

## **Title 218 – Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability**

**Chapter 1            Administrative Operations**

**Chapter 10        Educational Quality**

Subchapter 5      Educator Preparation Program Accreditation

Subchapter 7      Educator Assessment

Subchapter 9      Education Leadership Oklahoma

Appendix A        Competency Exam Requirements by Certification Areas

## **TITLE 218. COMMISSION OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

### **CHAPTER 1. ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS**

#### **218:1-1-1. Purpose**

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the administrative rules for the Commission of Educational Quality and Accountability, hereinafter known as CEQA. The general purpose of the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability, hereinafter known as OEQA, is prescribed by the Legislature and OEQA acts as the agency in the exercise of the policy powers of the State of Oklahoma.

#### **218:1-1-2. Definitions**

The following words or terms, when used in this Chapter, shall have the following meaning, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

**“Commission”** means the Commission of Educational Quality and Accountability.

**“Executive Director”** means the Executive Director of the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability.

#### **218:1-1-3. Official office**

The OEQA is located at 840 Research Parkway, Suite 455, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 73104. The phone number is 405-522-5399. The office hours are from 8:00a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Central Time, Monday through Friday, except legal holidays.

#### **218: 1-1-4. Commission meeting, quorum**

The Commission shall hold at least six (6) regular monthly meetings each calendar year at a time and place as shall be designated by the Commission. Four of the voting members of the Commission shall be present at the meeting to constitute a quorum.

#### **218:1-1-5. Executive sessions**

The Commission may hold executive sessions at such sessions as is permitted by the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act.

#### **218: 1-1-6. Special meetings**

Special meetings may be called by the Commission Chair and/or Executive Director by delivery of written notice to each member of the Commission with not less than forty-eight (48) hours notice. A majority of voting members shall be present at the meeting to constitute a quorum of the Commission.

#### **218:1-1-7. Notice of meetings**

Notice of regular and special meetings will be given in accordance with the provisions of the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act.

#### **218:1-1-8. Agenda items**

The Executive Director, in conjunction with the Commission Chair shall prepare an agenda for each meeting of the Commission. The agenda is filed and posted in accordance with the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act.

#### **218:1-1-9. Legal counsel**

The Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma shall serve as legal counsel for the CEQA and shall assist the Commission in its performance of the powers and duties delineated to it by statutory authority.

**218:1-1-10. Personnel**

- (a) Executive Director. The Commission shall select an Executive Director, according to procedures established by the Office of Management and Enterprise Services, to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties and responsibilities established by the Legislature.
- (b) OEQA Staff. The Executive Director will employ necessary personnel, according to procedures established by the Office of Management and Enterprise Services, to assist the Commission in the performance of its duties.

**218:1-1-11. Powers and duties of the Executive Director**

The Executive Director of the OEQA shall have the following powers and duties, which shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- (1) Acting as the chief administrative officer for purposes of carrying out the Commission's statutory authority;
- (2) Establishing and maintaining a central repository on information regarding availability, acquisition and disposition of all federal funds, state appropriations, and other grants related to the assessment of teachers and administrators and approval of teacher education programs;
- (3) Establishing and maintaining a central repository for all duly adopted rules and regulations, minutes, and reports;
- (4) Acting as an agent for the Commission in all matters relating to educational quality and accountability as delineated by the commission's statutory authority;
- (5) Employing, demoting, or dismissing personnel and making specific assignments of duties for positions and at rates of compensation approved by the Commission to the extent that funds are available.

**218:1-1-12. Availability of records and manner of obtaining information**

All files, records, minutes, proceedings, rules, documents, decisions, opinions, written statements of policy, and written materials of any other nature required by law to be maintained by the Commission are available for public inspection in the office of the Executive Director of the OEQA. Any persons desiring any information concerning the Commission, its policies and procedures or any pertinent information concerning said organization may make submissions or request the Commission, either in person or by mail by directing such submission or request to the office the Executive Director of the OEQA.

**TITLE 218. COMMISSION OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY  
CHAPTER 10. EDUCATIONAL QUALITY**

Subchapter 5. Educator Preparation Program Accreditation

### **218:10-5-1. Educator Preparation Program Accreditation and Review Process**

(a) Oklahoma educator preparation institutions function under an 'accreditation program' system which requires the evaluation of teacher education units and programs on a periodic basis.

(b). Effective July 1, 2014 the Commission of Educational Quality and Accountability, hereafter referred to as the CEQA, shall assume responsibility for accrediting educator preparation programs in Oklahoma's public and private institutions of higher education.

(c) The program accreditation system shall be a multifaceted system based on:

- (1) A competency-based educator preparation program built around the standards for Oklahoma educator preparation programs (See 218:10-5-3 and 218:10-5-4);
- (2) Institution plans as outlined in the standards for state accreditation;
- (3) On-site accreditation review team visits to the campuses of the institutions of higher education;
- (4) Analysis of data related to student success rates on the general education, professional education, and subject matter assessments;
- (5) Analysis of student satisfaction data;
- (6) Analysis of student/teacher candidate portfolios.

(d) Prior to being accredited each institution must meet the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation, herein referred to as CAEP, preconditions for accreditation and all requirements of the CEQA, and/or receive the approval of the OSRHE when applicable, and provide required documentation for each precondition.

- (1) All initial plans will be reviewed by the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability, hereafter referred to as OEQA, who will determine accreditation for seven years, accreditation for two years with a focused visit, accreditation for two years with a full visit, defer decision or denial of accreditation.
- (2) Performance-based training will be conducted by the CAEP and/or their designee.
- (3) Any OEQA member or OEQA appointee who is involved in any evaluation and/or accreditation decision related to any educator preparation unit and/or program must complete the performance-based training related to the review and accreditation of educator preparation units and/or programs prior to voting and/or participating on any accreditation decisions.

