ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
SELF-STUDY ADDENDUM

The leadership of the Oral Roberts University College of Education (COE) would like to thank the BOE team (CAEP team members and Oklahoma State team members) for the opportunity to provide an Addendum to the Self-Study in response to the Off-Site Review report submitted to CAEP and OCTP. The BOE team was very thorough and provided excellent guidance to the Unit as we continue the preparation for the On-Site Review.

The report will address, by standard, the continued areas for improvement (AFI), areas of concern (AOCs), and provide a description of requested evidence in addition to the actual evidence that it hopes will address all concerns that the BOE team wishes to validate during the On-Site Review. Finally, the report will also address a few statements made throughout the report that may be cause for concern and/or misconceptions.

STANDARD I

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 3: 2nd Paragraph)
Course assessments are linked to the ePortfolio handbook, and the ePortfolio serves as the Capstone Experience for the 12 initial programs and four advanced programs.

Unit Response:
The ePortfolio is a developmental process for candidates. All candidates (initial and advanced) are required to compile and maintain electronic portfolio from their inception into the program, starting with the first education course and throughout the time in the program; therefore, it is not limited to a capstone experience. The portfolio is referred to as developmental at the initial level in that several activities are repeated as candidates matriculate through the program; however, the same rubric is used to assess the artifacts. For example, the Contextual Information artifact is completed with each practicum and student teaching internship. For the first field experience, candidates are only required to fill out the Contextual Information Sheet, but the rubric at the "Exemplary" level requires the candidate to address the implications of the students' needs and resources as they plan the unit of instruction and assessment. While candidates are expected to address these areas later in the program, they are not expected to do so for the first field experience because they have not acquired the knowledge and skills to do so; therefore candidates should not score higher than a two; or the "Acceptable" level on the field experience contextual information artifact. *(See Exhibit 75: Contextual Information Rubric)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 4; 1st Paragraph)
Trends that emerge relate to the use of standards-aligned rubrics and the effective use of assessments to measure mastery of SPA standards. Exhibits do not provide examples of rubrics nor describe how they are being used by programs or the unit.

Unit Response:
Hyperlinks to rubrics used along with a description of how they are used by programs or the unit are embedded in the Initial ePortfolio Handbook and the Advanced ePortfolio Handbook. For example, the following is an excerpt from page 9 of the Initial ePortfolio Handbook:

PRACTICUM INFORMATION

Teacher candidates are required to complete additional practicum experiences specific to their major while in the Intermediate Level of their program. Candidates may choose any one of those practicum experiences competed during this phase of the program to address the following portfolio artifact requirements. Once the candidate has decided which practicum to use, it is the responsibility of the teacher candidate to inform the professor of record that the artifact has been placed in the portfolio and needs to be assessed.

Contextual Information Sheet

The candidate is expected to complete the Contextual Information Sheet during the practicum. The candidate will need to access the template and fill in the information. An interview with the cooperating teacher will be required to obtain some of the information needed to complete the assignment, or the information may be found on the school's or the school district's website. Note that additional information is required for this Contextual Information Sheet. The candidate will answer questions that require them to reflect on how the classroom environment affects instruction. A rubric is provided for use as a reference when completing the assignment. Upload the completed Contextual Information Sheet to the portfolio and share it with the professor (please use the "help" feature in ePortfolio for assistance with this process).

Contextual Information Sheet
Contextual Information Rubric

Assessor's Response:

The professor will use the scoring rubric, which is a duplicate of the rubric the candidate used, to grade the completed assignment.

The *Contextual Information Sheet* and the *Contextual Information Rubric* are actual hyperlinks within the handbook to rubrics used by candidates. They are also used as scoring rubrics by faculty to assess the assignment. Please find additional explanations and hyperlinks to rubrics on pp. 6, 10, 11, 15, and 16 of the handbook. Once assignments are assessed, data are aggregated and used to inform both Unit and program level improvements. Pages 11-14 of the Initial ePortfolio Handbook provide links to program specific rubrics. Most of the assignments attached to these rubrics are completed in methods courses. Faculty members who teach these courses are either full-time education faculty or secondary representatives who also supervise candidates while they are completing the assignments, thereby providing additional guidance and explanations as needed. *(See Exhibit 9: Initial ePortfolio Handbook)*

In addition to rubrics provided in the Initial ePortfolio Handbook, the COE submitted 12 program reports for state or national review. Each program report requires six to eight assessments which include an explanation of the assessments, alignment of program standards to the assessment, rubrics used and data reports. A common response from program reviewers was that rubrics needed to include alignment to SPA standards. Faculty have revised reports and reports were resubmitted March 2014. Copies of the reports, including the rubrics, can be found on the institution's AIMS website.

