Mid-America Christian University School of Teacher Education

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MID-AMERICA  CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY PASS RATE FOR CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS FOR OKLAHOMA EDUCATORS** | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | 2019-2019  STATE PASS RATE |
| OGET | 93.1% | 100% | 75% | 75.4% |
| OSAT | 82.6% | 76.5% | 82.6% | 66.7% |
| OPTE | 92.3% | 90% | 93.3% | 87.2% |
| PPAT |  |  | 100% |  |
| MACU OVERALL PASS RATE FOR ALL TESTS | 89.6% | 88.8% | 87.7 | 81.7% |

**ANNUAL REPORTING MEASURES FOR CAEP/STATE ACCREDITATION:**

**IMPACT ON P-12 STUDENT LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT (COMPONENT 4.1)**

**Teacher Work Sample**

This capstone project completed during the student teaching semester is a reflective look at how a future teacher can impact P-12 students. Each student teacher develops a unit plan, assess students before and after the unit, teach lessons between assessments and evaluation data collected from students during the process. Student teachers also reflect on their impact on the learning of the P-12 students and set goals for future professional development.

Component 1: Analysis of Learners: Candidates us demographics of the community, school district, school and classroom to describe students in terms of who they are culturally, personally, exceptionalities and classroom interaction to give them information about how to choose assessments, instructional strategies and activities to engage in differentiating instruction.

Component 2: Instructional Design: Candidates create a unit plan and lesson plans including lesson objectives aligned to state standards and competencies. Candidates us multiple levels of learning incorporating critical thinking, problem solving and authentic performance tasks. Candidates also include provisions for collaborative or instruction groups that are appropriate to the instructional goals. Technology use is both an appropriate avenue to achieve learning but meets various learning styles and student abilities.

Component 3: Assessment: Candidates choose appropriate assessments, aligned to goals and objectives, to assess students’ prior knowledge, adjust instruction throughout the lesson and post assess to provide information regarding student learning. Data is collected, analyzed and interpreted throughout the unit and candidates reflect on how these results impacted their teaching and their student learning.

Component 4: Evaluation of Learning: Candidates evaluate student learning both individually and as a group against each goal and objective using technology to create charts and graphs to show outcomes relating to the analysis of learners in their classroom. Candidates use evidence from the data to support conclusions about student learning, evaluating their impact on the student learning based on educational theory and research. Candidates reflect on their teaching discussing what was effective and what modifications would be made to improve student learning. Candidate also identifies professional learning goals and creates an action plan to meet those future goals.

Beginning fall 2019 Candidates piloted the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT). This assessment will replace the OPTE in spring 2021 and will also replace the Teacher Work Sample for Student Teachers. The Teacher Work Sample will continue to be used for teachers in their resident year or first year of teaching to assess impact on their P-12 learners.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MACU Student Teacher**  **Teacher Work Sample Scores** | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 |
| **Overall Mean Scores** | 3.31 | 3.36 | 3.42 |

**INDICATORS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS (CAEP COMPONENT 4.2)**

**MACU Resident First Year Teacher Evaluations**

**INTERSTATE TEACHER ASSESSMENT AND SUPPORT CONSORTIUM (InTASC)**

**TEACHER LEADER EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION/MARZANO FOCUSED TEACHER EVALUATION**

Teacher Candidates are evaluated during Student Teaching by the MACU Student Teacher Evaluation. This instrument is aligned to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards that were developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). The instrument was also aligned to the Teacher Leader Effectiveness Evaluation and the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation. Student Teacher Candidates are trained and then evaluated in the domains that show their effectiveness as teachers. Subsequently Resident First Year Teachers are evaluated in these domains to reflect the effectiveness of our school of teacher education.

**TEACHER LEADERSHIP AND EFFECTIVENESS MODEL DOMAINS**

Classroom Management

Instructional Effectiveness

Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement

Interpersonal Skills

Leadership

**MARZANO FOCUSED TEACHER EVALUATION MODEL**

Classroom Based Strategies

Planning and Preparing

Standards Based Planning

Reflecting on Teaching

Collegiality and Professionalism

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teacher Leadership and Effectiveness Model Domains**  **Score of 1.00-5.00** | **Spring 2017-Fall 2017** | **Spring 2018-Fall 2018** | **Spring 2019-Fall 2019** |
| Classroom Management | 3.44 | 3.55 | 3.67 |
| Instructional Effectiveness | 3.27 | 3.35 | 3.42 |
| Professional Growth and Continuous Improvement | 3.47 | 3.57 | 3.58 |
| Interpersonal Skills | 3.44 | 3.61 | 3.60 |
| Leadership | 3.20 | 3.30 | 3.56 |
| **Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model** |  |  |  |
| Classroom Based Strategies | 3.00 | 3.47 | NA |
| Planning and Preparing | 3.38 | 3.67 | NA |
| Standards Based Planning | NA | NA | 3.57 |
| Reflecting on Teaching | 3.50 | NA | NA |
| Collegiality and Professionalism | 2.89 | 3.89 | NA |

\*NA=Not Assessed

**SATISFACTION OF EMPLOYERS (CAEP COMPONENTS 4.2/A.4.1)**

**Administrator/Mentor Teacher Survey**

Administrators and mentor teachers measure how well educator preparation programs are preparing teachers for the classrooms. Surveys are administered by the Oklahoma Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA). The survey responses are for teachers prepared by Mid-America Christian University’s Teacher Education Program. Their administrators and mentor teacher rated the teachers using this scale:

1: Strongly Disagree

2: Disagree

3: Agree

4: Strongly Agree

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STATE FIRST YEAR TEACHER SURVEY**  **ADMINISTRATOR/MENTOR** | **Fall 2018-Spring 2019**  **N=3**  **4 points possible** |
| Overall Mean Satisfaction Score | 3.3 |

**SATISFACTION OF COMPLETERS (CAEP COMPONENT 4.1/A. 4.2)**

**RESIDENT FIRST YEAR TEACHER SURVEYS**

Resident first year teachers are surveyed by the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA). The resident teacher reflects on the effectiveness of their preparation in their teacher education program. This feedback informs faculty and stakeholders helping them to improve the quality and consistency of their programs. Teachers respond to the following elements.

1: Strongly Disagree

2: Disagree

3: Agree

4: Strongly Agree

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STATE FIRST YEAR TEACHER SURVEY**  **GRADUATE** | **Fall 2017-Spring 2018**  **N=5**  **4 points possible** |
| Overall Mean Satisfaction Score | 3.2 |

**OUTCOME MEASURES**

|  |
| --- |
| **GRADUATION RATES PROGRAM COMPLETERS** |
| **2016-2017 100%** |
| **2017-2018 100%** |
| **2018-2019 100%** |

|  |
| --- |
| **PROGRAM COMPLETER PASS RATES** |
| **2016-2017 100%** |
| **2017-2018 100%** |
| **2018-2019 100%** |

|  |
| --- |
| **RATE OF EMPLOYMENT OF COMPLETERS SEEKING TEACHING POSITIONS** |
| **2016-2017 100%** |
| **2017-2018 100%** |
| **2018-2019 100%** |

**STUDENT LOAD DEFAULT RATE -** 2017 CDR Draft Rate of 13.1.