See Appendix A for list of competencies, A-O.)**

Second philosophy=2.33;	3-23%	2-59%	1-18%
Artifact A=2.13;	3-39%	2-61%	1-0%
Artifact B=2.17;	3-26%	2-74%	1-0%
Artifact C=2.00;	3-41%	2-59%	1-0%
Artifact D=2.06;	3-39%	2-61%	1-0%
Artifact E=2.12;	3-33%	2-67%	1-0%
Artifact F=2.23;	3-21%	2-77%	1-2%
Artifact G=2.03;	3-6%	2-85%	1-9%
Artifact H=2.07;	3-6%	2-89%	1-5%
Artifact I=2.18;	3-21%	2-76%	1-3%
Artifact J=2.39;	3-39%	2-61%	1-0%
Artifact K=1.97;	3-2%	2-92%	1-6%
Artifact L=2.35;	3-35%	2-65%	1-0%
Artifact M=2.06;	3-6%	2-94%	1-0%
Artifact N=2.23;	3-24%	2-74%	1-2%
Artifact O=1.95;	3-3%	2-89%	1-8%

Secondary (N=38); Submission I

Overall Portfolio=2.65;	3-61%	2-39%	1-0%
Philosophy essay=1.56;	3-5%	2-63%	1-32%
Goals essay=1.78;	3-5%	2-74%	1-21%

Secondary (N=90); Submission II

Overall portfolio=2.33;	3-34%	2-61%	1-5%
Integration essay=2.13;	3-23%	2-61%	1-16%
Diversity essay=2.17;	3-24%	2-63%	1-12%
Professionalism essay=2;	3-19%	2-63%	1-18%
Life-long Learning essay=2.06;	3-28%	2-51%	1-21%
Integration artifact=2.12;	3-21%	2-63%	1-16%
Diversity artifact=2.23;	3-31%	2-53%	1-16%
Professionalism artifact=2.03;	3-18%	2-68%	1-14%
Life-long artifact=2.07;	3-20%	2-64%	1-16%

Secondary (N=84); Submission III

(Note: See Appendix A for list of competencies, A-O.)

Second philosophy=2.13;	3-23%	2-68%	1-9%
Artifact A=2.36;	3-37%	2-62%	1-1%
Artifact B=2.23;	3-25%	2-61%	1-14%
Artifact C=2.30;	3-33%	2-63%	1-4%
Artifact D=2.32;	3-32%	2-68%	1-0%
Artifact E=2.29;	3-30%	2-69%	1-1%
Artifact F=2.12;	3-14%	2-83%	1-3%
Artifact G=2.07;	3-13%	2-81%	1-6%
Artifact H=2.06;	3-13%	2-80%	1-7%
Artifact I=2.23;	3-26%	2-70%	1-4%
Artifact J=2.17;	3-20%	2-76%	1-4%
Artifact K=2.06;	3-10%	2-87%	1-3%
Artifact L=2.26;	3-26%	2-74%	1-0%
Artifact M=2.06;	3-8%	2-89%	1-3%
Artifact N=2.12;	3-13%	2-86%	1-1%
Artifact O=2.00;	3-6%	2-88%	1-6%

Student achievement of program outcomes was clearly demonstrated in this review of comprehensive portfolios of program completers.

(3) Student assessment of professional education

A survey of 55 program completers evaluated various elements of their programs. Results of the survey included:

Eighty-seven percent of the respondents rated their specialty preparation as fairly well-prepared to exceptionally well-prepared. Thirteen percent rated their preparation as not very well or poor.

Ninety-eight percent of respondents rated their knowledge and understanding of subject matter as fairly well prepared to exceptionally well- prepared.

Respondents positively rated their programs on all survey items. According to this survey, areas of program strengths included a) using hands-on, experiential learning, b) understanding biases and attitudes, c) openness to new ideas, d) understanding how students learn, e) encouraging students' social skills and responsibilities, f) knowledge of current school and societal issues. Areas that received relatively less positive ratings included identification and instruction of children with special needs, instruction of children from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, discipline techniques, and utilization of community resources.

Overall, the results of the survey indicate that students assessed their learning within professional education programs as significant in preparing them to enter the teaching profession although several areas of competence need to be better addressed in programs according to these students.

(4) Performance of student teachers evaluated by cooperating teachers and university supervisors

Using a scale of 1 (lowest) and 5 (highest), cooperating teachers (N=74) and university supervisors (N=74) at the **elementary level** assessed the competence of OSU student teachers as follows. This value represents the cooperating teacher and university supervisor's combined assessment.