In addition to the assignments described in the Initial ePortfolio Handbook completed by all initial candidates, music education majors must complete program specific assignments attached to the following rubrics as listed in the handbook (see pg. 13):

Music Education

MUS IPAS
MUS Vocal OSAT
MUS Instrumental OSAT

MUS Sight Ear IV Exam
MUS Conducting
MUS Applied Performance
MUS Harmony IV Exam

Data are provided for each of the above rubrics. *(See Exhibit 176: Program Specific Music Education Data)*

The Advanced ePortfolio Handbook is designed much like the Initial ePortfolio Handbook. Hyperlinks to rubrics and explanations are provided for each assignment *(see Exhibit 10: pp. 5, 6, and 8)*. Additionally, page 7 provides a list of program specific rubrics and a hyperlink to each rubric. In addition to the ePortfolio Handbook, candidates completing internships are provided with an internship handbook with detailed explanations of program requirements. *(See Exhibits 5 & 7)*

Like the initial program, the unit submitted two program reports for national review (building and district administration). Faculty members have addressed the concerns and program reports were resubmitted for review March 2014.

<u>Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 5: 1st Paragraph)</u>

To increase feedback from advanced candidates, they will begin participating in an Exit Review Day beginning spring 2014. Candidates will complete an oral exit interview and complete the Educational Benchmarking Inc. Survey.

<u>Unit Response:</u>

During the spring 2014 semester, the advanced candidate program completers participated in an Exit Interview and the Educational Benchmarking Inc. Survey (EBI). While the graduate faculty will review and analyze the reports during the fall 2014 COE Faculty In-service, a copy of the reports have been provided for the On-Site team's review. *(See Exhibit 177: Advanced Exit Interview 2014 and Exhibit 178: Educational Benchmarking Inc. Survey Results-Advanced)*

<u>Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 5)</u>

AFIs continued from last visit:

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

Rationale:

The unit does not present assessment data documenting advanced candidates' ability to impact P-12 student learning.

<u>Unit Response:</u>

Candidates in other professional school roles are expected to demonstrate that they possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to create positive environments for student learning, and that they understand and build upon the developmental levels of students with whom they work; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work. ELCC Standards 1-6 , specifically 2.1-2.3; 4.1; and 5.1-5.3, address the components of this standard. Advanced candidates participate in activities during their internships that provide evidence that they are proficient in each of these areas. A detailed description of what candidates actually do is provided in the Internship assessment rubric. *(See Exhibit 179: Advanced Internship Rubrics)*

Exhibits 100 and 105 provide advanced candidate data aligned with the ELCC standards; disaggregated by building and district programs and a summative analysis of the data. *(See Exhibits 100 and 105)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 5)

Areas of concern

1. The unit does not present evidence that initial and advanced candidates affect student learning.

Rationale:
One data piece was available; ePortfolio and other course-related rubrics and assessment information do not address P-12 student learning.

Unit Response:
In addition to the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), the student teaching performance evaluation, lesson plans, and the Defense of Student Learning provide evidence that initial teacher candidates possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to have a positive impact on P-12 student learning.

During all stages of the Professional Education Program, teacher candidates develop the knowledge base for analyzing student learning and practice by collecting data and assessing student learning through case studies, field experiences, and course assignments. The PED 382 Educational Assessment course is the main course that addresses these proficiencies. A major component of the teacher education program is the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). Candidates begin learning about this methodology during their first field experience; however, a large portion of the assessment course is spent teaching candidates how to use student assessments to inform instructional decisions using the teacher work sample methodology. By the time candidates are assigned to their student teaching internships, they are ready to complete the TWS independently. Data from the TWS assess the candidates' ability to use appropriate assessments in instruction and to develop meaningful learning experiences for students based on their developmental levels and prior experience. Data from the TWS are used to evaluate the candidate, the program, and unit operations. These data are reflected in artifacts collected for the ePortfolio. TWS data reports are available by criterion aggregated across programs, and disaggregated TWS data by programs are found in the Program Reports. Factors 1 through 5 of the TWS are used to demonstrate that candidates can effectively plan classroom-based instruction and Factors 6 and 7 demonstrate the candidates' ability to analyze student learning gains following instruction. Exhibit 83: Teacher Work Sample Prompt includes a detailed description of what candidates are expected to do when creating the TWS and detailed rubrics used to assess the TWS, both of which are available to candidates while completing the TWS. Additionally Exhibit 84 provides a minimum of three years of aggregated data for TWS results and a summative analysis of the data. Sample TWS that have been assessed are also available for review. *(See Exhibits 83, 84 and 159)*

During the Student Teaching Internship, candidates are evaluated a minimum of two times by the University Supervisor and two times by the Cooperating Teacher during each of the two internship placements using the Student Teaching Performance Evaluation Rubrics. An example of the Student Teacher Performance Evaluation Rubric is provided as Exhibit 85. Candidates are assessed in the areas of Lesson Planning and Instruction. Exhibit 86 provides aggregate data for the Student Teaching Performance Evaluation rubric in these areas, and program level data are provided in each of the individual subject specific program reports. *(See Exhibits 85 and 86)*

All initial candidates are required to participate in the Defense of Learning where they are assessed on their ability to describe the impact they have had on P-12 student learning during the Student Teaching

