BOARD OF EXAMINERS ONSITE REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

University of Tulsa
April 12-14, 2015

Onsite BOE Team Members
Dr. Ronna Vanderslice, Chair
Dr. Vivian Guarnera
Dr. Christee Jenlink
Ms. Christie Riley
Dr. Angela Watson

Onsite BOE Team Observers

Ms. Renee Launey-Rodolf, State Consultant
Ms. Heather Sparks
Dr. Lisa Huffman

Updated April 2015

Board of Examiners Report for
Continuous Improvement Visit

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

Institution: University of Tulsa

Team Recommendations:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Standard Met	Standard Not Met
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Standard Not Met	Standard Not Met
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Standard Met	Standard Met
4. Diversity	Standard Met	Standard Met
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Standard Met	Standard Met
6. Unit Governance and Resources	Standard Not Met	Standard Not Met

I.   INTRODUCTION

I.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

The University of Tulsa (TU) is a private, doctoral-degree granting institution located in Tulsa, Oklahoma. It was established in 1882 as the Presbyterian School for Indian Girls in Muskogee, Indian Territory. The institution was later elevated to the Henry Kendall College, named after the first general secretary of the Home Missions Board, and in September 1894, the first classes were held in the new college. In 1907, the year of Oklahoma's statehood, the college was moved to Tulsa and it became chartered as The University of Tulsa in 1920.

The mission of TU reflects the core values of excellence in scholarship, dedication to free inquiry, integrity of character, and commitment to humanity. The complete mission statement can be viewed online and was articulated by faculty and administration in interviews. The University's 2013-2014 enrollment was about 4,600 with approximately 3,450 undergraduates

and 1,150 graduate and law students. The fall freshman class of 2014 had an average ACT score of 29 and an average SAT score of 1250.

Currently, the University comprises the Henry Kendall College of Arts and Sciences, the Collins College of Business, the College of Engineering and Natural Sciences, the John Rogers College of Law, the Graduate School, and the Division of Lifelong Learning. The University also has a public-private partnership for the management of Gilcrease Museum of Western Art. The University of Tulsa provides undergraduate, graduate, and professional education in the arts, humanities, sciences, business, education, engineering, law, nursing, and applied health sciences.

In 2015, the University engaged in a partnership with the University of Oklahoma to initiate the TU College of Health Sciences, relocating Communicative Disorders and the School of Nursing, as well as other departments from the College of Arts and Sciences. Some teacher preparation programs will be housed in the new College, such as Exercise and Sports Sciences and Speech Language Pathology. The Provost confirmed finalization of this move will happen in Fall 2015.

The School of Urban Education is the professional education unit responsible for managing and coordinating all programs offered for the initial and advanced preparation of teachers and other school professionals. In 2013, the School of Urban Education was divided into two separate units: the School of Urban Education and the Department of Educational Studies. The mission of the School of Urban Education is to prepare teachers, while the Department of Educational Studies has responsibility for teaching and conducting research, in collaboration with the School, but with greater flexibility for the Educational Research faculty to develop collaborative and individual research. According to the provost, this division has allowed the School of Urban Education to concentrate better on their goal of producing high quality teachers for urban schools.

The School of Urban Education is composed of four full-time faculty members. The School of Urban Education consists of one tenured Associate Professor, one Elementary specialist/clinical Coordinator on a year contract as Visiting Professor (for the 4th year), and one Director/Applied Assistant Professor. In 2014, three new positions were filled: Certification Officer/Accreditation Administrator; English/Language Arts tenure-track Assistant Professor; K-12 STEM (math/technology) tenure-track Assistant Professor.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

The University of Tulsa is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission. TU is also a member of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), and the Oklahoma Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (OACTE).

National accreditation of the Teacher Education Program is provided by the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), in partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). State recognition of all TU teacher preparation programs is through Oklahoma's partnership between CAEP and the Oklahoma Office of

Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA), formerly the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation (OCTP).

Five NCATE BOE members conducted the offsite review in December 2014 in consultation with the state representatives from the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability. An offsite review report was completed and submitted to the institution in preparation for the onsite visit. An addendum was prepared by the unit and submitted by the unit on February 27, 2015.

A previsit was conducted on March 16. During the previsit, discussion focused on identification of programs to be reviewed, clarification of IR contents, individuals to include in onsite interviews, role of the teams, and logistical plans for the onsite visit. The onsite review was conducted concurrently by the state team in April 2015.

I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

The unit offers teacher preparation majors in both secondary and elementary and K-12 education. The following teacher preparation programs are fully accredited by their national professional accrediting associations are: Deaf Education (CED), Instrumental Music (NASM), Vocal Music (NASM), Physical Education, Health/Safety (NASPE), and Speech-Language Pathology (ASHA). The Masters of Science, Speech Pathology is at the Advanced Level.

