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1. Institution Name
Oklahoma Panhandle State University

2. State
Oklahoma

3. Date submitted
04/14/2008

4. Report Preparer's Information:
Name of Preparer:
Russell Thatcher
Phone: Ext.
(580) 349-1412
E-mail:
rmthatcher@opsu.edu

5. NCATE Coordinator's Information:
Name:
R. Wayne Stewart
Phone: Ext.
(580) 349-1408
E-mail:
rwstewart@opsu.edu

6. Name of institution's program
Elementary Education
7. NCATE Category
Elementary or Childhood Education

8. Grade levels(1) for which candidates are being prepared
Elementary 1-8

(1) e.g. Early Childhood; Elementary K-6

9. Program Type
- Advanced Teaching
- First teaching license
- Other School Personnel
- Unspecified

10. Degree or award level
- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's
- Post Master's
- Specialist or C.A.S.
- Doctorate
- Endorsement only

11. Is this program offered at more than one site?
- Yes
- No

12. If your answer is "yes" to above question, list the sites at which the program is offered

13. Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared
Elementary Education

14. Program report status:
- Initial Review
- Response to One of the Following Decisions: Further Development Required, Recognition with Probation, or Not Nationally Recognized
- Response to National Recognition With Conditions

15. State Licensure requirement for national recognition:
NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable
state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section III. Does your state require such a test?

- Yes
- No

SECTION I - CONTEXT

1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of ACEI standards. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

| no change from previous submission |

2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships. (Response limited to 8,000 characters)

| no change from previous submission |

3. Description of the criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the program, including required GPAs and minimum grade requirements for the content courses accepted by the program. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

| no change from previous submission |

4. Description of the relationship of the program to the unit's conceptual framework. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

| no change from previous submission |

   (2): The response should describe the program's conceptual framework and indicate how it reflects the unit's conceptual framework.

5. Indication of whether the program has a unique set of program assessments and their relationship of the program's assessments to the unit's assessment system. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

| no change from previous submission |

(3) This response should clarify how the key assessments used in the program are derived from or informed by the assessment system that the unit will address under NCATE Standard 2.

6. Please attach files to describe a program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet.)

7. This system will not permit you to include tables or graphics in text fields. Therefore any tables or charts must be attached as files here. The title of the file should clearly indicate the content of the file. Word documents, pdf files, and other commonly used file formats are acceptable.

| Chart One-Disaggregated Assessment | Expanded data for Standards 2.1-3.5 |

See Attachments panel below.
8. Candidate Information
Directions: Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master's, doctorate) being addressed in this report. Data must also be reported separately for programs offered at multiple sites. Update academic years (column 1) as appropriate for your data span. Create additional tables as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th># of Candidates Enrolled in the Program</th>
<th># of Program Completers(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) NCATE uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

9. Faculty Information
Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>no change from previous submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship(8), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service(9):List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.
(6) e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator
(7) e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor
(8) Scholarship is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel. Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.
(9) Service includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission.
(10) e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.
(11) Briefly describe the nature of recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.
In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the ACEI standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.

1. Please provide following assessment information (Response limited to 250 characters each field)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and Number of Assessment</th>
<th>Name of Assessment (12)</th>
<th>Type or Form of Assessment (13)</th>
<th>When the Assessment Is Administered (14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)</td>
<td>no change from previous submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in elementary education (required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #3: Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction (required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #4: Assessment of student teaching (required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #5: Assessment of candidate effect on student learning (required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses ACEI standards (required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses ACEI standards (optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses ACEI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

For each ACEI standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple ACEI standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards (optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(12) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.
(13) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).
(14) Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

### 1. DEVELOPMENT, LEARNING AND MOTIVATION

1. DEVELOPMENT, LEARNING AND MOTIVATION—Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual students’ development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. CURRICULUM STANDARDS

2.1 English language arts—Candidates demonstrate a high level of competence in use of English language arts and they know, understand, and use concepts from reading, language and child development, to teach reading, writing, speaking, viewing, listening, and thinking skills and to help students successfully apply their developing skills to many different situations, materials, and ideas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Science—Candidates know, understand, and use fundamental concepts in the subject matter of science—including physical, life, and earth and space sciences—as well as concepts in science and technology, science in personal and social perspectives, the history and nature of science, the unifying concepts of science, and the inquiry processes scientists use in discovery of new knowledge to build a base for scientific and technological literacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Mathematics—Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, procedures, and reasoning processes of mathematics that define number systems and number sense, geometry, measurement, statistics and probability, and algebra in order to foster student understanding and use of patterns, quantities, and spatial relationships that can represent phenomena, solve problems, and manage data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Social studies—Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and modes of inquiry from the social studies—the integrated study of history, geography, the social sciences, and other related areas — to promote elementary students’ abilities to make informed decisions as citizens of a culturally diverse democratic society and interdependent world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 The arts—Candidates know, understand, and use—as appropriate to
their own understanding and skills—the content, functions, and achievements of dance, music, theater, and the several visual arts as primary media for communication, inquiry, and insight among elementary students.