Understanding content	AVG.
Demonstrates broad knowledge in liberal arts and sciences	4.52
Demonstrates in-depth knowledge in content areas	4.52
Uses variety of appropriate teaching/problem-solving strategies	4.63
Incorporates guidelines and standards in teaching	4.66
Demonstrates an understanding of legal and ethical aspects of teaching	4.71

Curricular connections	
Integrates subject matter across content areas	4.68
Uses materials, resources, and technology for best practices	4.68
Varies knowledge construction through developmentally appropriate experiences	4.64
Organization and management	
Uses best practices related to motivation and behavior	4.68
Exhibits an ability to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction	4.75
Practices appropriate classroom management behaviors	4.57
Plans for opportunities to organize and manage varied learning groups	4.52
Understanding child development and individual differences	
Recognizes stages of human development and learning	4.59
Provides learning opportunities that are developmentally appropriate	4.77
Plans learning opportunities that allow for individual differences	4.55
Interactions with others	
Communicates effectively in written form	4.8
Communicates effectively in oral form	4.75
Interacts positively with families, administrators, and others	4.79
Exhibits collegiality with other teachers	4.8
Meaningful assessment	
Designs/selects assessment appropriate to the development	4.64
Interprets and communicates assessment results ethically	4.73
Integrates information from assessments into instruction	4.63
Diversity issues	
Uses appropriate practices in working with special needs students	4.71
Exhibits an ability to identify the diversity in the classroom	4.79
Seeks out and creates diverse curriculum	4.66
Professionalism	
Evaluates effects of his/her choices and actions on others	4.73
Fosters positive interaction with colleagues, families, and others	4.8
Encourages students to be life-long learners	4.86

Using a scale of 1.0 as the lowest and 4.0 as the highest, (N=54) the **secondary level** assessed the competence of OSU student teachers as follows. This value represents the cooperating teacher's rating. Note that the scores represent Spring 2002; the spring semester is designated as the student teaching semester for secondary students.

Professional dispositions	AVG.
Shows initiative	3.57
Demonstrates genuine concern	3.72
Interacts professionally	3.63
Develops rapport	3.61
Communicates value and relevance	3.54
Uses clear grading pattern	3.54
Works effectively as team member	3.54
Attends in-service and other meetings	3.46
Confers with teacher	3.5
Expresses self using correct grammar	3.41
Shows evidence of personal organization	3.56
Maintains ethical standards	3.72
Diversity	
Encourages mutual respect	3.70
Understands individual difference	3.56
Helps students understand similarities and differences	3.48
Selects appropriate activities	3.52
Provides proper modifications	3.57
Uses variety of assessment strategies	3.61

Integration of knowledge, skills, and pedagogy

Plans instruction on goals	3.52
Uses long and short term goals	3.52
Uses experiences to make learning meaningful	3.54
Provides collaborative activities	3.52
Provides a variety of instructional techniques	3.39
Uses current education theories/practices	3.52
Varies activities/methods	3.48
Uses best practices	3.44
Fosters inquiry and active engagement	3.52
Stays knowledgeable on current information	3.54
Uses assessment to guide instruction	3.39
Uses various assessment techniques	3.44
Uses self-reflection	3.69

As indicated by data gathered from the individuals who monitor and evaluate the student teaching internship, OSU students in STCL programs demonstrate a high degree of competence in all areas of evaluation.

(5) Performance during first year of teaching

The state of Oklahoma supports a residency program for first-year teachers. Each first-year teacher's committee must include a higher education committee member who attends three committee meetings and completes at least three observations that focus on the resident teachers' abilities in the areas of human relations, teaching and assessment, classroom management, and professionalism. During 2002-2003, OSU faculty served on 252 residency year committees of OSU graduates in over 90 school districts. Ninety-nine percent of OSU entry year teachers successfully met the criteria. One percent (two teachers) was recommended for a second year in the residency program.

(6) Assessment of recently hired graduates by principals

A telephone survey of five administrators representing three area school districts was conducted to determine how well recently-hired OSU graduates have demonstrated the program and state's 16 General Competencies. (See appendix.) All rated OSU graduates as well prepared and generally gave high ratings on each of the general competencies. Areas for improvement of new teachers entering the profession included legal rights and responsibilities of teachers, students, and the community as well as including career knowledge within the curriculum.

This feedback, based on the perceptions of employers of our students, corroborates information presented elsewhere in this section that indicates a high degree of competence by graduates in STCL degree programs.

Master of Science in Teaching, Learning, and Leadership

(1) Performance on state certification examination (OSAT) for Oklahoma educators

Students who want to qualify for reading specialist or special education certification must pass the Oklahoma Subject Area Test. Students performed as follows:

Reading Specialist (N = 12)

%OSU Pass Rate	%State Pass Rate
100%	100%

Special Education (N=12)

% OSU Pass Rate	% State Pass Rate
50%	61%

Students in the reading specialist program performed extremely well while those students in the special education program performed eleven percentage points below the state average.

(2) Performance on comprehensive examinations

Comprehensive examinations assess a students' knowledge about fields of specialization and professional education. It requires a synthesis of thinking and proficiency in communication skills.