Graduate programs are offered by both the School of Urban Education and the Department of Educational Studies. Advanced programs offered in the School of Urban Education at TU are a Master of Education in Education (M.Ed.), a Master of Science in Math and Science Education (M.S.M.S.E.) and a Master of Teaching Arts (MTA). Only the Master of Education program leads to initial certification. The Department of Educational Studies offers a Master of Arts in either Language, Discourse and Development or in Educational Foundations. The Masters in Science, Speech Pathology is a separate degree offered by the School of Urban Education. The unit does not offer doctoral programs in Education.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

There were no unusual circumstances that affected the visit.

II.   CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for the unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P–12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The mission of the professional education unit at the University of Tulsa focuses on developing *transformative* professional educators who are:

- Subject matter experts;
- Practicing scholars of educational research;
- Ethical, dedicated representatives of the profession;
- Equipped to advance every child's learning amid the social, economic and cultural diversity found in the classroom and surrounding community.

The philosophy of the professional education unit focuses on the five areas of: epistemology, human nature, curriculum, pedagogy, and teacher responsibility.

Six program phases were identified in the unit's assessment system. The six phases are:

1. Declaration of a major in Education;
2. Consultation with education advisor(s) to plan the student's course of study (Balance Sheet);
3. Preparation for Admission to the Teacher Education Program (TEP);
4. Application and Admission to the Teacher Education Program;
5. Application and Admission to Student Teaching; and
6. Completion of Student Teaching and Exiting the Program

These phases are found in both the Student Handbook and TU's Undergraduate Bulletin in the College of Arts and Sciences' section for The School of Urban Education.

III.   STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS *Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.*

1.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Onsite interviews with faculty, alumni, and current candidates and additional information in the addendum report confirmed the School of Urban Education has 12 undergraduate programs which lead to initial certification: deaf education PK-12, elementary education 1-8, instrumental music PK-12, vocal music PK-12, exercise and sports science PK-12, art education PK-12, foreign language PK-12, mathematics 6-12, English education 6-12, science education 6-12, social studies 6 -12, and speech/drama/debate 6-12. The unit also offers two advanced programs

for the preparation of teachers which are the Masters in Education with options in elementary education, anthropology, art, biology, chemistry, English, geosciences, history, mathematics, physics, political sciences, and sociology; and Masters of Science in Speech and Language Pathology and both degrees lead to initial certification. The unit offers three advanced programs for the preparation of teachers: Masters of Teaching Arts (MTA), Masters of Science in Mathematics and Science Education (MSMSE), and Masters of Arts (Language Discourse and Development and Foundations of Education) which do not lead to certification.

The program reports for elementary education, exercise and sports science, art education, foreign language, mathematics, English, science, social studies and speech/drama/debate were submitted for state review. The elementary education and the exercise and sports science programs were fully recognized. Art, foreign language, mathematics, English, science, social studies and speech/drama/debate were recognized with conditions at the undergraduate and graduate level. Deaf education, instrumental music, vocal music and speech and language pathology are accredited by their respective learned societies. The Masters of Teaching Arts (MTA), Masters of Science in Mathematics and Science Education (MSMSE), and Masters of Art do not lead to certification and therefore, are not required to submit reports for program review.

Content knowledge is assessed through the Oklahoma General Education Test (OGET) and the Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT). The unit provided OGET scores in the programs and for the 2013-14 school year in the exhibits. The scores are not disaggregated by program but they indicate that the candidates have more than an 80% pass rate. The OSAT scores were provided in the program reports and for the 2013-14 school year in the exhibits. The OSAT scores indicated that the candidates have more than an 80% pass rate. The OSAT scores were disaggregated by program. The Masters in Science, Speech and Language Pathology program reported a 100% passing rate for candidates in 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 on the Praxis. No evidence was provided on the assessment of content knowledge for the Masters of Teaching Arts (MTA), Masters of Science in Mathematics and Science Education (MSMSE) and Masters in Education (M.Ed.).

Pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills are assessed through the Oklahoma Professional Teacher Examination (OPTE). The unit provided OPTE scores in the program reports and for the 2013-14 school year in the exhibits. The scores are not disaggregated by programs but indicate that the reported candidates had more than an 80% pass rate. No evidence on pedagogical content knowledge and skills was provided for the Masters of Teaching Arts (MTA), Masters of Science in Mathematics and Science Education (MSMSE), Masters in Education (M. Ed.), and Masters of Art (MA).