(e) The CEQA is a performance-based partner with the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (State Regents) and CAEP. All educator preparation programs shall be expected to meet all CAEP unit and program standards, SDE competencies, as well as all additional standards established by the CEQA.

- (1) Application form. The application form containing the required information will be completed by the director of educator preparation at the institution seeking CEQA accreditation for the educator preparation certificate programs.
- (2) Institutional plan. The institutional plan shall be utilized by the CEQA for state accreditation, State Regents program review, and CAEP accreditation as stipulated in OS 70 sections 6-180.
- (3) Records to be kept on file at the institution. The following items and records shall be kept on file at the institution with the director/dean of teacher education.

- (A) Copy of the institution plan;

- (B) Copy of annual report to the CEQA;
- (C) Syllabi for courses in the areas of specialization, general education, and professional education will be kept on file with the institution; and
- (D) Full faculty resumes will be on file for review. All levels of teaching personnel will be indicated.
- (E) Copies of program review reports.
- (F) Candidate CEOE scores.

(4) OEQA personnel will establish an accreditation visit schedule that will adhere to CAEP accreditation timelines.

(5) Selection of accreditation review team. Selection of the accreditation review team will be coordinated by the OEQA staff after the visitation dates are set. Selection of the accreditation review team shall be based on the following:

(A) All team members must have been trained by CAEP staff and/or their designee in the application of CAEP standards and on the process for evaluating programs for the CEQA.

(B) Accreditation team for first accreditation. The membership of a first accreditation review team shall be as follows:

(i) Three to six representatives from the CAEP Board of Examiners (for CAEP accredited institutions).

(ii) State representatives appointed by the OEQA including:

(iii) P-12 representative;

(iv) One representative from higher education who is a member of a educator preparation unit. For accreditation of private institutions the representative shall be from a private institution; for public institutions this representative shall be from a public institution;

(v) One representative from the OEQA serving as State Consultant;

(vi) One additional at-large member;

(I) For any institution requesting accreditation of a career technology program(s) an additional accreditation review team member may be recommended by the State Director of Career and Technology Education.

(II) The OEQA will determine observers from representatives of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Oklahoma State Department of Education, Oklahoma Department for Career and Technology Education, professional organizations, and the community-at-large.

(III) Observers shall be actively involved in the data collection process, participate in the accreditation review team meetings, and assist the accreditation review team to understand state nuances. They may assist, but shall not be required to write any sections of the team report. They shall not be a voting member of the team.

(IV) Observers are expected to participate in the entire visit and all assigned meetings and activities.

(V) The chair of the accreditation review team has the authority to dismiss any observer from the accreditation visit who does not participate in the entire site review and assigned activities.

VI)The OEQA shall collaborate with the director of educator preparation at the institution requesting state accreditation to determine the team representation.

(C) Accreditation team for continuing accreditation. The membership of a continuing accreditation review team shall be as follows:

(i) CAEP representatives as determined by CAEP (for CAEP accredited institutions);

(ii) State representatives which will number one less than the CAEP representatives;

(iii) The OEQA shall collaborate with the director of educator preparation at the institution being reviewed to determine the state committee representation;

(iv) The OEQA will determine observers from representatives of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, State Department of Education, and the community-at-large. If a Career and Technology program is offered at the institution the State Director of Career and Technology Education may nominate a team member for any institution requesting accreditation of career and technology program(s);

(v) Observers shall be actively involved in the data collection process, participate in the accreditation review team meetings, and assist the accreditation review team with understanding state nuances. They may assist but shall not be required to write any sections of the team report. They shall not be a voting member of the team.

(vi) Observers are expected to participate in the entire visit and all assigned meetings and activities.

(vii) The chair of the accreditation review team has the authority to dismiss any observer from the accreditation visit who does not participate in the entire site review and assigned activities.

(D) Accreditation teams for non-CAEP accredited institutions shall be composed of state representatives.

(6) Logistics for CAEP/State accreditation visits shall adhere to the CAEP and State guidelines.

(A)The completed accreditation review team report will be presented to the CEQA and CAEP (as applicable).

(B)Visiting team members will be reimbursed for expenses incurred according to state guidelines. Reimbursement forms must be completed by team members on the last day of the visit.

(7)Preparation of the team report. The accreditation review team work will culminate in preparation of a report outlining the findings of the team following CAEP guidelines. The report will reflect the team consensus on the review.

(A) At the exit report, representatives of the accreditation review team will present a summary of its evaluation of the program. The summary will include findings for each standard and state requirement including areas for improvement.

(B) The completed CAEP and OEQA reports will follow the CAEP timelines for submission; and

(C) The recommendation of the accreditation review team regarding the program will be made to the CEQA. For CAEP accredited institutions, final accreditation decisions will be made after the CAEP Commission has forwarded its accreditation decision to the CEQA.

**(8)**The rejoinder process will adhere to the CAEP requirements regarding institutional rejoinders.

(A)Final action on the reports and institutional accreditation will proceed according to CAEP Guidelines.

(B)Final action by the CEQA may include the following actions:

(i)First and Continuing Accreditation for seven years.