Internship and defend the choices made for instruction. The candidate is expected to: describe all components of the Contextual Information, the implications of the contextual information, and describe adaptations made to the instructional strategies prior to, and throughout the unit based on the contextual information; list the goals and objectives for the unit, and describe the rationale for what was taught and why, and link the goals and objectives to the OK PASS objectives and/or the Common Core Standards; describe the pre-assessment tool used, present a graphic of the results, disaggregate the results into groups and sub-groups, address implications for unit based on the results, describe specific adaptations based on pre-assessment results linking all of them to specific individual students or sub-group or adequately defend their choice to not make adaptations; provide evidence of appropriate conclusions based on the analysis of student learning, present graphic results, and describe multiple hypotheses for why some students or sub-groups did not overcome barriers to achieve learning results; and identify teaching strategies needing strengthening; describe what effect his or her disposition, decisions, practices, or actions had on the learning community from a Christian Worldview, and include implications for self-change, and present at least one professional development goal that clearly emerged from the insights and experiences. A team of three evaluators listen and evaluate the candidate's Defense of Learning presentation. Exhibit 90 is a copy of the rubric used to assess candidates, and a data report based on administrators' feedback. Exhibit 180 provides additional data and a summative analysis of the data from the spring 2014 Defense of Learning assessment activity. *(See Exhibit 90 and 180: Defense of Learning Data)*

1.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 5)

1. *How do assessments demonstrate mastery of program standards? Consider providing samples of assessments, evaluations, and surveys, especially rubric benchmarks and evidence of standards alignment to demonstrate content knowledge mastery.*

Unit Response:

All rubrics are aligned with unit and/or program standards. Please review the information on pp. 1-3 of the Addendum. Samples of assessments, evaluations, and surveys are provided. Rubrics are embedded in the Initial and Advanced ePortfolio Handbooks. Finally, Exhibit 69: Title II Reports provide evidence that candidates demonstrate content knowledge mastery. The Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) results that are used for Title II reporting are aligned with state and national subject area standards. Test results indicate a 100 percent, 100 percent, and 97 percent pass rate for 2010, 2011, and 2012 program completers respectively.

Additionally, the resubmitted Program Reports with the National Response Reports will be available for the On-Site team to review. The COE will also update the Status of Program Reports Table as reports come in. *(See Exhibit 20)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 5)

2. *How do initial and advanced candidates demonstrate that they can affect student learning? Consider providing evidence of candidate's ability to affect student learning using teacher work samples and lesson plans.*

Unit Response:

Please see information provided on pp. 3 and 4 of the Addendum. The unit will provide a TWS for each certification area offered, which also includes a unit plan. *(See Exhibit 181: Teacher Work Samples and Sets of Contextual Information Sheets)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 5)

3. *When will the Undergraduate Council realign the competencies with the courses to ensure all competencies related to the OPTE are addressed?*

Unit Response:

The COE is committed to a continuous improvement model; therefore it is our intent to begin the process of realigning the competencies covered on the OPTE with the professional education courses fall 2014.

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 5)

4. *What is the Teacher Candidate Leadership Association? How does it function with the unit?*

Unit Response:

The Teacher Candidate Leadership Association (TCLA) is the leadership organization for the teacher candidates. All candidates are required to join an educational association in order to have insurance coverage prior to starting practicum experiences. Rather than have multiple associations on campus, and while candidates may choose to join Student Oklahoma Education Association (SOEA) or Professional Oklahoma Educators (POE), the COE decided to create its own candidate leadership organization. TCLA Officers are elected annually from among their peers to serve in leadership roles. The TCLA provides professional development and social events for all initial teacher education candidates. In addition, they help host the COE Homecoming conference. In terms of service leadership, they have helped remodel a community school through its "Move to Improve" event; they serve as spokespersons for the College of Education, host Test Prep Nights to help candidates prepare for the state certification exams, act as a liaison between candidates and faculty, and finally, serve as host for on-campus College of Education guests. The president and vice-president are sent to a national student leadership conference. Two full-time faculty members serve as faculty sponsors for the organization.

STANDARD 2

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 6: 1st Paragraph)
In addition to data from the ePortfolios, the unit collects data from other sources, such as alumni and employee surveys, Cooperating Teacher unit evaluations, course evaluations, comprehensive exams, admissions reports, and Title II Reports, but it is not clear where these data are housed.

Unit Response:
Alumni and employee surveys, Cooperating Teacher unit evaluations, course evaluations, comprehensive exams, admissions reports, certification exam results and Title II Reports are all housed on the Unit's Shared Drive or "S" drive to which all full-time and adjunct education faculty members and staff have access. Additionally, the Title II reports are posted on the University website. Reports are copied and discussed in various meetings including Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, Faculty Assembly, Assessment Week, and Faculty In-Service meetings. In addition to the following exhibits, hard copies of all meeting agendas and minutes will be available for the On-site Team to review. *(See Exhibits: 47, 48, 52, 53, and 59)*

Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 7)
2. What rubrics are being used, and how is the unit using them to support consistency within the unit and to eliminate biases?

Unit Response:
Please see the Unit's response to Standard 1 on pages 1-3.

The unit ensures that assessments are fair, accurate, non-biased, and procedurally consistent. All candidates must meet the same set of criteria to show competency. All are provided with the same guidelines and resources in addition to individual advisors to ensure they understand program requirements. Candidates have access to rubrics used to assess artifacts when they are creating the artifacts.

STANDARD 3

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 8: 1st Paragraph)
The unit provides field-based experiences (30 hours plus an additional 10-15 hours for major areas; for candidates in both elementary and secondary education.