Onsite interviews with cooperating teachers, faculty, and alumni indicated that teacher candidates can apply the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning through field experiences and student teaching. No evidence was provided that the candidates in the programs in Masters of Teaching Arts (MTA), Masters of Science in Mathematics and Science Education (MSMSE), Masters in Education (M.Ed.), and Masters of Art (MA) which demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

The unit provided the data for the teacher work sample through the program reports and for the 2013-14 school year in the exhibits. The teacher work sample was not disaggregated by program but the overall scores demonstrate that the candidates in the initial, bachelor programs demonstrate their ability to develop and implement meaningful learning experiences for students and can analyze student learning and make data-driven decisions about the teaching and learning process. No evidence was provided that the candidates in the programs in Masters of Teaching Arts (MTA), Masters of Science in Mathematics and Science Education (MSMSE), Masters in Education (M.Ed.), and Masters of Art (MA) demonstrate the candidates' impact on student learning.

The unit provided a list of dispositions in the addendum report that the candidates are evaluated on within their field experiences and student teaching. The list of dispositions did not include the required dispositions of the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn. The candidates were not familiar with the professional dispositions and they were unaware of when they were assessed on the dispositions. It was unclear what program candidates were assessed and included in the aggregated data submitted in the addendum. There was no evidence of a rubric that is utilized in the assessment process of the dispositions or a procedure which indicated when candidates were assessed.

1.2a Movement Toward Target

Not applicable to this standard

1.2.b Continuous Improvement

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has developed assessment plans and submitted program reports for 11 undergraduate and one graduate degree with 12 options. The unit has continued to redesign their assessment plans and have reduced the number of standards that were not met in the original reviews.

1.2.b.i Strengths

The candidates in the initial, undergraduate programs demonstrated competencies in knowledge, content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills and student learning.

1.3.c. What new AFs are recommended?

AFI (Advanced): The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates in the advanced programs with the exception of the Masters in Speech and Language Pathology demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content that they teach.

Rationale: There is no data available at this time on the in-depth knowledge of the content in the advanced programs.

AFI (Advanced): The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the content of their field and of the theories related to pedagogy and learning.

Rationale: There is no data available at this time on the in-depth understanding of the content in their field and of the theories related to pedagogy and learning in the advanced programs.

AFI (Advanced): The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates demonstrate in-depth professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Rationale: There is no data available at this time on the in-depth professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

AFI (Advanced): The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates thoroughly understand the major concepts related to assessing student learning, regularly apply them in their practice, and make data-driven decisions so that all students can learn.

Rationale: There is no data available at this time on the impact on student learning in the advanced programs.

AFI (Initial and Advanced): Candidates are not familiar with professional dispositions and no evidence is available to demonstrate classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn.

Rationale: In the interviews with candidates, there was no evidence that candidates knew the dispositions or the process for assessing the dispositions. There was no data available that assessed fairness and the belief that all students can learn.

1.4 Recommendations

Initial Teacher Preparation   MET
Advanced Preparation   NOT MET

STANDARD 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION *The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.*

2.1 Overall Findings *What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?*

The unit's assessment system at the initial level includes six transition phases that provide data collection points to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates and its programs.

Examples of assessments include the state mandated tests (OGET, OSAT, OPTE), the Teacher Work Sample, admission requirements, and the Student Teaching Summary Evaluation. Transition phases for the assessments for the Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology are outlined through a Program Analysis Timeline. Data from the Praxis exam, employment/job placement rates, and graduate/program completion rates serve as key assessments for the program. Program faculty regularly review data and make changes based upon those reviews.

The Conceptual Framework, professional, and state standards are reflected in assessments. Data are collected from applicants, candidates, and faculty, and there are no candidates in alternate route, off campus, or distance learning situations.

The Chalk and Wire system is used for e-portfolios at the beginning and end of initial level programs and the Speech Pathology program. The unit plans to incorporate the Chalk and Wire system for the purpose of collecting assessment data and evaluation to improve unit operations, candidate performance, and programs. The unit has had one formal student complaint with evidence provided for the resolution of that complaint.

There is no evidence demonstrating the unit systematically collects and analyzes data through multiple, comprehensive, integrated assessments with subsequent evaluation to monitor and improve candidate performance. The unit did not provide evidence to demonstrate the professional community's involvement in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the assessment system. No evidence was found indicating effective steps have been taken to eliminate bias in the assessments and for the assurance of fairness, accuracy, and consistency of the assessment procedures and unit operations.