During the academic year 2002-2003, fifty-nine students passed the comprehensive examinations and one failed. The one student who failed later took the test and passed.

These results demonstrated end-of-program competencies in each of their respective specialty areas.

(3) Student assessment of graduate program preparation

Upon completion of their programs of study, fall and spring master's students in STCL (N=57) evaluated the outcomes of the program. The results are listed below.

Ninety-five percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the program improved their general level of education.

Eighty-eight percent agreed or strongly agreed that the program was effective in improving the skills needed for a professional career.

Ninety-five percent rated their programs and classes as strong or very strong, and ninety-five percent rated STCL classes and its professors as strong or very strong.

(4) Performance on theses or creative component project

The purpose of a thesis or creative component is to demonstrate competence in the field by completing original research or project. During the academic year under review, master's students in STCL successfully completed 45 theses or creative components.

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

Note: The Ph.D. program has three options: 1) Professional Education, 2) Occupational Studies, and 3) Curriculum and Social Foundations. Given that the third option spans two schools, this program area compiles a separate assessment report. In addition, most students discussed in this report are Ed.D. students because the Ph.D. option has been available only since last fall.

(1) Performance on qualifying examinations

Qualifying examinations are designed to present a rigorous and thorough examination of a doctoral student's progress. During the academic year under review, eleven students successfully completed qualifying examinations.

(2) Student assessment of graduate program

Upon completion of their programs, fall and spring doctoral students in STCL were invited to evaluate the outcomes of the program. The survey results (N=3) are as follows:

All agreed that the program improved their general level of education, and one strongly disagreed with this statement.

All agreed that the program was effective in improving the skills needed for a professional career, and one strongly disagreed with this statement.

All students highly rated classes and professors in SCTL.

In addition, a focus group interview was held with three doctoral students at the conclusion of their programs to ascertain competencies gained from their programs as well as to understand aspects of the program that could be strengthened to provide additional competencies. Competencies gained from STCL doctoral programs included: knowledge of strategic planning, understanding and using research methodologies, ability to evaluate multiple perspectives, and improved writing skills. The students considered the following as areas to be addressed: more information about the process of the doctoral program, increased structures in the program to facilitate peer and faculty support, and more emphasis on working with different cultures.

(3) Dissertations completed

Each dissertation should demonstrate the ability to conduct original research and special expertise in the field of study. During the academic year under review, eleven dissertations were successfully completed by doctoral students in STCL.

Uses of Assessment Results:

The assessment report was disseminated and discussed at a STCL program coordinators' meeting in the Fall 2002 semester. Program coordinators then met with area faculty to discuss specific information contained in the report. From these activities, the following changes were made:

1. When the assessment report was circulated, several program coordinators were not aware of their students' performance on state examinations. Therefore, an immediate change was made to initiate a clear process of sharing results of the examinations with faculty. Once this process was in place, program coordinators have more meaningfully used the results with their program area faculty and advisory committees. They also found some errors in the state-reported data.
2. This year, each certification area chair began compiling assessment data for accreditation reports that are due February 2004. Each of the 12 STCL certification programs must meet their respective specialty association's standards at the state and national levels. Test reports from the OGET, OPTE, and OSAT were used by program faculty to evaluate specific areas in which student learning can be strengthened. In addition, the use of other assessment report data, especially portfolio data, has been used in making modifications in some programs. Examples of modifications include the following:

Secondary-level student teacher observation forms were modified to better focus on evaluating competencies of pre-service teachers. These changes will support secondary programs' ability to demonstrate if standards are met.

Special Education faculty members are working to significantly revise their program including improved connections to other program areas in the college to strengthen certain areas of their program.

Elementary Education is developing a significant component in their program to offer students advanced preparation in working with diverse populations.

English Education made significant changes to its degree program in order to enhance students' content knowledge and writing skills.

Reading Education developed rubrics to evaluate student work for each certification course.

3. The portfolio process at the undergraduate and graduate levels continues to be revised to better integrate portfolio requirements in coursework, that is, students better understand how to use artifacts developed in classes and field experiences in the development of the portfolio. Further,

programs are meeting aspects of accreditation requirements by the use of external portfolio reviewers.

4. In response to concerns expressed by graduate students, the School will have a Graduate Student Handbook available by Fall 2003.
5. In order to address core goals for two, common master's courses (Curriculum Issues and Educational Advocacy and Leadership), faculty who teach those courses presented at a faculty meeting to review their syllabi including course objectives, content, and evaluation. A common understanding about core courses will underpin use of comprehensive examinations as an effective student assessment tool.
6. A focus-group exit interview was initiated with doctoral students in order to gain more information from students about the program.
7. To improve our abilities in assessing students' knowledge, skills, and disposition, a unit-wide assessment system is being developed. This system will significantly enhance our abilities to evaluate student competencies in all certification areas.