# Southwestern Oklahoma State University Department of Education Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP 5.4/A.5.4)

#### 1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (CAEP 4.1)

The EPP has undergone an initial partnership to measure and better understand the impact program completers have on academic success of P-12 students. The EPP partnered with a local public school to obtain a completer's STAR and ACT Aspire benchmark data on their students.

The Completer's class STAR Reading Growth Report results for academic year 2018 – 2019 are as follows:

| Academic Year | Program Completer                       | STAR Reading Percentile Rank (PR) |
|---------------|---|-----------------------------------|
|               |   | (Class Average N=20)              |
| 2018 - 2019   | Completer 1 (Elementary)                | Pre-test (August 2018): PR 30     |
|               | , | Post-test (March 2019): PR 56     |
|               |   |                                   |
|               | CHANGE:                                 | +26                               |

STAR Reading benchmarks are the minimum performance levels students are expected to reach by certain points of the year in order to meet end-of-the-year performance goals. Specific to this Completer, the STAR Reading end-of-the-year performance goal was PR 40. As indicated by the pre and post test scores for this Completer, the end-of-the-year performance goal was met and exceeded. The EPP can determine that this purposeful Completer had a positive impact on student-learning growth as measured by the STAR Reading indicator.

The Completer's class ACT Aspire results for Academic year 2018 – 2019 are as follows:

| Academic    | Program      | ACT Aspire      | ACT Aspire      | ACT Aspire      | ACT Aspire      |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Year        | Completer    | English results | Reading results | Science results | Math results    |
| 2018 - 2019 | Completer 1  | ACT Interim     | ACT Interim     | ACT Interim     | ACT Interim     |
|             | (Elementary) | Readiness       | Readiness       | Readiness       | Readiness       |
|             |              | Benchmark: 158  | Benchmark: 160  | Benchmark:      | Benchmark:      |
|             |              | Class current   | Class current   | 164             | 160             |
|             |              | average         | average         | Class current   | Class current   |
|             |              | (n = 20): 160.6 | (n = 20): 159.3 | average         | average         |
|             |              |                 |                 | (n = 20): 163.5 | (n = 20): 161.9 |
|             |              | Exceeds         | Below           | Below           | Exceeds         |
|             |              | Benchmark       | Benchmark       | Benchmark       | Benchmark       |

For each subject tested, a Completer receives a scaled score for their class. For this Completer's class and grade level, benchmarks were met in 2 of the 4 subject areas tested (English and Math), and below for 2 of the 4 subject areas tested (Reading and Science). It is worth mentioning that the Completer's class average in Reading and Science were below benchmark by less than 1 total point. As indicated by each of the class average scores in English, Reading, Science, and Math, respectively, can determine that this purposeful Completer had a positive impact on student-learning growth as measured by the ACT Aspire indicator.

# 2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (CAEP 4.2)

Teacher Leader Effectiveness (TLE) data are submitted as evidence to demonstrate that program completers have an effective impact on P-

12 student learning and development. The TLE evaluations are approved by the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) and the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA). The OSDE provides the TLE data to OEQA and OEQA shares the data with the EPP.

The TLE Rubric uses the following scale: 1 – ineffective, 2 – needs improvement, 3 – effective, 4 – highly effective, and 5 – superior. The TLE measures five domains: Classroom Management, Instructional Effectiveness, Professional Growth and Improvement, Interpersonal Skills, and Leadership.

### Classroom Teachers

| All C                     | All Completers Total Evaluation Scores for Classroom Teachers in the 2017-2018 Academic Year |          |         |       |        |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------|--|----------|---------|-------|--------|--|--|--|--|
|                           |  | N =      | 136     |       |        |  |  |  |  |
| Mean                      | Standard   | Minimum  | Maximum | Score | Most   |  |  |  |  |
| Score                     | Deviation  | Score    | Score   | Range | Common |  |  |  |  |
|                           | (SD)   | (MIN)    | (MAX)   | (MAX- | Score  |  |  |  |  |
| $(\overline{\mathbf{x}})$ | (SD)   | (IVIIIN) |         | MIN)  | (MODE) |  |  |  |  |
| 3.5                       | 0.4  | 2.7      | 4.8     | 2.1   | 3.0    |  |  |  |  |
| 5.5                       | V. I   |          |         |       |        |  |  |  |  |

Within each of the following domains specific indicators are assessed by trained district evaluators. Indicator rating scales again range from 1 to 5 with five being superior. Percentage weights and the number of rated indicators within each domain are listed within the table.

