# 2018 EPP Annual Report

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CAEP ID:** | 20607 | **AACTE SID:** | 102880 |
| **Institution:** | University of Arkansas - Fort Smith | | |
| **Unit:** | School of Education | | |

## Section 1. AIMS Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

### 1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate…

| | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| 1.1.1 Contact person | ◉ | ○ |
| 1.1.2 EPP characteristics | ◉ | ○ |
| 1.1.3 Program listings | ◉ | ○ |

## Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to <u>initial</u> teacher certification or licensure[1]

`103`

2.1.2 Number of completers in <u>advanced</u> programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)[2]

`0`

Total number of program completers   103

---

[1] For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

[2] For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2016-2017 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.

No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

No Change / Not Applicable

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited

No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

No Change / Not Applicable

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

| Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4 \| A.5.4) | |
| --- | --- |
| Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4) | Outcome Measures |
| 1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1) | 5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels) |
| 2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2) | 6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels) |
| 3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 \| A.4.1) | 7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels) |
| 4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 \| A.4.2) | 8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels) |

*4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.*

1

| | |
| --- | --- |
| **Link:** | https://education.uafs.edu/education/accreditation-information |
| **Description of data accessible via link:** | Both the assessment manual and the quality assurance reports are available at the link. These documents show the data and provided a description of changes that were made based on the data. |

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

| Level \ Annual Reporting Measure | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Initial-Licensure Programs | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ | ☐ |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

*4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.*

| |
| --- |
| What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?<br>    Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?<br>    Are benchmarks available for comparison?<br>    Are measures widely shared? How? With whom? |

University of Arkansas Fort Smith went through the rigorous process of CAEP accreditation, culminating in our site visit in spring, 2017. In preparation, the entire assessment system was analyzed, scrutinized and updated beginning fall 2014. The updates/programmatic changes over the 2016-2017 academic year follow:

In response to the CAEP Formative Feedback Report, the faculty met to address each standard, including Standard 5, over the Quality Assurance System (QAS). Beginning with Fall 2016 data, analyses would be provided in the assessment report after each semester, to summarize patterns, trends and issues after collaboratively meeting with School of Education faculty, secondary-level content area faculty, school partners and students.

The question was asked concerning the ability of the EPP to have the capacity to manage the QAS: Initially, assessments and accompanying rubrics were used for objectivity of scoring, but are now being used to analyze student and programmatic outcomes. Currently, the assessment coordinator receives a three-hour reduction in load and the position of Administrative Analyst was added to assist the Assessment Coordinator with data collection in order to support the QAS. Since this infrastructure has been established, the SOE has been able to maintain the QAS.

Many of the UAFS SOE assessments are proprietary and were aligned with EPP standards required by the Arkansas Department of Education. The EPP-created assessments are also all aligned with CAEP and state teaching standards (InTASC). The EPP has

established face validity through alignment to standards and review by external consultants. Additionally, the EPP reviews and analyzes data (minutes from Faculty meetings, Faculty Retreat, TEC). Consultations continue with math faculty and the UAFS Director of Academic Assessment and Accountability. With the transition from NCATE to CAEP, the UAFS SOE felt the need to seek advice from outside consultants in regard to the current direction of programs and unit assessments.

The Praxis II scores are being addressed in multiple ways: Title II reporting encourages more effective monitoring of programmatic progress; a new course has been created by math content faculty for secondary and middle-level math majors, was implemented Spring, 2017 and specifically addresses Praxis II math content; Social Studies Curriculum Instruction and Assessment is a new course developed to support elementary and middle-level Praxis II content in Social Studies that was implemented Spring 2017; STEM Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment is a new course developed to support elementary and middle-level Praxis II science content that implemented Spring 2017.

The UAFS SOE continues to establish inter-rater reliability. Exercises were conducted in using the Danielson and edTPA rubrics in Spring 2017, with results available in LiveText so that faculty and assessment personnel could use the reporting tools. Faculty revised the diversity and e-portfolio rubrics, developed a lesson plan rubric and an intern interview rubric. All show face validity after being aligned to CAEP, TESS and ISTE standards, and will go through the Lawshe method for content validity.

The following initiatives were implemented to recruit and retain more diverse candidates: 1) The recruitment plan (Spring 2016) was implemented Fall 2017. 2) Data from Plans of Action has shown support and retention efforts. 3) Teacher Cadet programs (Alma) for recruitment. 4) At-Risk Candidate Analysis – the plan-of-action describes the process the SOE uses to identify at-risk students in collaboration with SOE faculty and administration, advisors, teacher candidates and school partners. The UAFS SOE Policy and Procedures Manual outlines the protocol followed to support at-risk teacher candidates. The protocol (as described in the Policy and Procedures Manual) was developed by SOE faculty and administration in collaboration with school partner administrators (EPP and TCSC members). Candidate areas of growth are identified, an individualized plan-of-action is developed in order to support teacher candidate improvement. 5) Impact on Student Learning – the School of Education Support System (SOESS) had its first meeting in October 2016. All fall 2015 – spring 2016 graduates were invited to participate. As none of the employed graduates had been evaluated at that time, the plan was to gather the data from spring 2017 administrator Danielson evaluations. Participants were to be added to the pilot project each semester so that the numbers of participants will increase the data base. However, the response from graduates has been minimal, so the 2017-18 academic year contains significant revisions to the EPP plan for gathering student impact data.