Unit Response:
The total minimum hours of pre-student teaching internship practicum hours are as follows:

- Elementary/Early Childhood/Special Education candidates =105 hours
- Secondary/k-12 = 80 hours

Please note that many majors exceed the minimum hours of pre-internship practicum hours. *(See Exhibit: 78)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 8: 1st Paragraph)
Placement of candidates in field experiences is coordinated with the Tulsa Public Schools and the unit's field experience coordinator. Candidates also have an opportunity to volunteer in the Junior Achievement program.

Unit Response:
Field experience placements are not limited to Tulsa Public Schools, but several Tulsa area public and private schools including Jenks Public Schools, Union Public Schools, Broken Arrow Public Schools, Little Lighthouse, Victory Christian School, Lincoln Christian School, and Summit Christian School.

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 8-9: 5th Paragraph)
It is unclear however how university supervisors and cooperating teachers are selected and how the unit ensures they are prepared for their respective roles.

Unit Response:
University supervisors are assigned to supervise teacher candidates during the student teaching internship based on their area(s) of expertise, for example, the early childhood coordinator supervises candidates who are participating in a student teaching internship in an early childhood setting. Candidates that are completing internships in a special education classroom are supervised by the special education coordinator or a faculty member who has teaching credentials in special education. P-12 and secondary teacher candidates are supervised by secondary representatives who are faculty members in the departments in which they have their majors. For example, mathematics teacher candidates are supervised by a full-time math education faculty member and health and physical science teacher candidates are supervised by a full-time faculty member in the HPE department. *(See Exhibit 182: List of University Supervisors by Subject Area Specialty)*

The Coordinator of Student Teaching works with either the district central office personnel or the building principal in the selection of the cooperating teacher who supervises the teacher candidate on site. Letters are sent to district personnel or building principals that include required credentials needed for the Cooperating Teachers. Once selected, the Cooperating Teachers, teacher candidates and University Supervisors are required to participate in the Cooperating Teachers Orientation meeting. Orientation meetings are held once every semester, and include important information about the role and responsibilities of the Cooperating Teacher as well as an overview of the unit Conceptual Framework. Following each placement, candidates have the opportunity to evaluate their cooperating teachers. This information is utilized in conjunction with other information when decisions for future placements are made. Finally, building and district administrators return signed letters stating they will only select cooperating teachers and administrators as mentors that meet the ORU COE criterion. *(See Exhibit 183: Letters to District Personnel and Building Principals; Exhibit 196: Teacher Candidate Evaluations of Cooperating Teachers; Exhibit 197: Examples of Signed Letters from Administrators; Exhibits 39, 40)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 9: 2nd Paragraph)

The advanced program consists of two 120-hour internships during which candidates have opportunities to apply their knowledge and skills to real-world challenges.

Unit Response:

While candidates in the master building level administration certification program complete two 120-hour internships, candidates in the advanced Ed.D. program working toward district level administration certification participate in a minimum of 225 supervised hours in the field in an array of school settings. Candidates take a formal internship course, GADM 855 to complete 150 of the 225 internship clock hours. They are also required to complete five 15-hour field experiences as part of five specific courses. The five 15-hour field experiences constitute the remaining 75 clock hours of the 225 total requirements. The five specified courses are as follows:

- GADM 805 The Superintendency
- GADM 830 Business management practices in Education
- GADM 840 School Facilities Planning
- GADM 850 Legal, Political and Ethical Issues in Education Administration
- GADM 855 / GPED 855 Instructional Theory and Practice *(See Exhibit 17: GADM 805, GADM 830, GADM 840, GADM 850, GADM 855, and GPED 855)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 9-10: 6th Paragraph)

The unit has been engaged in continuous improvement by providing events in which representatives from the professional community are providing written feedback regarding programs and unit operations. There is limited information however regarding how the unit is using this feedback to demonstrate continuous improvement.

Unit Response:

Feedback from representatives from the professional community is constantly interwoven in Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, Faculty Assembly, and Assessment Week meetings. Examples of how information from these resources is used for continuous improvement include, but are not limited to the following:

Data Sources	Challenge	Program Changes	Results
Student Teaching coordinator end of year report. Assessment and Unit Evaluation Committee minutes.	Performance Evaluations needed to be in electronic format in order to improve the process for off-site faculty and cooperating teachers' submission of assessments. Faculty discussions began in 2011.	2013 -Electronic Performance Evaluations for student teaching internship assessment.	Electronic Performance Evaluations were Beta tested and in place by spring 2013.
TWS Data & Senior Day minutes and notes and Defense of Learning scoring sheets.	Improve candidate reflection, research skills, and professional demeanor.	Restructuring of Senior Honors Defenses on Senior Day to improve professionalism and research skills in presentation of student learning data acquired in student teaching internship.	Candidates presented their data in a Defense of Learning power point from that gathered in teaching a unit during the student teaching internship to a panel of P-12 school representatives, faculty and teaching alumni. Candidates were required to field questions and were scored based on student learning charts and answers.
Internship Supervisors Surveys	The unit sought feedback regarding the ELCC aligned internship experiences	Fall 2013 Internship supervisors were surveyed regarding the quality of the internship field experiences, the effectiveness of the scoring tools and interactions with ORU faculty.	Feedback from the Internship supervisors is reviewed each semester and adjustments are made as needed

Please see Exhibit 117 for additional initial and advanced data-driven changes made at the program and unit levels, many of which are based on feedback from the professional community. *(See Exhibit 117)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 9-10: 6th Paragraph)
The unit is providing professional development for the local school partners. Limited information is provided regarding examples of these professional development activities.