|  | All Completers Domain Evaluation Scores for Classroom Teachers in the 2017-2018 Academic Year  |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
|  | Domain 1   | Domain 2  | Domain 3  | Domain 4  | Domain 5  |  |  |  |
|  | Classroom<br>Management  | Instructional<br>Effectiveness  | Professional<br>Growth &<br>Continuous<br>Learning  | Interpersonal<br>Skills   | Leadership  |  |  |  |
| CAEP ALIGNMENT: Domain scores demonstrate completers | Application of professional knowledge and skills needed for managing behavior, establishing positive climates, and building student relationships. | Application of professional knowledge and skills needed for lesson implementation that is based on academic standards, inclusive of all learners, and responsive to assessment. | Presentation of attributes and characteristics which underlie observable, professional dispositions leading to engagement professional development to increase professional knowledge and skills. | Presentation of attributes and characteristics which underlie observable, professional dispositions and application of professional skills needed for open, sensitive communication with families and colleagues. | Presentation of attributes and characteristics which underlie observable, professional dispositions resulting in contributions to the profession and increased growth among colleagues, the school, and students. |  |  |  |

| % weight                       | 30% | 50% | 10% | 5%  | 5%  |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mean $(\overline{x})$<br>Score | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Standard<br>Deviation          | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Minimum<br>Score               | 2.5 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Maximum<br>Score               | 5.0 | 4.7 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Range<br>(MAX-                 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Most<br>Common                 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |

# Leaders

| All Co                    | All Completers Total Evaluation Scores for School Leaders in the 2017-2018 Academic Year |             |             |             |                   |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
|                           | N = 15   |             |             |             |                   |  |  |  |  |
| Mean                      | Standard   | Minimum     | Maximum     | Score Range | Most Common Score |  |  |  |  |
| Score                     | Deviation  | Score (MIN) | Score (MAX) | (MAX-MIN)   | (MODE)            |  |  |  |  |
| $(\overline{\mathbf{x}})$ | (SD)   |             |             |             |                   |  |  |  |  |
| 3.6                       | 0.5  | 2.73        | 4           | 1.3         | N/A               |  |  |  |  |

Within each of the following domains specific indicators are assessed by trained district evaluators. Indicator rating scales again range from 1 to 5 with five being superior. Percentage weights and the number of rated indicators within each domain are listed within the table.

|  | All Completers Domain Evaluation Scores for School Leaders in the 2017-2018  Academic Year  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|  | Domain 1 Data Driven Focus on Student Achievement   | Domain 2 Continuous Improvement of Instruction  Application of professional  | Domain 3  A Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum  Application of professional  | Domain 4 Cooperation and Collaboration  Presentation of   | Domain 5 School Climate  Demonstrate   |  |  |  |
| CAEP ALIGNMENT: Domain scores demonstrate completers | Application of professional knowledge and skills needed for establishing and monitoring data driven school, classroom, and student achievement. | knowledge and skills needed to evaluate teacher ability and embed professional development. As well as presentation of dispositions which support and retain those highly effective. | knowledge and skills needed to ensure curriculum and assessments adhere to standards, reasonable in relation to instructional time, and available to all students. | attributes and characteristics which underlie observable, professional dispositions needed for open, sensitive communication and input from and among families, teachers, and students. | attributes and characteristics, dispositions, of personal growth garnering constituent trust.  Professional knowledge and skills create a safe, fiscally sound, and operational environment. |  |  |  |
| % weight   | 21%   | 21%  | 13%  | 21%   | 25%  |  |  |  |
| Mean (x̄)<br>Score                                   | 3.3   | 3.5  | 3.8  | 3.5   | 4  |  |  |  |

| Standard<br>Deviatio<br>n (SD) | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Minimu<br>m Score<br>(MIN)     | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| Maximum<br>Score<br>(MAX)      | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| Range<br>(MAX-MIN)             | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Most<br>Common<br>Score        | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |

# **Counselors**

| All C                       | All Completers <b>Total Evaluation Scores</b> for <u>Counselors</u> in the 2017-2018 Academic Year $N = 10$ |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|
| Mean Score $(\overline{x})$ | MeanStandardMinimumMaximumScore RangeMost Common ScoreScoreDeviationScore (MIN)Score (MAX)(MAX-MIN)(MODE)   |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |
| 3.6                         | 0.3   | 3.3 | 4.4 | 1.0 | 3.5 |  |  |  |

Within each of the following domains specific indicators are assessed by trained district evaluators. Indicator rating scales again range from 1 to 5 with five being superior. Percentage weights and the number of rated indicators within each domain are listed within the table.