2.6 Health education—Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts in the subject matter of health education to create opportunities for student development and practice of skills that contribute to good health.

2.7 Physical education—Candidates know, understand, and use—as appropriate to their own understanding and skills—human movement and physical activity as central elements to foster active, healthy life styles and enhanced quality of life for elementary students.

2.8 Connections across the curriculum—Candidates know, understand, and use the connections among concepts, procedures, and applications from content areas to motivate elementary students, build understanding, and encourage the application of knowledge, skills, and ideas to real world issues.

3. **INSTRUCTION STANDARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction—Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, subject matter, curricular goals, and community.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Adaptation to diverse students—Candidates understand how elementary students differ in their development and approaches to learning, and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse students.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Development of critical thinking, problem solving, performance skills—Candidates understand and use a variety of teaching strategies that encourage elementary students’ development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Active engagement in learning—Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self motivation, and positive social interaction and to create supportive learning environments.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Communication to foster collaboration—Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the elementary classroom.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>ASSESSMENT FOR INSTRUCTION</strong>—Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Practices and behaviors of developing career teachers—Candidates understand and apply practices and behaviors that are characteristic of developing career teachers.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Reflection and evaluation—Candidates are aware of and reflect on</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their practice in light of research on teaching and resources available for professional learning; they continually evaluate the effects of their professional decisions and actions on students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community and actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

5.3 Collaboration with families—Candidates know the importance of establishing and maintaining a positive collaborative relationship with families to promote the academic, social and emotional growth of children.

5.4 Collaboration with colleagues and the community—Candidates foster relationships with school colleagues and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.

SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in Section IV. The assessments must be those that all candidates in the program are required to complete and should be used by the program to determine candidate proficiencies as expected in the program standards. Assessments and scoring guides should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards.

In the description of each assessment below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas that are addressed in NCATE’s unit standard 1:

- Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
- Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
- Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare a document that includes the following items: a two page narrative that responds to questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 (below) and the three items listed in question 5 (below). This document should be attached as directed.

1. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
2. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
3. A brief analysis of the data findings;
4. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording; and
5. Attachment of assessment documentation, including:
   (a) the assessment tool or description of the assignment;
   (b) the scoring guide for the assessment; and
   (c) candidate data derived from the assessment.

It is preferred that the response for each of 5a, 5b, and 5c (above) be limited to the equivalent of five text pages, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides may go beyond five
All three components of the assessment (as identified in 5a-c) must be attached, with the following exceptions: (a) the assessment tool and scoring guide are not required for reporting state licensure data, and (b) for some assessments, data may not yet be avail

1. ACEI standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to 2.1-2.8. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>disaggregated data from OSAT 50</th>
<th>disaggregated data from OSAT 51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment One Addendum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

2. ACEI standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to Standards 2.1-2.8. Assessments that address Standards 2.1-2.4 are required. (The assessments of the different content areas of elementary education may entail multiple attachments; however, they will be considered in their entirety as Assessment #2.) Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, course grades from content fields, and portfolio tasks. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

(15) For program review purposes, there are two ways to list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance, the portfolio would be considered a single assessment. However, in many programs a portfolio is a collection of candidate work—and the artifacts included

3. ACEI standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 1, 2.1-2.7, 3.1-3.5, 4, and 5.1-5.4. Assessments that address Standards 2.1-2.4 are required. (The assessments that address planning of instruction in the content areas of elementary education may entail multiple attachments; however, they will be considered in their entirety as Assessment #3.) Examples of assessments include the evaluation of candidates’ abilities to develop lesson or unit plans or individualized educational plans (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

4. ACEI standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 1, 2.1-2.7, 3.1-3.5, 4, and 5.1-5.4. The assessment instrument used in student teaching and the internship should be submitted. ACEI standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 1, 2.1-2.7, 3.1-3.5, 4, and 5.1-5.4 (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV
5. ACEI standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 2.1-2.8, and 3.1. Examples of assessments include those based on student work samples, portfolio tasks, case studies, follow-up studies, and employer surveys. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

6. Additional assessment that addresses ACEI standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, tutoring assignments, and follow-up studies. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

7. Additional assessment that addresses ACEI standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, tutoring assignments, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

8. Additional assessment that addresses ACEI standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, tutoring assignments, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

no change from previous submission

SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

1. Describe what changes or additions have been made in response to issues cited in previous recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report or a response to condition report are available on the NCATE web site at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=4

(Response limited to 24,000 characters.)
No changes have been made to the assessments used in this program review. However, aggregated/disaggregated data are presented for each of the ACEI Standards 1 through 3.5 as requested.