Unit Response:
Please see Exhibit 184 for a list of professional development activities that unit faculty conducted for local, national and international P-12 schools. Information provided in the document was extracted from faculty vitae and Unit Annual Reports. *(See Exhibit 184: P-12 Faculty Workshops and Exhibits 35 [pg. 4]; 36 [pg. 5]; 37 [pp. 7, 14, 31]; 119)*

Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 10)

1. *Are contextual information sheet available to demonstrate that the unit ensures diverse placements for candidates?*

Unit Response:
The Unit provided completed Contextual Information sheets as evidence of candidate diverse experiences. Please see Exhibit 160. Additional sets of Contextual Information Sheets (CIS) have been included for 13 candidates. There are between one to four contextual information sheets for each candidate which could include the following: (1) completed during the Field experience, (2) CIS completed with the Teacher Work Sample during the first student teaching internship and (3) CIS completed by the same candidate during the second student teaching internship. Hard copies will also be available for the On-Site BOE team. *(See Exhibit 160; See Exhibit 181: TWS and Sets of Contextual Information Sheets)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 10)

2. *How many candidates participate in Junior Achievement activities/experiences? Although a flyer for Junior Achievement was provided, no data or records were available to indicate how many candidates participated.*

Unit Response:
As a part of the Early Field Experience 30 hour practicum, candidates have an opportunity to volunteer in the Junior Achievement program. Thirty (30) candidates have chosen to participate in Junior Achievement in the past two years. *(See Exhibit 185: Field Experience Coordinator's Junior Achievement Report)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 10)

3. *How are university supervisors and cooperating teachers selected and how does the unit ensure they are prepared for their respective roles?*

Unit Response:
Please see the previous explanation on page 8 of this addendum.

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 10)

4. *How does the unit use feedback from the professional community to demonstrate continuous improvement in field experiences and clinical practice?*

Unit Response:
Please see the previous explanation on page 9-10 of this addendum.

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 10)

5. *What types of professional development does the unit provide to school partners? Provide specific examples.*

Unit Response:
Please see the previous explanation on page 10 of this addendum.

<u>Standard 4</u>

<u>Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 11: 3rd Paragraph)</u>
Initial candidates in the senior cohort are paired with advanced candidates who take modular courses concurrently.

<u>Unit Response:</u>
While initial candidate cohort classes and advanced candidate modular classes are conducted simultaneously, cohort candidates are not paired with modular candidates. Cohort candidates have opportunities to meet and discuss future plans with modular candidates which may result in candidates completing practicum experiences or internships in the buildings of modular candidates. Modular candidates also provide advice and feedback regarding cohort candidate goals.

<u>Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 11: 5th Paragraph)</u>
The unit has implemented an electronic data tracking system since the previous accreditation visit to track the number, type, and diversity setting for each candidate.

<u>Unit Response:</u>
The unit is in the beginning stages of implementing an electronic data tracking system. The ePortfolio provider is still beta testing the system and working out the flaws. The Unit's Educational Technology Director attended a conference recently to learn more about the system and to provide feedback to the provider regarding what works and what doesn't work. The ORU College of Education has entered into an agreement with the company to be a pilot institution for the implementation of the software. It is hoped that the system will be fully operational by spring 2015.

Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

<u>Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 13: 1st Paragraph)</u>
The unit works closely within the community through its planned outreach efforts. To this end, there is a proposed formal partnership would be provide the faculty and teacher candidates with the opportunity to take courses and to volunteer service at McClure Elementary in Tulsa Public Schools and Rosa Parks Elementary in Union Public Schools.

<u>Unit Response:</u>
The unit is currently working with Tulsa Public School District and the Union Public School District to formulate additional partnerships with area schools.

<u>Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 14)</u>

- *What data from cooperating teachers/mentor teachers indicate that initial candidates demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to student diversity? Provide examples of cooperating teacher assessments of candidates' ability to work with students from diverse populations, e.g., evaluative responses in the ePortfolio with feedback with faculty.*

<u>Unit Response:</u>
When enrolled in PED 111/121 – Field Experience, candidates are required to participate in a 30-hour practicum in which they complete a Contextual Information Sheet. The intent at this level is to build awareness of diversity in the classroom. Please see Exhibit 160: Samples of Complete Contextual

Information Sheets. Additionally, candidates complete weekly reports where they are required to answer several reflective questions. One such weekly report addresses diversity and candidates answer the following questions:

- List the cultures represented in the classroom; what is the significance of the diversity to a teacher and how does it affect the way you teach and work with parents?
- How many boys/girls are in the classroom; list differences in behavior and learning of boys/girls?
- How does being familiar with diversity assist this teacher in helping students of diverse backgrounds succeed?
- What is an IEP and how could it affect the success of any students in the class?
- Using your textbook, explain the teacher's position on diversity as observed in this classroom.
- What are the biblical principles for diversity?
- What other forms of diversity such as learning styles, personalities, etc. are presented in this classroom? List examples.