| All Completers Domain Evaluation Scores for Counselors in the 2017-2018 Academic Year |          |          |          |          |  |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| Domain 1  | Domain 2 | Domain 3 | Domain 4 | Domain 5 |  |

|  | Counselor<br>Center<br>Management   | School<br>Counseling<br>Effectiveness  | Professional<br>Growth &<br>Continuous<br>Improvement   | Interpersonal<br>Skills   | Leadership   |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| CAEP ALIGNMENT: Domain scores demonstrate completers | Application of professional knowledge and skills needed for delivering guidance curriculum and establishing safe, orderly environments as well as presentation of dispositions contributing to a positive school climate. | Application of professional knowledge and skills for assessing and monitoring student and school progress toward established goals.  Dispositions and skills encourage social, emotional growth of students and handles crisis interventions effectively and professionally. | Presentation of attributes and characteristics which underlie observable, professional dispositions leading to engagement professional development to increase professional knowledge and skills. | Presentation of attributes and characteristics which underlie observable, professional dispositions and application of professional skills needed for open, sensitive communication with families and colleagues. | Presentation of attributes and characteristics which underlie observable, professional dispositions resulting in increased equity, family and community involvement, respect among faculty for sharing in school responsibilities. |
| % weight   | 20%   | 30%  | 10%   | 20%   | 20%  |
| Mean (x̄)<br>Score                                   | 3.8   | 3.5  | 4   | 3.5   | 3.7  |
| Standard<br>Deviatio<br>n (SD)                       | 0.2   | 0.4  | 0.0   | .5  | .4   |

| Minimu<br>m Score<br>(MIN)        | 3.7 | 3   | 4   | 3   | 3.5 |
|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Maximum<br>Score<br>(MAX)         | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Range<br>(MAX-<br>MIN)            | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0   | 2   | 1.5 |
| Most<br>Common<br>Score<br>(MODE) | 3.7 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |

### **2016-2017 Graduates**

Classroom Teachers: 1 teacher was identified for use in the following data table.

| Total                     | Total Evaluation Scores for 1st Year Classroom Teachers in the 2017-2018 Academic Year              |             |             |           |        |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------|---|-------------|-------------|-----------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| Mean                      | Mean         Standard         Minimum         Maximum         Score Range         Most Common Score |             |             |           |        |  |  |  |  |
| Score                     | Deviation   | Score (MIN) | Score (MAX) | (MAX-MIN) | (MODE) |  |  |  |  |
| $(\overline{\mathbf{x}})$ | (SD)  | , , , ,     | , , , , ,   |           | , , ,  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1                       | 0.0   | 3.1         | 3.2         | 0.0       | N/A    |  |  |  |  |

# Leaders: No leader evaluations were provided for completers graduating in the 2016-17 year.

| T                         | Total Evaluation Scores for 1st Year School Leaders in the 2017-2018 Academic Year                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Mean                      | Mean         Standard         Minimum         Maximum         Score Range         Most Common Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Score                     | Score   Deviation   Score (MIN)   Score (MAX)   (MAX-MIN)   (MODE)                                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $(\overline{\mathbf{x}})$ |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                           | No readable scores for 2016-2017 completers were provided to the EPP                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Counselors: 1 counselor was identified for use in the following data table.

Total Evaluation Scores for 1st Year Counselors in the 2017-2018 Academic Year

| Mean                      | Standard  | Minimum     | Maximum     | Score Range | Most   |
|---------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| Score                     | Deviation | Score (MIN) | Score (MAX) | (MAX-MIN)   | Common |
| $(\overline{\mathbf{x}})$ | (SD)      |             |             |             | Score  |
|                           |           |             |             |             | (MODE) |
| 3.3                       | 0.02      | 3.3         | 3.38        | 0.05        | 3.33   |

# 3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (CAEP 4.3/A.4.1) Administrator Mentor Survey

The Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA) administers the Administrator/Mentor Survey to mentors/administrators within the state who have hired the EPP's graduates as first year teachers. The survey is aligned to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards and seeks information from mentors/administrators about the EPP's program completer preparedness and overall satisfaction with SWOSU Department of Education graduates.

- 2015-2016 Administrator/Mentor Survey Responses Table
- 2016-2017 Administrator/Mentor Survey Responses Table
- 2017-2018 Administrator/Mentor Survey Analysis

### 4. Satisfaction of completers (CAEP 4.4/A.4.2)

# First Year Teacher Survey

The Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA) administers the First Year Teacher survey every spring. The survey is aligned to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards and seeks information from program completers about their preparation provided by the EPP.