Also, additional disaggregated data is presented for Assessment One dealing with the content area Licensure Exams required by Oklahoma. These charts are uploaded in SECTION IV, Assessment One

Because this additional requested data goes across the assessment instruments, it does not “fit” within the specified categories of SECTION IV. Narrative for the additional data is below and the corresponding tables and data charts are uploaded in SECTION ONE, Number 7

Data for the OPSU Elementary Education program review have been disaggregated in the attached spreadsheets. Where a candidate has achieved less than an 80% level, the score has been highlighted in red. All other scores are at or above the passing level. In the OPSU rubrics scores of 2 and 3 are passing and 1 is failing. OPSU will not accept a score of 1 on anything in any of the unit’s rubrics. A score of 1 must be remediated and performed at a minimum of a novice level (2) for a candidate to pass in the program. New assessments began in spring 2007 (Assessment #7) and fall 2007 (Assessment #8). Note needs to be taken that all required courses in the major area are aligned with state and ACEI standards; therefore, all standards are being measured and met at other levels than the eight submitted assessments for this program review. Chart One delineates where ACEI standards are being assessed within the framework of the eight assessments of this program review. (Chart One-Disaggregated Assessment)

Further explanation of each standard follows.

Standard 2.1 English Language Arts
Aggregated data suggests that on the whole candidates have sufficient skills in the English language arts. When examining disaggregated data, there appear to be some areas of concern in the reading and language arts as it relates to tests (OGET and OSAT) even though data from other evaluations (GPA, etc.) show an acceptable level of competence. Because of the data from the OGET and OSAT, the unit took measures to shore up these scores. In the spring semester of 2008 one of the reading classes was divided into two separate classes: one in reading and one in language arts. It is believed this will give candidates more exposure to these areas. Data showing results of this division are not currently available for analysis. (Chart Two, page one)

Standard 2.2 Science
Disaggregated data suggest that OGET scores in science are somewhat low for a few candidates; however, OSAT science scores seem to improve. The OSAT is taken 1-1 ½ years after the OGET. Science scores improve as candidates take more science courses during this time period in order to complete the 4 X 12 content areas as required by the state. GPAs indicate that candidates have sufficient skills in science. (Chart Two, page two)

Standard 2.3 Math
Disaggregated math data suggest OPSU candidates have sufficient knowledge in this discipline. Test scores indicate high pass rates and GPAs correlate well. There are no current concerns about OPSU candidates’ math skills. (Chart Two, page three)

Standard 2.4 Social Studies
Disaggregated data suggest that the spring semester of 2005 revealed some concerns about social studies on the OGET. By the time candidates took the OSAT, 1-1 ½ years later, social studies scores had increased. This can be attributed to candidates completing more social studies courses for the 4 X 12 required by the state. Discussion was brought up that candidates were experiencing difficulties with
questions about Oklahoma history on the OSAT. Many of our candidates have had no Oklahoma history
due to the fact that OPSU draws students from a five state area. Because of this, effort was taken to
incorporate Oklahoma history into the social studies methods course. Evidence of higher, and acceptable
scores, is seen in the OSAT exams taken since the implementation of this action. Chart Two, page four)

Standard 2.5 Arts
The disaggregated data indicates initial concerns at the beginning of the program when candidates take
the OGET. Arts scores improve significantly by the time candidates take the OSAT. OSAT scores, GPA
and performance indicators reveal adequate levels of knowledge and usage of the arts in the elementary
education platform. (Chart Two, page five)

2.6 Health
Disaggregated data presents some concerns in Standard 2.6-health. In order to correct this, the unit has
implemented more health education into the science and the HPER methods courses. Candidates are
required to further demonstrate competency in this area by the development of activities, materials,
lessons, and presentations. New components were added to rubrics to measure these attributes. Data
collecting for the new components began in May, 2007. Results from the data indicate that OPSU
candidates score well on the standardized test, on designated rubrics dealing with health, and in the
science and HPER methods courses. (Chart Two, page six)