The unit did not provide evidence that it regularly and comprehensively analyzes and summarizes assessment data to improve unit operations, its programs and candidates. There is evidence indicating an informal process is in place for improving candidate performance, but evidence of a formalized process for this purpose was not found. Two programs regularly and systematically conduct graduate and employer follow-up surveys (Master of Science and Deaf Education); however, other programs within the unit do not. No evidence of assessment data collection, analysis, and evaluation was found for the Master of Arts, Master of Science in Mathematics and Science Education, and the Master of Teaching Arts. The role of external sources in the collection of data could not be determined.

Evidence did not exist demonstrating the unit regularly and systematically uses data to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs, and clinical experiences. There was no evidence indicating data are shared with candidates and faculty to improve their performance and programs.

2.2b Continuous Improvement

The unit will implement the use of technology to support the systematic collection and analysis of data through the Chalk and Wire system for candidate and program improvement.

2.3 Areas for Improvement (Initial and Advanced)

2a. Assessment System

The unit does not have a systematic and comprehensive assessment system.

Rationale: The unit's assessments are not systematized and comprehensive.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

The unit does not regularly and systematically collect, analyze and evaluate data.

Rationale: The unit does not collect, analyze and evaluate data in a systematic way.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

The unit does not regularly and systematically use data for program improvement.

Rationale: The unit does not have a formal system for regularly using data for program improvement.

2.4 Recommendations

Initial Teacher Preparation—Not Met

Advanced Teacher Preparation—Not Met

STANDARD 3: FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE *The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.*

3.1 Overall Findings *What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?*

There is clear evidence that the unit is engaged in a variety of field-based experiences for candidates in both elementary and secondary education. Candidates have the opportunity to participate in observations, short-term and long-term placements in the classroom setting. They are provided experiences in diverse settings with a wide range of student demographics. The unit partners with Tulsa Public Schools for many of the candidate placements as well as placements in other area schools. However, there is no evidence of tracking to ensure each candidate participates in field experiences including students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender and socioeconomic groups.

During the onsite visit, evidence was reported of collaboration in designing and implementing various field experiences through informal collaboration. For example, information is gathered

through conversations, the cooperating teacher seminar and the graduate follow-up breakfast surveys. While data is collected from these activities, there is no evidence that the data are acted upon.

The initial report provided no correlation between the field experiences and clinical experiences to the conceptual framework. The evidence provided in the addendum report shows the four components of the conceptual framework are outlined in the Student Teaching Summary Evaluation Form completed by the faculty evaluator and the mentor teacher at midterm and at the end of student teaching. The interviews provided evidence of student proficiency in technology and the use of the teacher work sample which concentrated on assessments, data and impact of student learning. (Exhibit: #64- Assessment of Oklahoma Competencies: Student Teaching Summary Evaluation Form)

Candidates in master's programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels which lead to initial certification complete the same field experiences as the undergraduate teacher candidates though data is not disaggregated by initial undergraduate and initial graduate programs.

3.2 Movement Toward Target? What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?"

The unit has a partnership with Tulsa Public Schools department of professional development for training on a New Teacher Mentor Program. TU faculty and candidates are allowed full access to this training. A Field Placement Packet is given to each cooperating teacher outlining the expectations and providing the evaluation forms to be completed. Evaluations during the student teaching semester are completed by the mentor teacher and the faculty advisor at mid-term and the end of the semester. The mentor teacher also completes an evaluation on the program itself. The onsite visit interviews provided additional evidence of collaboration on designing and implementing various field experiences, the sharing of expertise and the integrating of resources to support candidate learning.   Some examples of this collaboration would be the recommendation by a P-12 school for students to have additional training on the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) in order to have a better understanding of classroom implementation. On the recommendation of a P-12 faculty member, a special education teacher is invited into the classroom to provide a more detailed instruction on the use of the IEP in public schools. Also, the use of Love and Logic as the behavior management style used with the teacher candidates is also supported in a partnership between TU and Kendal-Whittier Elementary School, with the principal of the school becoming a trainer in the program. This allows for an easier transition from the classroom into the school system using the same form of behavior management.

3.3 Areas for Improvement (Initial and Advanced)

Some of the plans provided during the interviews to enable the unit to move to target level would be the hiring of an additional unit member to enable better tracking of teacher candidate placements and field experiences.

3.3a

Previous AFI: P-12 school partners are not involved in designing appropriate field experiences for candidates in P-12 schools.

Removal: *Evidence has been provided of collaboration in designing field experiences for candidates in P-12 schools.*

Additional AFI: The unit does not ensure that all candidates at the undergraduate and graduate level leading to initial certification have field experiences and clinical practice with P-12 students from different socioeconomic groups, students from diverse ethnic/racial groups, English language learners, and students with disabilities.

Rationale: *There is no evidence of tracking to ensure each candidate participates in field experiences including students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender and socioeconomic groups.*

Additional AFI: The unit does not have field experiences in the advanced level programs.