- 2015-2016 FYT Survey Responses Table
- 2016-2017 FYT Survey Responses Table
- <u>2017-2018 FYT Analysis</u>

# 5. Graduation rates (Initial and Advanced Levels) Initial Level Graduation Rates

| YEAR  | # STUDENT<br>TEACHING | GRADUATED | GRAD RATE |
|-------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|
| 15-16 | 80                    | 78        | 97.50%    |
| 16-17 | 98                    | 95        | 96.94%    |
| 17-18 | 106                   | 106       | 100.00%   |
| 18-19 | 89                    | 84        | 94.38%    |

#### **Advanced Level Graduation Rates**

| YEAR  | # STUDENTS<br>INTERN/PRACT | GRADUATED | GRAD<br>RATE |
|-------|----------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| 15-16 | 98                         | 93        | 100.00%      |
| 16-17 | 118                        | 112       | 98.31%       |
| 17-18 | 96                         | 92        | 95.83%       |
| 18-19 | 92                         | 84        | 91.30%       |

# 6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (Initial and Advanced levels)

# **Certification Examinations for Oklahoma Educators (CEOE)**

The Oklahoma Department of Education and OEQA require candidates at the initial level to pass the three exams to receive teacher certification in addition to completing an accredited teacher education program. All exams are criterion-referenced and competency-based. The certification examinations assess general knowledge (OGET), subject-area knowledge (OSAT) and professional knowledge (OPTE).

| Certification Pass Rates   |  |  |                                     |                                     |                                     |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2015-2019  |  |  |                                     |                                     |                                     |
| SWOSU PASS RATE FOR CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS FOR OKLAHOMA EDUCATORS: | 2015-2016                              | 2016-2017                              | 2017-2018                           | 2018-2019                           | STATE<br>2018-2019                  |
| OGET (GENERAL EDUCATION)   | 90.7%                                  | 85.6%                                  | 84.2%                               | 82.1%                               | 81.1%                               |
| OPTE (PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE/PEDAGOGY)                                 | PK-8 <b>69.6%</b><br>6-12 <b>94.7%</b> | PK-8 <b>89.4%</b><br>6-12 <b>90.2%</b> | PK-8 <b>77.6%</b> 6-12 <b>89.6%</b> | PK-8 <b>74.6%</b> 6-12 <b>88.6%</b> | PK-8 <b>88.8%</b> 6-12 <b>97.7%</b> |
| OSAT (SUBJECT AREA TEST)   | 78.4%                                  | 75%                                    | 76%                                 | 80.0%                               | 65.8%                               |
| SWOSU OVERALL PASS RATE FOR ALL THREE TES                              | STS 83.4%                              | 81%                                    | 80%                                 | 81.3%                               | 83.4%                               |

## 7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (Initial and Advanced Levels)

Initial and advanced completers from 2015-2016 had a hiring rate 100% hiring rate.

Initial and advanced completers from 2016-2017 had a hiring rate 100% hiring rate.

Initial and advanced completers from 2017-2018 had a hiring rate 100% hiring rate.

Initial and advanced completers from 2018-2019 had a hiring rate 100% hiring rate.

Due to the extreme and continuing teacher shortage in the state of Oklahoma, the ability of initial and advanced completers to be hired in education positions for which they are prepared continues to be 100%.

### 8. Student loan default rates (Initial and Advanced Levels)

Student Loan Default Rates FY 2016, 2015, 2014

| OPE    |                                   |               |         |                    |                           |        |        |        |
|--------|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| ID     | School                            | Type          | Control | PRGMS              |                           | FY2016 | FY2015 | FY2014 |
|        | Southwestern                      | Undergraduate |         |                    | Default<br>Rate           | 9.7    | 10.6   | 11.9   |
|        | Oklahoma and State Graduate       | _             | Public  | Both<br>(FFEL/FDL) | No. In<br>Default         | 105    | 123    | 142    |
| 003181 | University  100 Campus  Drive     |               |         |                    | No. In<br>Repay           | 1,080  | 1,155  | 1,184  |
|        | Weatherford,<br>OK 73096-<br>3098 |               |         |                    | Enrollment figures        | 5,907  | 5,821  | 5,952  |
|        | 3070                              |               |         |                    | Percentage<br>Calculation | 18.2   | 19.8   | 19.8   |

ENROLLMENT: To provide context for the Cohort Default Rate (CDR) data, we include data (students enrolled at any time during the year) and a corresponding percentage (borrowers entering repayment divided by that enrollment figure). While there is no direct relationship between the timing of when a borrower entered repayment (October 1 through September 30) and any particular enrollment year, for the purpose of these data, we have chosen to use the academic year ending on June 30 prior to the beginning of the cohort year (e.g., FY 2016 CDR Year will use 2014-2015 enrollment).

**Current Date: 11/25/2019** 

#### 9. Teacher Shortage Information

https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/teacheshortageareasreport2017.pdf

#### **Teacher Shortage Task Force Report**

https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/teacheshortageareasreport2017.pdf

## 10. Specialized Professional Associations

- Early Childhood National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)
- Education Administration Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)
- Elementary Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI)
- Health and Physical Education SHAPE America (formerly NASPE)
- Language Arts The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)
- Mathematics National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)
- Media & Technology International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)
- Music National Association of Schools of Music (NASM)
- Natural Sciences National Science Teachers Association (NSTA)
- Reading The International Reading Association (IRA)
- School Psychology National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)
- Social Sciences The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS)
- Special Education Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)