(l) First Accreditation or Continuing Accreditation for seven years is granted to the education unit and program(s) if the CEQA finds that standards have been adequately addressed to merit accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the CAEP standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its annual report the institution will be expected to address progress on the areas for improvement cited in the accreditation report. When the CEQA has determined that an education unit is not making progress toward the removal of the areas for improvements cited during their visit, the institution will be notified that the unit will be required to submit a plan and timeline for addressing the areas for improvement. If at the end of six (6) months the CEQA determines the education unit has not submitted sufficient data documenting adequate progress toward the removal of the areas for improvement, a state-level Focus Visit will be warranted within 18 months. After such Focus Visit the CEQA will have the option of granting continuing accreditation or revoking accreditation. This progress will be reviewed, annually, by the OEQA. First accreditation is retroactive to the semester in which the accreditation visit occurred.

(ii) Accreditation for two years with a focused visit.

(l)This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one or more of the standards. When the CEQA renders this decision, the unit has or maintains its accredited status; but must satisfy provisions by meeting previously unmet standard(s) within an established time period.

(II) If Accreditation for two years with a focused visit is granted, the CEQA will require a focused visit on the unmet standard(s) within two years of the semester of the accreditation decision. After a focused visit, the CEQA will (1) grant accreditation or (2) revoke accreditation.

(III) If accreditation is granted, the next on-site visit is scheduled for seven years following the semester in which the accreditation visit preceding the focused visit occurred.

(iii) Accreditation for two years with a full visit.

(I) This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one or more of the CAEP standards, and serious problems exist across standards. When the CEQA renders this decision, the unit has or maintains its accredited status, but must satisfy conditions by meeting the previously unmet standard(s) within an established time period.

(II) If accreditation for two years with a full visit is granted, the CEQA will require a full visit on the unmet standard(s) within two years of the accreditation decision. After a full visit, the CEQA will (1) continue accreditation or (2) revoke accreditation.

(III) If accreditation is granted, the next on-site visit is scheduled for seven years following the semester in which the continuing accreditation visit occurred.

(iv) Defer Decision

(I) The CAEP Commission or CEQA will make this decision if the BOE team recommended that any standard(s) was met for which the CAEP Commission or CEQA did not accept the team's recommendation.

(II) A supplemental rejoinder related to the new unmet standard(s) may be submitted for review by the CAEP Commission or CEQA. The supplemental rejoinder must be based on evidence available at the time of the visit. The institution will be required to submit said documentation to the CAEP Commission or CEQA as applicable.

(III) For CAEP/State institutions, the CEQA will defer decision until the next CAEP Commission meeting. For State only institutions, the CEQA will defer decision for no more than sixty (60) days.

(IV) If the standard(s) continues to be unmet after the supplemental rejoinder, accreditation will be granted for 18 months with either a focused or full visit.

(v) Denial of accreditation (First).

(I) Denial of accreditation is rendered when the CEQA finds that the professional education unit and/or programs have severe and/or numerous areas for improvement that limits its capacity to offer quality programs.

(II) All students who have been admitted to the program must be notified by mail, within 30 days of receipt of the CEQA decision, as to the denial of program accreditation of the unit and programs.

(III) Institutions that are denied accreditation may recommend candidates for certification for one year from the end of the semester in which accreditation is denied.

(vi) Revocation of accreditation (Continuing).

(I) Revocation of accreditation terminates current accreditation after a two-year visit if the CEQA finds that critical areas for improvement are not corrected. Accreditation will be terminated at the end of the semester in which the CEQA revokes accreditation.

(II) All students who have been admitted to the program must be notified by mail, within 30 days of receipt of the CEQA decision, as to the revocation of accreditation of the unit and programs.

(III) Institutions that lose their accreditation may recommend candidates for certification for one year from the end of the semester in which accreditation is revoked.

(IV) An on-site interim accreditation visit may be requested by the Appeals Board, hereinafter referred to as AB, acting on behalf of the CEQA. This visit would result from the committee's determination that compelling reasons exist to authorize reexamination of the accreditation of an institution's professional education unit and/or programs. If the AB determines that a complaint received by the committee needs to be investigated, the committee will authorize an interim accreditation review team visit to the campus. The interim accreditation review team will consist of one member from the first or continuing accreditation review team and the remainder of the members will be appointed by the CEQA.

(V) The interim accreditation review team will prepare a report for the CEQA. At the next CEQA meeting following such a visit, the interim review team will recommend the institution's accreditation status to the CEQA.

(VI) The CEQA may revoke accreditation if the unit and/or program(s) (a) no longer meets the state accreditation standards, (b) fails to submit annual reports and other documents required for accreditation; (c) misrepresents its accreditation status to the public; (d) fails to meet timelines of conditional or probationary accreditation or (e) fails over a three-year period to meet and maintain teacher candidate performance standards on the competency-based assessments as established by the CEQA.

(VII) All accreditation decisions shall be reported annually in the CEQA annual report.

(VIII) In the event that accreditation is denied or revoked, an institution may reapply for first accreditation following a three-year waiting period. Before a first visit may occur, a minimum of three years must have lapsed since accreditation was denied. Reapplication shall occur based on the state accreditation standards. All procedures for first accreditation will be followed during the reapplication process.

(9) Appeals Board.

(A) For CAEP accredited units the AB shall consider the recommendations of the CAEP appeals board for unit accreditation;

(B) For appeals related to program(s) and non-CAEP accredited institutions the following procedures shall be followed.

(C) Membership of CEQA Appeals Board shall be:

(i) CEQA chair. The CEQA Chair shall be the Chair of the Appeals Board;

(ii) Representative from OEQA with State Consultant experience;

(iii) Program subject matter and/or standards expert(s). If the appeal is related to a specific program, the program expert shall be in the area(s) being appealed;

(iv) One P-12 school classroom teacher;

(v) One member trained as a site visitor (when applicable);

(vi) One teacher educator; and

(vii) One representative from the arts and sciences faculty or from school administration.