Rationale: *There is no evidence that advanced teaching candidates apply coursework in classroom settings.*

STANDARD 4: DIVERSITY *The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with **diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P12 schools.***

4.1 Overall Findings. *What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?*

The onsite visit confirmed that the University of Tulsa recognizes the important role diversity plays in the success of all aspects of life in a growing global community. The unit's mission of developing transformative professional educators who are equipped to advance every child's learning is clear. Although it is not clear in the institutional report that the unit had articulated

proficiencies related to diversity in their conceptual framework; interviews confirmed consistency in clarifying the expectations.

The unit offers a required course addressing students with exceptionalities. Candidates are required to take EDUC 4103-6403 –Education for the Exceptional Child. In this course, classroom safety, classroom management techniques, and mental health issues are discussed from the perspective of various special education exceptionalities. In addition, the Lesson Plan now includes an additional criteria addressing meeting the needs of all students. It includes the accompanying question of "How will support for various learning needs be addressed/ provided?" This addition was made in 2005 and was based on feedback from the previous 2005 Institutional report.

Candidate interviews confirm they are aware of different learning styles and can adapt instruction to meet the needs of their students; however the unit did not have dispositional data demonstrating that candidates demonstrate classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideas of fairness and the belief that all students can learn. While some dispositional data related to diversity is assessed, the data is not used to provide feedback to candidates for improving their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping students from diverse populations learn.

Demographic information provided on the unit's candidates and faculty indicates that candidates have interaction with others from diverse backgrounds. Faculty demographic data at the University level indicate that 67% of the faculty members are male, while 33% are female. As reported in the self-study 1% of the university's faculty members are Black or African American, 3% are Hispanic/Latino of any race, 5% are American Indian or Alaska Native, 6% are Asian, 79% are White and 5% did not report their ethnicity. At the unit level, the faculty consists of 1 African American, 1 Native American, and 2 Caucasian members. Interviews confirm the unit's efforts to increase the diversity of unit faculty. Candidates interact with faculty from at least two ethnic/racial groups.

In initial programs, 77% of candidates are White, 7% are American Indian or Alaska Native, 3% are Hispanic/Latino of any race, 2% are Black or African American, 4% reported two or more races and 2% are unknown. In the advanced programs, 70% of candidates are White, 15% are American Indian or Alaska Native, 5% are Hispanic/Latino of any race, 3% are Black or African American, and 7% are unknown. Since the number of candidates is extremely small, no candidates in the advanced programs reported two or more races.

All but one professional education course includes required field hours where candidates go into the local schools. Prior to student teaching, all education majors are required to complete a minimum of 45 hours of field experiences. Although all candidates are placed in Title I schools wherever possible during their Student Teaching Seminar, there is not a tracking system in place to confirm that all candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practice that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender and socioeconomic groups.

4.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Candidates participate in a field experience in a very diverse school, Kendall-Whittier Elementary.

4.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?
Not applicable

4.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Candidates in the unit work collaboratively with unit faculty in P-12 classrooms to transform schools and address the achievement gap of students in high-poverty, low-income schools.

4.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

No previous AFIs

4.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?
AFI AFI Rationale

No previous AFIs

4.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI: The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidate proficiencies related to diversity are assessed, and the data are used to provide feedback to candidates for improving their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping students from diverse populations learn.

Rationale: Assessment data is not shared with candidates for self-improvement.

4.6 Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation Met
Advanced Preparation Met

STANDARD 5: FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Overall Findings. *What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?*

Unit personnel are comprised of four faculty members, a certification officer, two administrative assistants, and five graduate assistants. Faculty are qualified, holding doctorates and exceptional expertise in their fields and demonstrating contemporary professional experiences in school settings. As content experts, they are able to help candidates develop the requisite proficiencies specified in professional standards, which was confirmed by candidates in interviews. Faculty members encourage candidates' development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions. They use a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of different learning styles, and they integrate diversity and technology throughout their teaching.

In addition, faculty are engaged in scholarly work that is consistent with unit and university missions. They collaborate with P-12 partners and are involved in various professional associations. Faculty are also engaged in service to the university and broader community and provide education-related services at the local and state levels in ways that are consistent with the university's mission. Evidence is still lacking, however, to substantiate regular and systematic collaboration with colleagues in other college or university units to improve teaching, candidate learning, and the preparation of educators.

Although faculty demonstrate exemplary qualifications and service, there is insufficient evidence to determine how assessment data are used to inform professional development. For example, it is unknown how they assess their own effectiveness as teachers including the positive effects they have on candidates' learning and performance; how evaluative data are used to improve faculty teaching, scholarship, and service; and how needs identified in faculty evaluations are used to provide opportunities to develop new knowledge and skills, especially as they relate to the conceptual framework, performance assessment, diversity, technology, and other emerging practices.