Please find completed examples of weekly reports as evidence. *(See Exhibit 160 and Exhibit 186: Sample Diversity Weekly Reports)*

The Student Teaching Performance Evaluation has several sections which measure candidate performance in settings with diverse student learning needs. One is under Lesson Plan Accommodation: Candidate plans for student diversity abilities and styles. Another is under Instruction in which the candidate is assessed on monitoring for understanding and making adjustments or modifications based on his/her findings. Also, see the Cooperating Teachers ratings of candidates under 'Individual Student Differences.' Scores range consistently from Competent to Exemplary. *(See Exhibit 187: Student Teaching Performance Evaluation Diversity Data)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 14)

- *What feedback and/or survey data from P-12 school personnel on candidate preparation for working in diverse P-12 settings are available?*

Unit Response:

Cooperating teachers provide feedback on candidate preparation for working in diverse P-12 settings on the Student Teacher Performance Evaluation. Additionally, the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation Employer Data report provides feedback on candidate preparation to work with diverse P-12 learners. *(See Exhibit 187: Student Teaching Performance Evaluation Diversity Data; Exhibit 114 [pp. 4-5])*

ELCC Standards 1.1-1.5 and 5.1-5.3 reflect advanced candidates' ability working with diverse populations. The Program Reports for the Building Level and District Level: Assessment #5 for both present data collected from the Internship School Site mentors. The data suggests that candidates are well prepared to work with students from diverse populations. *(See Building and District Program Reports: Assessment 5)*

Additionally, the majority of our alumni serve in P-12 schools. The 2009 Alumni survey is aligned with the ELCC standards. ELCC Standards 1.1-1.5 and 5.1-5.3 relate to working with diverse populations. These are reflected on the 2009 Alumni survey as Question 16 and 18. This data suggests that our alumni felt that they were very well prepared to work with diverse populations. *(See Exhibit 113: pp. 16 & 19 – Questions 16 and 18)*

<u>Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 14)</u>

- *Where are advanced candidates placed, and what is the diversity of the student population in those placements? Provide detailed data regarding placements for advanced program candidates' internship/practicum experiences in diverse settings.*

<u>Unit Response:</u>
The internship includes a variety of extensive experiences in diverse settings, planned and guided cooperatively by university and school personnel. These experiences will provide interns with substantial responsibilities which increase over time in amount and complexity and which involve direct interaction and involvement with students, staff, parents, and community leaders. The internship provides significant opportunities in the workplace for the intern to synthesize and apply the knowledge and to practice and develop the skills identified in six of the ELCC Standards. If a private school with a diverse student population is not available, the candidate's second school internship will typically be served in a larger public school with a more diverse student population. A list of candidate internship sites is available with links to the school's website. Advanced candidates also provide feedback regarding their experiences with diverse P-12 learners. *(See Exhibit 188: Advanced Internship Sites 2011-2014; Exhibit 178: EBI Survey Results [Advanced])*

STANDARD 5

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 14: 2nd Paragraph)
The unit has 17 full-time faculty members (including three members on the administrative level) with a doctoral degree and six full-time faculty members with a master's degree.

Unit Response:
The unit has 16 total full-time faculty members: 14 full-time faculty members (including three members on the administrative level) with a doctoral degree and two full-time faculty members with a master's degree. *(See Exhibit 118)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 14: 2nd Paragraph)
The criteria to evaluate scholarship was not clearly outlined or discussed, although a merit pay rubric was included and illustrated the value of scholarship.

Unit Response:
In addition to being evaluated annually by the COE leadership utilizing the merit pay rubric, faculty scholarship is evaluated for promotion, tenure, and sabbatical leave. The Oral Roberts University Policies and Support Material for Faculty Promotion, Tenure, and Sabbatical Leave document outline criterion used to determine if faculty qualify for promotion in rank, tenure, or is granted sabbatical leave. Recently, the Unit adopted additional criteria for promotion in rank for its faculty to better clarify the expectations. *(See Exhibit 189: ORU Policies and Support Material for Faculty Promotion, Tenure, and Sabbatical Leave; 190: COE Promotion and Tenure Policy)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 15: 1st Paragraph)
While the unit discussed the use of technology by faculty, there was limited evidence of the integration of technology beyond submitting assignments via computer or platform systems (i.e., Blackboard). The unit did not present evidence as to how professional development encourages the use of technology integration.

Unit Response:
Interviews with faculty and candidates will substantiate faculty integration of technology for instruction.