2.7 Physical Education
While OPSU candidates have sufficient opportunity to develop knowledge and skills in physical
education, it became apparent while writing the program review that sufficient data was not being
collected. Assessments #7 and #8 were developed in part to fill in this gap. Disaggregated OSAT scores
indicate that OPSU candidates score well in this area. From the limited data collected to date with the
new rubrics, candidates appear to be doing well in this area. (Chart Two, page seven)

2.8 Connections across the curriculum
OPSU candidates are given opportunity to achieve both at intellectual and practical levels in the area of
connections across the curriculum. Candidates must demonstrate an intellectual level of competency of
this in the portfolio. Data from descriptors in the portfolio have been disaggregated along with the
descriptors from assessments #7 and #8 which designate field experience with connections across the
curriculum. The chart indicates that OPSU candidates achieve a significantly high mark in this area.
Again, the program review process revealed OPSU needed more descriptors to evaluate this component;
and the above mentioned assessments were implemented in the spring and fall of 2007. (Chart Two,
page eight)

3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction
Since this is a very broad topic, it is necessary to use a sufficiently broad scope of assessments.
Certification exams, GPAs, Oklahoma General Competencies for Teacher Licensure, intern evaluations,
and new rubrics, #7 and #8 are all necessary to address this standard. The chart indicates substantial
GPAs and standardized exam scores to indicate content and pedagogical knowledge. Disaggregated data
from assessment #3 indicate candidates are doing quite well in meeting the standards for Oklahoma
Teacher Certification and Licensure. Data from assessment #4 (intern rubric) and assessment #5 (student
products) indicate that OPSU candidates score quite high in this standard according to both university
supervisors and cooperating teachers during the internship. Assessment #7, designed as a result of the
program review process because certain items were being done but not assessed significantly enough,
addresses standard 3.1. OPSU candidates have a high score and do a fantastic job of putting into practice
at a high level of knowledge of students, learning theory, subject matter, curricular goals and
community. This is evidenced throughout the program as can be seen by the disaggregated data on the
numerous descriptors provided. In addition, assessment #8, although new, is indicative that candidates
Standard 3.2 Adaptation to diverse students
Disaggregated data indicates that OPSU candidates have multiple places where they prepare adaptations to diverse learners. Data from the portfolio process and the internship reveal that OPSU candidates perform very well on this standard. Perhaps the reason is partly due to the fact that all lesson plans done for the methods courses have a diversity/adaptation component. In addition to this all candidates take a 3 hour course designed just for diversity. By the time candidates perform in the practicum courses and internship, they have developed a conscious awareness of the need to appropriately respond to cultural and educational circumstances/needs as presented to them in the classroom. Mentor teachers and university faculty consider this extremely important and make sure candidates significantly contribute to the education of those with special cultural or academic needs. (Chart Two, page ten)

Standard 3.3 Development of critical thinking, problem solving, performance skills
Although OPSU faculty were diligently including this standard into the consciousness and practice of candidates, the standard was not being measured significantly. The accreditation process made the unit aware of the need for more data to confirm that candidates do have the ability to affect learning in regards to this standard. Consequently, assessments #7 and #8 were developed. Again, these have just recently been implemented; however, the new data is consistent with data from the portfolio and student products presented at the final portfolio review. Data seems to indicate that OPSU candidates are on target or better for standard 3.3. (Chart Two, page eleven)

Standard 3.4 Active engagement in learning
Constructive learning is a key component in the OPSU conceptual framework. In all of the methods courses active engagement is a key concept and requirement for candidates to implement in their lesson planning and presentations. The course in education technology concentrates excessively on integrating technology into the classroom whereby public school students are using the technology for purposes of authentic learning and authentic assessment. This course, as well as other courses, concentrates on candidates being able to effectively involve students in cooperative group activities which involve or simulate real life situations thus giving real meaning and purpose to learning. Because of this the Ed Tech grades from assessment #6 are also being included here. Previously to the accreditation process with ACEI, this standard was only measured in two assessments. Now it is being examined in five. Obviously, data from assessment #7 and #8 will be upcoming; however, data from the other three indicate that the Unit has adequate information to indicate that there are no concerns about this standard not being met. Disaggregated data suggests that OPSU candidates score significantly above the novice level. Limited data from the new assessments also concur with this assessment. (Chart Two, page twelve)

Standard 3.5 Communication and collaboration
Components of the portfolio and the Internship evaluation were the primary focal points for assessing this standard. The accreditation process with ACEI helped inform the Unit that it was necessary to develop further assessment instruments for this standard. Assessments #7 and #8 were consequently developed. Disaggregated data from the portfolio and the internship evaluation instruments indicate that OPSU candidates have a sufficiently high level of communication to foster collaboration. The data from the newly implemented evaluation instruments seems to concur with this. (Chart Two, page thirteen)
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