5.2 Continuous Improvement

5.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has been actively seeking to collaborate and form partnerships with P-12 school stakeholders. Moreover, many faculty members have shown initiative in pursuing scholarship through publications and presentations in their area of expertise and some have successfully pursued grant development.

5.2.b.i Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Faculty members are meaningfully engaged in scholarship related to their areas of expertise, are licensed in the fields that they teach, and are recognized for their competence in their field.

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

What AFIs should be continued but revised?

AFI (revised): Unit faculty do not collaborate regularly and systematically with faculty in other college or university units to improve candidate learning and the preparation of educators.

Rationale: Evidence suggests that the unit does collaborate regularly with P-12 stakeholders and members of the broader professional community, but does not appear to regularly or systematically collaborate with faculty in other college or university units involved with preparation of teacher candidates to improve candidate learning and the preparation of educators.

AFI: The unit lacks sufficient evidence that professional development is provided to address needs based on faculty and unit evaluations.

Rationale: There is no evidence of professional development opportunities based upon evaluation data.

STANDARD 6: UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES *The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.*

6.1 Overall Findings. *What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?*

Although there is an authority structure whereby important information is disseminated and discussed, unit leadership and authority arrangements do not result in coherent planning, delivery, or operation of programs for the preparation of teachers and other school personnel. Published materials appear to be accurate and current; however, there is some potential confusion over whether or not the M.T.A. should be advertised in the School of Urban Education brochure. Candidates have access to academic co-advising from both within the professional education department and the other departments that may house their majors. The collegial university culture is conducive to informal communication and collaboration. Mutual respect and deference enable faculty within the unit and between other departments to voice opinions and concerns in the design and implementation of programs. The institutional report and interviews suggest a recent improved mechanism for collaboration within the School of Urban Education and P-12 stakeholders, although evidence is unclear regarding whether there is sufficient involvement of university content experts from other departments.

It could not be determined if the budget for these programs is proportional to other comparable clinical programs at the university. Interviews yielded conflicting information about whether or not there are adequate resources to fund the educator preparation programs. The budget structure

does not allow for planning to meet all needs adequately. Interviews suggest a budgetary need must first arise to which the university will then respond.

The institutional report suggests that workload policies allow for faculty members to meet obligations. Faculty members typically carry a 15 hour load per year (three classes one semester; two classes the next). The supervision of student teachers is calculated into the teaching load on the basis of two student teachers per credit hour. Multiple interviews, however, suggest that there is not enough support personnel to adequately meet all program needs. For example, multiple sources confirmed a need for more graduate assistants as well as a full time person to coordinate clinical assignments and help manage a comprehensive assessment system.

The institutional report indicates that the university provides adequate campus facilities. Additionally, plans are in place to begin a new building project to benefit the unit. Follow-up interviews confirmed that there is a shortage of space, that more room is needed to adequately meet program needs, and that the new building may not be used by the unit. Existing facilities do support faculty and candidate use of information technology in instruction.

The institutional report did not make clear the details of the unit's assessment plan. Interviews suggest that assessment is informal and ongoing, but existing human resources do not appear to be sufficient to adequately develop, implement, and administrate a formal assessment plan for the unit.

The unit has access to adequate information technology resources to support faculty and candidates. Professional education faculty and candidates have access both to sufficient and current library and curricular resources and electronic information. The unit does not currently offer distance learning programs as a distance design is not consistent with the current mission of the unit.

6.2 Continuous Improvement

6.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Interviews have highlighted multiple changes and improvements that have been planned and implemented in recent years. Structural changes have streamlined the unit and improved efficiency in collaborations within the unit and with other departmental units in the university. Significant improvements in technology tools and training have been implemented, as well as increasingly comprehensive and high quality library resources.

6.2.b.i Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Faculty and candidates have access to exemplary library, curricular, and electronic information resources that serve not only the unit but also a broader constituency. Library personnel are committed to procuring any resources needed and making themselves accessible to faculty and students. Moreover, the technology expert who teaches the undergraduate technology courses and has been responsible for training and support has aggressively pursued the most recent developments in technology to support faculty in modeling the use of technology and to support candidates in practicing technology use for instructional purposes.

6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.3b What AFIs should be continued?

AFI: The unit does not have established procedures to ensure collaborative decision making within the unit.

Rationale: There is no evidence of established procedures to ensure collaborative decision making within the unit, which should include every faculty member involved in educator preparation.