The unit consistently provides opportunities for faculty professional development in the area of technology. The Director of Technology offers workshops on how to use Smartboards and clicker systems. The university online department offers assistance to faculty who want to include an online component to their face-to-face classes or who want to develop an online course. As a result most unit faculty members have an online D2L component in their courses. Please see faculty course syllabi. The university has a partnership with the 8th Floor, a technology center that offers technology professional development to area P-12 and higher education faculty. A review of faculty professional development plans and vitae will reveal that several faculty members take advantage of the opportunity to take classes at the 8th Floor. The 2012 Homecoming Conference sponsored by the College of Education offered workshops on the integration of technology in instruction of which several faculty members participated. The 2011 COE Faculty In-Service meeting includes several workshops on the integration of technology. Finally, the Graduate Council has a standing agenda item for its meeting entitled new discoveries on the IPad. *(See Exhibits 16, 17, 119,120, 138 and Exhibit 191: COE Homecoming Conference Program-2012; 192: COE Faculty In-Service Agenda-2011)*

<u>Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 15: 3rd Paragraph)</u>
The protocol for determining how faculty members are evaluated is unclear, as is the process for ensuring faculty members make adequate progress toward their goal.

<u>Unit Response:</u>
Faculty evaluations consist of student end of course instruction evaluation and peer observation evaluations. Faculty members are evaluated by candidates at the end of every course. Initial faculty member courses utilize the Student Opinion Survey which is electronic. Because of the modular format of graduate courses, advanced faculty members are evaluated using a slightly different instrument. Finally, in addition to faculty members selecting peers to conduct observations, the COE leadership develops an annual schedule for observing faculty members. Faculty can select from one of two evaluation instruments to use for the observations. Faculty members include completed evaluation forms in their Professional Development notebooks which will be available for review by the On-site team. *(See Exhibit 193: Faculty Observation Instruments; 194: Leadership Observation Schedules 2011-2014)*

In February when faculty contracts are distributed, either the chair or dean meets with each faculty member to discuss their professional development plans and course evaluations. At the beginning of each academic year, all full-time faculty members complete the Professional Development Form (PDF) and submit it to the respective chair for review to determine if the plan reflects the goals of the faculty member. Once approved, faculty may complete a Proposal for Funding form to accompany the PDF. Once it has been determined that funding is available for the proposed professional development activities, all proposals go to the unit Professional Development Committee (PDC) to determine alignment of activities with goals. Faculty members must justify the significance of the conference, as well as how it relates to faculty specific area of expertise and how it is related to criterion 3D. Continuing Education on the Professional Development Form which states the following as examples: doctoral classes; 8th floor; list of conferences; books or articles you plan to read and **should be based on evaluations**, etc. At the end of the school year, faculty members are required to complete the PDF by selecting whether or not they Accomplished/Continuous/Terminated the proposed goal. The PDC reviews the final document as do the chairs and the dean. *(See Exhibit 12)*

<u>Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 15: 4th Paragraph)</u>
The unit did not offer evidence as to how the PDC determines if the activities are approved. Also, additional evidence is needed to corroborate how faculty members integrate information learned from professional development into improving their teaching, scholarship, and service.

<u>Unit Response:</u>
Please see the above statements regarding approval of faculty professional development activities. Additionally, faculty members present at Brown Bag luncheons and at various faculty member gathers information learned at professional development functions and how they have applied information learned to improve their teaching, scholarship, and service. (*See Exhibit 119 and 121)*

<u>Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 16)</u>
Areas of concern
1. Though there is a faculty evaluation system in place, it is unclear how faculty evaluation data are used to develop new knowledge and skills, especially related to performance assessment, technology, diversity, and other emerging practices.

Rationale: Evidence is needed to substantiate the connection between the faculty evaluation data and the unit's effort to facilitate professional development of faculty members.

Unit Response:
Please see previous explanations addressing these concerns on page 16 of this addendum.

Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 16)

- *How are faculty evaluations used to improve the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service?*

Unit Response:
Please see previous explanations addressing these concerns on page 16 of this addendum.

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 16)

- *How do faculty members integrate diversity in their instruction?*

Unit Response:
Please see previous course syllabi for examples of how faculty members integrate diversity in their instruction. *(See Exhibit 16 & 17)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 16)

- *How does the unit use faculty evaluations to facilitate professional development?*

Unit Response:
Please see previous explanations addressing these concerns on page 16 of this addendum.

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 16)

- *How does the unit address faculty members who do not meet performance expectations?*

Unit Response:
In the case where a preponderance of evidence is presented that a faculty member is not meeting performance expectations, especially multiple low scores on end of instruction evaluations, one or more members of the unit leadership team will conduct an observation. In addition, the dean and the appropriate chair will meet with the faculty member. If it is an adjunct faculty member, the contract would not be renewed at the end of the semester. In the case of a full-time faculty, a detailed development plan is produced with a timeline for follow-up. A copy of the plan is given to the faculty member and a copy is kept in the dean's office. The Provost is kept abreast of any on-going faculty challenges. Procedures, including a detailed grievance policy, are outlined in the ORU Faculty and Administration Handbook. *(See Exhibit 195: ORU Faculty and Administration Handbook pp. 38-39 & 56-58)*

STANDARD 6

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 17: 4th Paragraph)
From the description in the IR, it is unclear if the secondary representatives are unit faculty or faculty members from other colleges on campus.