(10) Conditions for appeals.

(A) Any institution that is the object of an adverse decision, as determined by the CEQA, may appeal that decision to the CEQA Appeals Board.

(B) An adverse decision is defined as the denial or revocation of program(s) or unit accreditation.

(C) An institution may also appeal, in writing, accreditation for two years with a focused visit, accreditation for two years with a full visit, and defer decision accreditation decisions. A adverse decision may be appealed only on the following grounds:

(i) Stated procedures were not followed;

(ii) Evidence favorable to the institution was provided to the accreditation review team but was not considered;

(iii) Evidence was presented to the appropriate board in the form of a rejoinder or stipulation response but was not considered;

(iv) If a college or university believes that one or more of these conditions was a factor in its accreditation, the only available means of redress is through the appeals process; or

(v) There was a lack of the full number of team members due to last minute emergencies; however, that factor alone is not sufficient to uphold an appeal.

(I)The institution must convincingly demonstrate that this fact made a difference in the accreditation decision.

(II)The institution shall prove actual prejudice to it and that the prejudice changed the accreditation decision.

(III) The fact that the institution did not recommend canceling the visit would be evidence that it, at least before the visit, believed that the assembled team would be sufficient to conduct a fair and complete visit.

(D)The findings and recommendations of the AB are received by the CEQA at its first meeting following the meeting of the AB.

(E)Subsequent actions shall be based on grounds upheld by the CEQA and may include, but are not limited to:

i) Assigning another accreditation review team to revisit an institution;

(ii)Reinstating accreditation or

(iii)Upholding the initial recommendation for denial or revocation of accreditation.

(F) The status of the appellant at the time of the visit remains unchanged until the appeals process has been exhausted.

11) Process for appeal. The following provisions govern the appellate process:

A)Within 15 days of receiving notice of the adverse decision, an institution electing to appeal an adverse decision of the CEQA must present the OEQA Executive Director and the CEQA written notification of its intention to appeal.

(B)No later than 30 days from the date that it submits its notification, the institution must submit a brief to the Executive Director which sets forth the specifics of its appeal and includes full documentation.

(C)The CEQA Chair shall convene the AB within 60 days after an appeal brief has been filed. The AB will hear and act on the appeal within this time frame.

(D) The appellant shall have the right to present a 30-minute oral argument on its brief. The appellant shall also have the right to be represented by counsel during the appeal, but may not call witnesses or introduce new evidence on its own behalf.

(E)If the decision appealed is accreditation for two years with a focus visit, accreditation for two years with a full visit or defer decision the appellant's right to appeal is limited to the submission of written documentation.

(F)In the case of an accreditation decision review, the AB has the right to seek clarification of the accreditation review team report from the state team chair, and clarification of the CEQA deliberations from the chair of the CEQA.

(G)In the case of an accreditation decision review, all evidence presented in the appellant's brief and considered by the AB must be confined to conditions existing at the time of the accreditation review team visit as cited in the final report, or in the case of a petition for stipulation removal, to conditions existing at the time the petition for stipulation removal was submitted.

(12) **Cost of review.**

(A)If the appeal leads to an affirmation of the CEQA's original decision, the appellant will be liable for the expenses of the AB, the second accreditation

review team visit, and all expenses related to the review. All expenses will be reimbursed according to state travel reimbursement guidelines.

(B) If the AB finds in favor of the institution, the CEQA will be liable for expenses of the AB and second accreditation review team. All expenses will be reimbursed according to state travel reimbursement guidelines.

#### **218:10-5-2. Program Review Advisory Board**

(a) The Program Review Advisory Board (PRAB) shall provide consultation related to program reviews. The PRAB shall make final reviews on all program reports and make recommendations on program status for all non-CAEP institutions and for program areas not associated with a CAEP-recognized learned society. Program reviews will take place in conjunction with the college's/university's accreditation cycle, occurring according to the established CAEP/or OEQA timeline as applicable.

(1) Members of the Program Review Advisory Board (PRAB) shall be approved by the CEQA.

(2) The Program Review Advisory Board (PRAB) members shall serve an initial term of two years.

(3) Two or more of the Program Review Advisory Board (PRAB) members may be reappointed to additional terms to allow for continuity.

(4) Members shall have completed training on the program review process.

(5) Discretion and ethical judgment shall be used in making recommendations.

(6) The Program Review Advisory Board (PRAB) may be comprised of trained reviewers in specific subject areas from the following groups:

(A) Practicing P-12 classroom teachers

(B) Practicing P-12 administrators

(C) Higher education faculty members

(7) The Director of Educational Quality or designee may chair the Program Review Advisory Board (PRAB) committee.

#### **218:10-5-3. Specific State Standards For Program Accreditation**

(a) The following standards apply to both undergraduate and graduate programs. The governance and administration of the total educator preparation program standard is based on the premise that there must be a recognizable and functioning governance entity within the institution's administrative structure which has responsibility for designing, approving and continuously evaluating and developing educator preparation programs. This governing unit may be a council, committee, department, school, college, or any other recognizable entity, which includes the administration of educator preparation as one of its functions.

(1) The governing unit membership and responsibilities include the following:

(A) Membership on the educator preparation governing unit shall be defined by written policy to include:

(i) A majority of the members who have a minimum of three years teaching experience in public schools;

(ii) A majority of the members in the governance unit who are currently teacher education faculty members;

(iii) Some faculty members who shall represent the arts and sciences;

(iv) A designated director of educator preparation defined as the institution's official representative for educator preparation. The authority and responsibilities of this individual shall be clearly defined in written policies; and

(v) A clearly defined process whereby faculty members and administrators become members and the terms of office.