AFI (revised): Unit does not have a clear structure to ensure input from important stakeholders including university content experts.

Rationale: Evidence is missing to indicate a clear structure to ensure that meaningful input is gathered from university content experts.

6.3c What new AFIs have been recommended?

AFI: There is no evidence that the unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations.

Rationale: There is no evidence that the unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations at least proportional to other units on campus with clinical components or similar units at other campuses to provide programs that prepare candidates to meet standards.

OKLAHOMA
STATE REQUIREMENTS REPORT
(Onsite)

Institution: University of Tulsa
Date of Visit: April 12-14, 2015

Oklahoma Requirements		Team Findings	
		Initial	**Advanced**
1	Candidate Portfolios	Met	Met
2	Foreign Language Requirements	Met	n/a
3	Input from Stakeholders	Not Met	n/a
4	Content Preparation	Met	n/a
5	Advisement	Met	n/a
6	Field Experiences	Met	n/a
7	Admission Requirements	Met	n/a
8	Exit Requirements	Met	n/a
9	Faculty Professional Development	Not Met	n/a
10	Alternative Placement Program	Met	n/a

M = Requirement Met   NM = Requirement Not Met

Requirement 1: Candidate Portfolios (Initial and Advanced)

1.1 Overall Findings
The institution requires all initial and advanced certification candidates to develop a portfolio documenting evidence of candidates' accomplishments, learning and strengths related to the standards and competencies. Evidence was provided that the unit established periodic portfolio checkpoints which provide feedback to candidates. The portfolio handbook is maintained within the Student Handbook and includes philosophy, written policies, criteria and rubrics.

1.2 Areas for Improvement (AFI's) n/a

AFI's Removed:

AFI	Rationale

AFI's Continued:

AFI	Rationale

New AFI's:

AFI	Rationale

Requirement 2: Foreign Language Requirement (Initial and Advanced)

2.1 Overall Findings

Candidates completing the Teacher Education Program must demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language by completing a language course offered by The University of Tulsa. Languages include American Sign Language, Chinese, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Latin, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish. Four college semesters of a single language are required by the Henry Kendall College of Arts and Sciences with a grade of "C" or higher or a proficiency examination. This requirement is included in the Undergraduate Bulletin.

2.2 Areas for Improvement (AFI's) n/a

AFI's Removed:

AFI	Rationale

AFI's Continued:

AFI	Rationale

New AFI's

AFI	Rationale

Requirement 3: Input from Stakeholders (Initial and Advanced)

3.1 Overall Findings
Evidence was provided and interviews confirmed that the unit seeks input from P-12 administrators and cooperating teachers along with the unit's teacher candidates. However, it could not be determined that the unit has an established process for seeking program information and input from faculty from arts and sciences or other appropriate programs and disciplines.

The institution does report, on an annual basis, to OEQA the procedures used to inform the public regarding the institution's teacher education program.

3.2 Areas for Improvement (AFI's)

AFI's Removed:

AFI	Rationale

AFI's Continued and Revised:

AFI	Rationale
The unit does not have an established process for seeking program information and input from faculty from arts and sciences, and other appropriate programs and disciplines	No data was provided to indicate that the unit regularly and systematically seeks input with faculty from arts and sciences and other appropriate programs and disciplines

New AFI's:

AFI	Rationale

Requirement 4: Content Preparation (Initial)

4.1 Overall Findings
Candidates are required to earn an undergraduate major in their subject area. Teacher candidates in elementary education are required to take 12 semester hours of mathematics, science, language arts, and social studies. Interviews with candidates and course syllabi confirmed that candidate preparation included information regarding substance abuse symptoms, mental illness symptoms, mental health issues, classroom management, and classroom safety and discipline techniques.

Areas for Improvement (AFI's): n/a

AFI's Removed:

AFI	Rationale

AFI's Continued:

AFI	Rationale

New AFI's:

AFI	Rationale

Requirement 5: Advisement (Initial)

5.1 Overall Findings
Interviews confirmed that teacher candidates are advised of opportunities for employment, including shortage area information and salary structures.

5.2 Areas for Improvement (AFI's) n/a

AFI's Removed:

AFI	Rationale

AFI's Continued:

AFI	Rationale

New AFI's:

AFI	Rationale

Requirement 6: Field Experiences (Initial)

6.1 Overall Findings
Prior to student teaching, all initial candidates complete at least ten hours of field experience in EDUC 1101 Introduction to Education and 20 hours in each methods course. Students' field experiences are evaluated as compared to other pre-service teachers.