Unit Response:
Secondary Representatives are full-time tenure-track faculty members, with the exception of one who is an adjunct faculty member, who are housed in the respective departments of the candidate's major. So for instance the Science Education Secondary Representative is a full-time faculty member in the Biology department which is a part of the College of Science and Engineering. Secondary Representatives serve on the COE's Undergraduate Council and supervise and advise candidates who are education majors in their subject areas. The unit pays each Secondary Representative a stipend for attending the monthly Undergraduate Council meetings. Additionally, Secondary Representatives are paid a stipend for supervising student teacher interns from the COE budget. Finally, Secondary Representatives can also apply for professional development funding from the COE to attend education related conferences and workshops. *(See Exhibit 15)*

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 17: 4th Paragraph)
It is also unclear how the P-12 community is represented on governance structures in the unit.

Unit Response:
NCATE Standard 6 states the following at the acceptable level: Faculty involved in the preparation of educators, P-12 practitioners, and other members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its program. While the standard does not require that the P-12 community is represented in the governance structure in the unit, a P-12 representative does serve on the Unit's Professional Development Committee. Additionally, the IR explains in detail the involvement that P-12 practitioners and the professional community have in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs. Please reference, in the IR, Standard 2 Target Level (1st paragraph), Standard 3 section 3.1 (1st paragraph), and Standard 3 section 3.2 (2nd paragraph) for explanations of how the unit engages members of the professional community in its programs.

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 18: 2nd Paragraph)
It is unclear how advisors are assigned to candidates in other school professional programs.

Unit Response:
Advanced level faculty members have areas of expertise and experience that serve the various areas of concentration within the advanced programs. There are at least two faculty members for all but one area of concentration. Therefore, the area of concentration selected by the candidate in the application process will reduce the advisor selection to the faculty members serving that specific area of concentration. Once this is determined, the Chair of the advanced programs selects the advisor simply by alternating equally between the advisors specializing in that area.

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 18: 4th Paragraph)

Even though the unit has documented total funding for professional development over a three-year period, it is unclear if professional development is a recurring budget item or if there is a set amount per faculty member that is consistently budgeted for professional development, including conference travel.

Unit Response:

The budget for professional development has been a consistent line item in the undergraduate and graduate budgets since at least 2003 and has continued to increase annually with the exception of the years between 2008 through 2010. Since the 2011 budget, the funding for the COE professional development has continued to increase. Please see the budget for professional development from 2003 to present below.

Professional Development Budgets

Budget Year	Amount for Undergraduate Education	Amount for Graduate Education	Total Allotted College of Ed.
2003-2004	7,182	0	7,182
2004-2005	15,830	7,376	23,206
2005-2006	19,830	7,376	27,206
2006-2007	19,830	7,376	27,206
2007-2008	26,928	10,376	37,304
2008-2009	23,928	6,376	30,304
2009-2010	23,928	6,376	30,304
2010-2011	24,804	5,071	29,875
2011-2012	25,930	8,071	34,001
2012-2013	25,930	8,816	34,746
2013-2014	21,185	20,564	41,749
2014-2015	19,612	25,459	45,071

Please note that the original document (see Exhibit 127) and the table above have different totals for years 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013. The document that was submitted previously did not include the travel budget for the recruiter, while the above document does include those figures. *(See Exhibit 127)*

The unit leadership has chosen not to allocate a set amount per faculty member for professional development. Each faculty member turns in his/her Professional Development Form which includes desired conference/workshop attendance and presentations, at the beginning of the year and the leadership team determines if we have enough budgeted to cover all requests. If not, we begin prioritizing first by who is presenting. Then we look at who was funded the previous year. If a faculty member proposes to go to the same conference two years in a row and there is a shortage of funds, we ask them to wait until the next year. Thus far, because additional funds are available in a restricted account, 100 percent of the requested professional development activities have been funded.

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 19: 2nd Paragraph)
Additionally, the unit has recently hired a recruiter.

Unit Response:
The unit has had the position of a recruiter for several years; we just hired a new recruiter for the existing position.

Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 20)

1. *How are P-12 partners involved in unit governance? The unit has provided documentation regarding the involvement of faculty outside of education in the governance processes of the unit. It is unclear how P-12 partners are involved or represented on governance-related councils or committees in the unit.*

Unit Response:
Please see previous explanations addressing these concerns on page 18 of this addendum.

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 21)

2. *Who are secondary representatives as referred to in various IR sections, such as the descriptions on advising and professional development? Clarify the academic home and responsibilities of secondary representatives.*

Unit Response:
Please see previous explanations addressing these concerns on page 18 of this addendum.

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 21)

3. *How are candidates in other school professional programs assigned advisors? What is the advising process for these candidates? Documentation regarding advisement of candidates in initial preparation programs exists; however, it is unclear how candidates in other school professional programs (principal and district-level administrator programs) are advised.*

Unit Response:
Please see previous explanations addressing these concerns on page 18 of this addendum. Additionally, candidates meet with their advisors on an “as needed” basis. Advisors utilize email, phone, Skype, and face-to-face strategies to advise candidates.

Off-Site Report Statement (Pg. 21)

4. *Is funding for professional development regularly budgeted and does the unit have a per-faculty amount allocated for professional development? The unit has provided evidence of policies, practices, and sample activities related to professional development of faculty. One document identifies the amount of funding used to support professional development over a three-year period. It is unclear if professional development is a recurring budget item or if there is a set amount per faculty member that is consistently budgeted for professional development, including conference travel.*

Unit Response:
Please see previous explanations addressing these concerns on page 19 of this addendum.