(B) The responsibilities of the educator preparation governing unit shall be defined by written policy to include:

(i) Responsibilities of the officers of the unit;

(ii) Responsibilities of the unit's standing committees; and

(iii) Responsibilities in the following areas as they are related to educator preparation:

(I) Admission/retention in educator preparation;

(II) Field experience and student teaching (admission and placement);

(III) Development of courses and program curricula; and program review, evaluation and planning.

(C) Program review, evaluation and revision responsibilities include:

(i) The governance unit shall conduct at least one systematic review, evaluation, and when appropriate, revision of all educator preparation programs within each accreditation period;

(ii) Periodic program reviews and revisions shall be based on, but not limited to, stated goals and objectives; and

(iii) The process for conducting program review, evaluation, and revision shall include, but not be limited to, participation by the following:

(I) Educator preparation faculty and arts and science faculty;

(II) Graduates of the programs;

(III) Students currently in the program;

(IV) Teachers and administrators from the public schools;

(V) Parents of P-12 students and business and community leaders who are actively involved in assisting P-12 schools.

(D) Documentation related to the budget-making process and level of financial support shall include the following:

(i) A clearly defined budget-making process for all teacher education programs; and

(ii) An analysis showing that the institution's financial support for programs in educator preparation are maintained at a level appropriate for a professional preparation program.

(b) Educator preparation faculty standards are to be consistent with accreditation standards.

(c) Candidate-related standards are to be consistent with accreditation standards.

(d) Program decisions of the professional education unit are to be guided by a conceptual framework, which establishes the shared vision for the preparation of teacher candidates.

(1) The conceptual framework must include the following structural elements:

The mission of the institution and the educator preparation program;

(A) The program's philosophy, purposes, professional commitments and dispositions;

(B) A knowledge base that provides the foundation for the framework;

(C) Performance expectations for candidates that align with professional, state and institutional standards; and

(D) A system by which candidate performance is regularly assessed.

(2) A description of the conceptual framework shall be submitted along with the institution's preconditions report by any institution seeking first accreditation.

(3) A description of the conceptual framework shall be included in all institutional reports submitted prior to first and continuing accreditation visits.

(e) The following guidelines are to be used to collect and maintain data on each institution's educator preparation program:

(1) The institution shall establish a process which seeks information and program input from educator preparation faculty; faculty from arts and sciences and other programs and disciplines which are appropriate; candidates within the educator preparation program; teachers, administrators, parents, guardians or custodians of students; and business and community leaders.

(2) The institution shall establish procedures to inform the public regarding the educator preparation program and to solicit and receive public input.

(3) The institutional plan shall be accessible to any interested party under the Oklahoma Open Records Act.

(4) The submitted institutional plan must be approved by the institution's governing board.

(5) Annual reviews and reports indicating program changes.

(f) The following policies, procedures and guidelines are used to direct the content and candidates' experiences of each institution's teacher preparation program.

(1) Programs require teacher candidates to have speaking and listening skills at a novice high level in a language other than English.

(2) General studies requirements for candidates include the arts, communication, history, literature, mathematics, philosophy, sciences, English, government, and the social sciences.

(3) Programs establish cohort or colleague groups within the institution to assist teacher candidates in achieving competencies, better adapting to the school environment and furthering professional growth.

(4) Candidates complete a well-planned sequence of courses and/or experiences in pedagogical studies that ensures student competency in the Oklahoma State

Department of Education Full Subject Matter Competencies for Teacher Licensure and Certification.

(5) The guidelines and standards for program reviews representing specialty organizations and national learned society standards are used in developing programs in each content area.

(6) Secondary and elementary/secondary teacher candidates have undergraduate majors or their equivalents, in a subject area.

(7) Teacher candidates in early childhood, elementary, and special education have subject area concentrations, which allow qualification as a generalist. To qualify as a generalist, candidates must document competency in mathematics, science, language arts, and social studies as identified in the CAEP professional learned societies' standards and State Department of Education Full Subject Matter Competencies for early childhood, elementary and special education.

(8) Teacher candidate coursework includes the study of substance abuse symptoms identification and prevention; mental illness symptoms identification and mental health issues; classroom management skills; and classroom safety and discipline issues.

(9) Effective September 1, 2015 teacher candidates must have a minimum of 60 hours of diverse field experiences prior to their student teaching experience.

(10) Teacher candidates are provided with advisement services to assist them in taking course work designed to maximize their opportunities for certification and employment. At a minimum, teacher candidates are provided information on the latest supply and demand information concerning teacher employment, state salary structure, and teaching shortage areas.

(11) Substantive collaboration and classroom interaction with students accompanies theoretical curriculum, thus allowing teacher candidates the opportunity to apply theory to actual classroom situations.

(12) Instruction integrates pedagogical competencies or skills with experiences in the school setting.

(13) Teacher candidates are provided with opportunities to have parental, family and community involvement within their pre-service programs.

(14) The unit establishes and publishes a set of criteria/competencies for exit from each professional education program. These criteria/competencies reflect the Oklahoma Department of Education General Teacher Competencies and/or subject matter competencies outlined in the CAEP national (professional) learned societies' standards.

(15) The unit establishes and publishes the criteria/competencies for exit and satisfactory completion adhering to all rules and regulations established by the Oklahoma State Department of Education.

(16) A candidate's mastery of a program's stated exit criteria or competencies is assessed through the use of multiple sources of data such as culminating experience, portfolios, interviews, videotaped and observed performance in schools, standardized tests and course grades.