All students in initial programs complete Student Teaching courses and EDUC 4971 Seminar in Student Teaching, which involves 15 consecutive weeks of full-time student teaching. Students seeking K-12 certification are required to complete EDUC 4616 Student Teaching in Elementary School, EDUC 4626 Student Teaching in Middle School or EDUC 4636 Student Teaching in Senior High School.

6.2 Areas for Improvement (AFI's) n/a

AFI's Removed:

AFI	Rationale

AFI's Continued:

AFI	Rationale

New AFI's:

AFI	Rationale

Requirement 7: Admission Requirements (Initial)

7.1 Overall Findings
Documentation of the candidate's experiences working with children is required as part of the teacher candidate's interview for Admission to Teacher Education, as confirmed on the interview rubric.

Criteria for admission into TU's Teacher Education Program are:
- **Achievement of an overall grade point average of at least 2.75 in 30 semester hours of college credit.**
- **Achievement of a grade point average of at least 2.75 in their major to date**
- **Achievement of a grade point average of at least 3.0 in professional education courses**
- **Passing score on the Oklahoma General Education Test (OGET)**
- **Achievement of at least a "C" in English l033 or equivalent.**
- **Achievement of at least a "C" in Education 1101 and Education 2103.**
- **Completed interview with Education Advisor.**
- **Signed statement of knowledge of and compliance with pertinent State laws.**
- **Completed review of Teaching Portfolio by Education advisor.**
- **Recommendation of Education Advisor.**

As stated in the TU's School of Urban Education Student Handbook, Undergraduate Bulletin, Application for Admission to the Undergraduate Teacher Education Program, and EDUC 1101 syllabus, candidates must pass the OGET to be admitted to teacher education programs.

7.2 Areas for Improvement (AFI's) n/a

AFI's Removed:

AFI	Rationale

AFI's Continued:

AFI	Rationale

New AFI's:

AFI	Rationale

Requirement 8: Exit Requirements (Initial)

8.1 Overall Findings
Exit requirements for TU's School of Urban Education include the development and completion of the Teacher Work Sample through student teaching, evidence of general and subject matter competencies at the level of mastery expected for a beginning teacher (lesson plans, unit plans, video tapes of teaching, evaluations by cooperating teachers, peers and university supervisors), and evidence of reflection on personal qualities as a teacher and on personal philosophy of education (both are required to be written reflections). In addition, candidates are expected to provide evidence of a plan for continuing development.

8.2 Areas for Improvement (AFI's) n/a

AFI's Removed:

AFI	Rationale

AFI's Continued:

AFI	Rationale

New AFI's

AFI	Rationale

Requirement 9: Faculty Professional Development (Initial and Advanced)

9.1 Overall Findings
The unit does not have an active system in place documenting and reporting the annual professional development activities of all teacher education faculty members.

It is not clear that all faculty directly involved in the teacher education process serve for at least 10 clock hours per school year in state accredited public schools in direct contact with meaningful and relevant roles.

9.2 Areas for Improvement (AFI's)

AFI's Removed:

AFI	Rationale

AFI's Continued:

AFI	Rationale

New AFI's:

AFI	Rationale
The unit does not annually document and report the professional development activities of its teacher education faculty members. All full-time faculty directly involved in the teacher education process, are not verified as serving 10 hours per year in public schools with meaningful and relevant responsibilities.	**No data was provided to indicate that the unit annually collects and reports faculty professional development activities. Data was not provided that verified that all full-time faculty involved in the teacher education process serve a minimum of ten hours per year in public schools.**

Requirement 10: Alternative Placement Program (Initial and Advanced)

10.1 Overall Findings
The unit has a plan in place for candidates who seek alternative certification.

10.2 Areas for Improvement (AFI's) n/a

AFI's Removed:

AFI	Rationale

AFI's Continued:

AFI	Rationale

New AFI's:

AFI	Rationale

University of Tulsa – Portfolios

Emma Mosely	Elementary Ed	
Farra Dykes	Elementary Ed	
Ellen Eisenhower	Math	
Carter Scarbrough	Math	
Shalynne Chaplin	History	
Michael Mancini	History	
Katie Boul	English	
Kelsey Kindbom	English	
Tonya North	Deaf Ed	
Shawna Compassi	Deaf Ed	
Emma Cantrell	Voice	
Dana Pharis	Voice	
Bobby Kitchen	Instrumental	
Keysto Stotz	Instrumental	
Jesse Brubaker	Exercise/Sports Science	
Luke Snyder	Exercise/Sports Science	
Gracie Weiderhaft	German	
Timothy Dougherty	Spanish	
Marry Timmons	Chemistry	
Gregory Jones	Chemistry	
Lindsay Lane	English	
Adranna Catalanotto	Communications	
Diane Kelly	Speech Pathology	
Carole Cothran	Speech Pathology	