(17) Effective September 1, 2015 mentor teachers are required to have minimum of three years of teaching experience in the area in which they are certified.

(g) The following guidelines are to be used to facilitate the professional learning of faculty:

(1) Teacher education faculty continue their professional learning during their tenure at an institution of higher education to ensure that the future teachers of Oklahoma are taught by professional educators fully trained in their areas of expertise. Professional development for teacher educators and arts and sciences faculty should be focused on the faculty members' ability to model such effective teaching strategies as inquiry, group discussions and collaborative learning.

(h) The following policies are to be used to evaluate individual program areas at each institution:

(1) The institution shall submit program reviews for each required program area based upon the CAEP/State guidelines and accreditation schedule.

(2) Following the completion of each program evaluation, the institution will receive written notification of each program's status. Recognition decisions will include the following categories: recognized, recognized with conditions, recognized with probation, further development required, and not recognized.

(3) If the program is recognized, it will retain its status through the semester and year of the institution's next accreditation visit. To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted before that review.

(4) If the program is recognized with conditions, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted within 18 months of the date of the status report. The report must address the conditions specified by the reviewers. Once acceptable data has been submitted, the condition(s) will be removed. If the program does not submit acceptable information within the designated timeframe, the decision reverts to "not recognized."

(5) If the program decision is recognized with probation or further development required, a revised report addressing the issues identified by the reviewers must be submitted within 12 months, or the unit may submit a new program report for recognition within 12 months. If the revised report adequately addresses the concerns cited by reviewers, the program decision will be changed to "recognized" or "recognized with conditions." If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to "not recognized."

(6) A program can receive a decision of "not recognized" only after two submissions are unsuccessful in reaching either "recognized" or "recognized with conditions." If the program is not recognized, a revised report addressing unmet standards may be submitted within 12 months of the date of the recognition report. [This report will be sent to the original team if possible.] If the program does not receive a recognized decision within 12 months, admission of new candidates will not be allowed. The unit may elect to submit a new program report for recognition within 12 months. [This report will be sent to a new team of reviewers].

(7) Programs which are required to submit through CAEP and receive an initial decision of "recognized with probation" or "further development required" may apply to OEQA for state recognition and thus recommend teacher candidates for certification under the following conditions:

(A) The program must have an aggregated pass rate of all candidates on the Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) of 80% or more over a three-year period. An application for program recognition must be submitted to OEQA containing basic program information as well as current recognition status and future submission deadlines; however an additional review will not be required.

(B) Institutions must submit a revised program report according to applicable CAEP/SPA or OEQA guidelines as appropriate addressing concerns cited in the review. If the revised report is not recognized, the unit must submit additional revised reports according to guidelines. The unit must exhaust all available CAEP options for revision.

(C) Programs which do not meet the required 80% pass rate on the OSAT may apply to OEQA for state recognition only after the unit has exhausted all available CAEP options for revision. The application for state recognition must address concerns cited by reviewers in the final report.

(D) Programs receiving state recognition under these conditions will maintain recognition until the submission period prior to the unit's next scheduled accreditation visit, at which time the unit will be expected to submit a program review to CAEP or OEQA, as appropriate.

(8) Units may receive conditional approval for new programs. These programs must undergo reviews as outlined in the New Certification Program Procedures for Established Units guidelines before receiving full recognition. Recognition will be retained through the semester and year of the unit's next accreditation visit.

(9) Programs that do not comply with the procedures detailed in items (h)3-7 will no longer be eligible to recommend candidates for licensure and certification.

(10) An institution with a non-compliant program may apply to the CEQA for a waiver if there is evidence that the non-compliant status of a program is due to transitioning national standards.

#### **218:10-5-4. Standards for Oklahoma Educator Preparation Programs**

(a) The following standards as defined by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education shall apply to undergraduate and graduate programs through August 31, 2016.

(1) Standard One: Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions.

(A) Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions

necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

(B) Elements for Standard One include content, pedagogical and professional knowledge; dispositions for all candidates; and student learning for all candidates.

(2) Standard Two: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation.

(A) The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the qualifications of applicants, the performance of candidates and graduates, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

(B) Elements of Standard Two include data collection, analysis, and evaluation; and use of data for program improvement.

(3) Standard Three: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice.

(A) The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

(B) Elements of Standard Three include collaboration between the unit and school partner; design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice; and candidates' demonstrations of the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary for student learning.

(4) Standard Four: Diversity.

(A) The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

(B) Elements of Standard Four include design, implementation, and evaluation of candidate experiences relevant to diversity.

5) Standard Five: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development.

(A) 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.

(B) Elements of Standard Five include hiring of qualified faculty, modeling of best professional practices, ongoing evaluation and professional development and collaboration.

(6) Standard Six: Unit Governance and Resources.

(A) 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.

(B) Elements of Standard Six include evidence of leadership within the unit and across the institution, the unit budget, personnel and other resources.

**(b) Effective September 1, 2016 standards as defined by CAEP shall apply to undergraduate and graduate programs.**

**(c) Teacher candidate portfolios.**

(1) Institutions shall require all initial and advanced certification program(s) students to develop a portfolio following the guidelines outlined in this section.

(2) A portfolio is a documented profile of an individual's accomplishments, learning, and strengths related to the competencies, state and national standards, and outcomes established by the CEQA, State Regents, SDE and institution.

(3) The portfolio, for purposes related to institutional accreditation is a unit of measure which presents evidence that the institution is providing initial, on-going, and focused opportunities and avenues which lead to student achievement of competencies, state and national standards and outcomes determined by the CEQA, Regents, SDE and institution.

(4) Institutions will provide for review during each regularly scheduled accreditation visit:

(A) The unit's portfolio handbook containing a written philosophy related to portfolio development and assessment which is consistent with the institution's and unit's mission and conceptual framework, as well as written policies, criteria, and institutional rubric(s) related to the assessment of the portfolio as a whole or individual artifacts contained in the portfolios for all individuals enrolled in initial and advanced programs.

(B) Two representative candidate portfolios for each program offered. OEQA will randomly select one candidate portfolio in each program area and the second will be selected by the unit. Portfolios should represent candidates at the final transition point.

(C) In addition, annual reports must include any revision in the institution's portfolio process.

(5) Institution's pre-service and/or advanced portfolio process.

(A) The teacher education unit and programs shall:

(i) Require the portfolio development process to begin with enrollment into the professional education course work;

(ii) Have a written portfolio handbook(s) containing a written philosophy related to portfolio development and assessment which is consistent with the institutions and unit's mission and conceptual framework(s);

(iii) Have written policies, criteria, and institutional rubrics related to the portfolio assessment(s) of individual(s) enrolled in initial and advanced certification programs.

**(d) Annual report.** Each Oklahoma educator preparation unit shall submit an annual report to the OEQA. This report will satisfy the requirements for the CEQA, State

Regents for Higher Education, State Department of Education, and CAEP/AACTE. The following information will be included in the report:

- (1) Changes that occurred in implementation of the standards outlined in the Institution Plan as a result of local and statewide evaluations/assessments, public hearings or other reasons;
- (2) Progress made in addressing the areas for improvement, if any, identified by the most recent on-site visit by the on-site accreditation review team;
- (3) Quantitative data related to the unit's programs as required in the AACTE/CAEP Annual Report. These data shall reflect information pertaining to supply and demand for teacher candidates;
- (4) Program changes being implemented for OEQA and CAEP continued accreditation;
- (5) Report on resources devoted to technology;
- (6) Report on professional development activities of faculty;
- (7) Report on the number of hours each faculty member taught or were in direct contact with students in public schools;
- (8) Report on the number of graduate students admitted conditionally and the success rates.
- (9) Report on the results of the assessment of teaching skills in the area of reading instruction as administered to candidates in elementary, early childhood education, and special education.
- (10) Report on the participation in the alternative placement programs offered by the institution.
- (11) Report on the procedures used to inform the public regarding the institution's teacher education program and the manner through which public input is solicited and received.
- (12) Annually, the OEQA shall provide feedback to any institution if their annual report indicates that progress is not being made in addressing areas for improvement.
- (13) Complete copies of the annual reports for public institutions will be distributed to OSRHE and summary data for all institutions will be distributed to constituents based on reporting requirements outlined in 70 O.S., Section 6-186.
- (14) The OEQA will produce a report describing the accreditation status of each institution. This report will devote a section to each institution separately and include a summary of CAEP and OEQA review findings.

## Subchapter 7. Educator Assessment

### **218: 10-7-1 Educator assessment regulations**

- (a) Examinees-initial licensure and certification.
  - (1) Any individual who applies for a teaching license/certification must successfully complete the competency examination as defined by the OEQA. The competency examination is made up of three components: The Oklahoma General

Education Test (OGET), the Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) and the Oklahoma Professional Teaching Exam (OPTE).

(2) See Appendix A for competency exam requirements by certification area and test codes.

**(b) Examinees - additional certification.**

(1) Individuals wishing to add a certification area to an existing teaching credential must successfully complete the Oklahoma Subject Area Test for the field of the desired certification.

(2) Individuals wishing to add a teaching certification area to an existing license or standard certificate in Speech Language Pathologist, School Nurse, School Psychometrist and/or School Psychologist must successfully complete the Oklahoma Subject Area Test and the Oklahoma Professional Teaching Exam for the field of the desired certification.

(3) See Appendix A for competency exam requirements by certification area and test codes

**(c) Examinees - alternative placement program.**

(1) Individuals seeking a teaching license via the Alternative Placement Program must successfully complete the Oklahoma General Education Test and the Oklahoma Subject Area Test. A licensed teacher via the Alternative Placement Program seeking a standard certificate must successfully complete the Oklahoma Professional Teaching Exam.

(2) See Appendix A for competency exam requirements by certification area and test codes.

(d) Examinees-out of state certification. Individuals seeking an Oklahoma license/certification who are certified educators in another state (s) shall meet the same assessment requirements as all other individuals seeking initial licensure/certification. Individuals having successfully completed comparable examination(s), as determined by OEQA, shall be exempt from the corresponding part(s) of Oklahoma's assessment requirement.

(1) Certified out-of-state educators who have taught a minimum of five (5) years in an accredited P-12 school may be exempt from the OGET requirement.

**(e) Examinees - testing conditions and requirements compliance.**

(1) If an examinee fails to comply with the conditions and requirements specified or referenced on the *Certification Examinations for Oklahoma Educators Test* website, including the *Conditions of Test Participation*, or take any prohibited actions, the test results may be voided, no refund will be issued, no portion of the testing fee can be applied toward the cost of any future test administrations and/or the examinee's registration may be cancelled.

(2) If an examinee's test score is found to be unverifiable by either the testing company or the OEQA, the examinee will be allowed one (1) retake under controlled conditions at no cost to the examinee.

**218:10-7-3. Alternative Testing Arrangements**

**(a) Alternative testing arrangements - religious practices.**

- (1) Alternative test dates may be arranged for individuals whose religious practices do not allow them to take tests on Saturday.
  - (2) Alternative test dates will be available at a minimum of two test sites per test administration.
  - (3) Individuals wishing to request an alternative test date due to religious convictions must submit the following to National Evaluation Systems no later than the regular registration deadline for the test administration desired:
    - (A) A completed registration with proper payment
    - (B) A completed form requesting an alternative test date
    - (C) A letter from a member of the clergy, on that individual's professional letterhead, attesting to the religious convictions of the examinee requesting accommodation.
- (b) Alternative testing arrangements - accommodation of the basis of disability.
- (1) Alternative testing arrangements may be made for individuals with either temporary or permanent physical disability, illness, or injury.
  - (2) Standard accommodations may be requested by individuals with a disability and can be accommodated at all test sites. Standard accommodations include the following:
    - (A) Special seating
    - (B) Allowance of a medical device in the testing room
    - (C) Frequent breaks
    - (D) Use of a magnifying glass, colored overlays, or a straight edge
    - (E) Use of a pen for written assignment
    - (F) Use of a trackball mouse
    - (G) Adjustable table
  - (3) Standard accommodations may be requested by submitting the following to Evaluation Systems Group of Pearson no later than the regular registration deadline for the test administration desired:
    - (A) A completed registration with proper payment.
    - (B) A completed form requesting alternative testing arrangements indicating the nature of the request.
- (c) Alternative testing arrangements - non-standard accommodation on the basis of a physical disability.
- (1) Non-standard alternative testing arrangements may be made for individuals with a temporary or permanent disability, illness, or injury.
  - (2) Individuals requesting alternative testing arrangements on the basis of a physical disability must submit the following to National Evaluation Systems no later than the regular registration deadline for the test administration desired:
    - (A) A completed registration form with proper payment
    - (B) A completed form requesting alternative testing arrangements identifying the disability and the specific arrangements requested.
    - (C) A statement by a licensed professional, on that person's professional letterhead, whose credentials are appropriate to diagnose the disability.

Statements must include the disability for which accommodation is being sought as well as recommended administration modifications.

d) Alternative testing arrangements - non-standard accommodation on the basis of cognitive or emotional disability.

(1) Non-standard alternative testing arrangements may be made for individuals with temporary or permanent cognitive or emotional disability, illness, or injury.

(2) Individuals requesting non-standard alternative testing arrangements on the basis of cognitive or emotional disability must submit the following to Evaluation Systems Group of Pearson no later than the regular registration deadline for the test administration desired:

(A) A completed registration form with proper payment

(B) A completed form requesting alternative testing arrangements identifying the disability and the alternative arrangements requested.

(C) A statement by a licensed professional, on that person's professional letterhead, whose license or credentials are appropriate to diagnose the disability. The statement must include the disability for which accommodations are being requested, along with supporting documentation, and recommended test administration modifications.

#### Subchapter 9. Education Leadership Oklahoma

### **218: 10-9-1. Education Leadership Oklahoma regulations**

#### **(a) Selection of scholarship recipients.**

(1) Applicant can be funded for only one Education Leadership Oklahoma (ELO) scholarship to attain National Board Certification.

(2) Applicant must currently be a, full-time, Oklahoma public school classroom teacher with special consideration given to teachers who work in inner city schools as defined by law.

(3) OEQA shall develop the ELO application and any associated deadlines. The application will seek information in the form of short answer questions and essay.

(4) OEQA shall designate the place and time for ELO applications to be read and scored by the Application Review Committee if necessary.

(5) The Application Review Committee shall review and score applications to award scholarships

(A) The Application Review Committee will consist of thirteen National Board Certified Teachers.

B) Each Application Review Committee member may choose National Board Certified Teachers, as needed, to assist in reading and scoring ELO applications.

(C) Each Application Review Committee member including National Board Certified Teachers will be trained to read and score applications.

(D) The Application Review Committee members shall serve a term of no more than five years.

(E) If an Application Review Committee member resigns before the end of his/her term, the agency responsible for that nomination will submit a nomination of a person to replace that member.

(F) The Application Review Committee may consider one or more of the following:

- (i) Knowledge of NBPTS process
- (ii) Inclusion of the five core propositions within the essay question
- (iii) Degree to which the applicant's essay conveys his/her application of the five core propositions
- (iv) Conveyance of commitment to rigorous process
- (v) Provision of quality writing which is clear and sufficiently elaborated
- (vi) Demonstration of knowledge, ability, and leadership
- (vii) Verification of percentage of free/reduced lunch

(G) ELO candidates shall be selected based on scores determined within the application process.

- (i) Applicants will be ranked from highest to lowest based on the application scores.
- (ii) Special consideration will be given to teachers who work in inner-city schools (as defined by law).
- (iii) In case of a tie score, the locale (under-represented areas of the state) may be considered for candidate selection.
- (iv) Candidates must attend required Professional Development

(b) Payment and reimbursement of assessment fees.

(1) OEQA shall make assessment fee payments to NBPTS for each scholarship candidate, upon signing a contract.

(2) Should a candidate be unable to complete the process by the National Board deadline, the following shall apply:

(A) If the candidate withdraws by the National Board deadline and OEQA can recover partial amount of the application fee, the candidate may pay the amount not recovered and will then be considered in the next applicant pool.

(B) If the candidate does not withdraw or submit by the National Board deadlines, he/she will be responsible to OEQA for the reimbursement of the assessment fee

(3) OEQA shall reimburse candidates who pay the National Board assessment fee if they are a full-time public school classroom teacher in the year they certify.

(4) OEQA will fund a maximum of two retakes to candidates that bank scores with the NBPTS provided funding is available.