The SOE faculty met to discuss the progression of unit assignments in new programs of study. They discussed the options that would be most advantageous for the candidates while providing the scope, sequence, and consistency required to ensure candidate success. They discussed the progression of skills required as candidates matriculate through the programs of study and aligned curricular objectives and tasks for the following courses: 1) EDUC 2752 Introduction to Education – Instructors will give an overview of the InTASC Standards, Arkansas Teacher Standards, Danielson Domains (TESS), UAFS SOE Candidate Outcomes (InTASC), UAFS SOE Dispositions, edTPA Tasks. 2) ELML 2013 Educational Technology and Digital Literacy and EDUC 3302 Introduction to Educational Technology – Introduce ISTE standards and reinforce alignment of SOE ICOs, InTASC, Danielson (TESS), edTPA; Dispositions. 3) ELML 3202 Practicum I and EDUC 3221 Practicum I – Focus is Planning: edTPA Task I Planning and Danielson Domain I, Lesson Planning (use Lesson Plan rubric to score the taught lesson), demonstrate alignment of Danielson Rubrics to edTPA and InTASC; Candidates will create three lesson plans and teach one; edTPA Task I scored in LiveText; Parent Workshop implemented. Reinforce use of technology standards (ISTE). SIP Plan objectives are implemented during this time and SOE faculty will continue to provide opportunities for candidates to interact with parents and families. SOE will collect data for the SIP Plan. 4) ELML 4102 Practicum II and EDUC 4211 Practicum II – Focus is Instruction: edTPA Task II Instruction and Danielson Domain 2; Candidates will create three lesson plans and teach one, the taught lesson scored using Lesson Plan rubric and observation scored using Danielson rubrics; edTPA Task II scored in LiveText. Reinforce planning skills; alignment of ICOs, Danielson, edTPA, and InTASC; reinforce use of technology standards (ISTE); planning for diverse learners. 5) ELML 4303 STEM Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment and EDUC 4222 Assessment – Focus is Assessment: edTPA Task III Assessment, Danielson Domains 1-4 assessment in planning, implementation, instruction, reflection; edTPA Task III assignments scored in LiveText; differentiation and assessment for diverse learners; technology in documenting impact on student learning. Reinforce planning skills; alignment of ICOs, Danielson, edTPA, and InTASC; reinforce use of technology standards (ISTE); planning for diverse learners. 6) EDUC4802 Seminar in Education and EDUC 490A Internship – Focus is on edTPA Tasks 1-3; Danielson/TESS Domains 1-4; ICO's 1-10; Lesson Planning (use Lesson Plan rubric to score the summative observation lesson); impact on student learning. Reinforce: Candidates will meet or exceed expectations on all required unit assessments including: edTPA Tasks 1-3 and Danielson Domains 1-4. Assignments will be scored in LiveText. A grade will be attached to the edTPA Professional Portfolio. SIP Plan objectives will be monitored throughout the programs of study. SOE faculty will continue to provide opportunities for candidates to interact with parents and families. SOE will collect data for the SIP Plan. Note – ALL Education courses will reinforce the alignments as candidates' progress through the program

April, 2017 – successful completion of accreditation process, concluding with the visit by the on-site CAEP team. The team chair recommended zero AFIs, with the findings official after the CAEP board met in the fall of 2017.

## Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

## Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous

improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3
The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

---

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

---

The University of Arkansas Fort Smith School of Education (SOE) reviewed Praxis II data and recognized a need to provide candidates with additional opportunities to learn content. As a result, three new courses were developed and taught for the first time in the Spring of 2017. A math, social studies and STEM course were added and required of both the newly established elementary education program and the middle level program. (assessment tables 20 and 21)
In reviewing candidates who are at risk, either academically or dispositionally, the SOE noted that a system for supporting these candidates needed to be developed and maintained. The SOE developed a Plan of Action process for both identifying at- risk candidates. Once areas for growth are identified, a plan of action is developed and shared with the candidate with specific expectations outlined. Once students met the required expectation they are removed from the Plan of Action. If they do not meet the expectation, the candidate may receive a second counseling session prior to removal from the program if the issues persist. (table 9) In the Summer of 2016 SOE faculty held a retreat with school partners and students to ensure stakeholder input into the self improvement plan which was the Parental Involvement assignment.The Parental Involvement assignment addresses concerns about low scores on this part of the Internships assessment instrument. The goal is to improve teacher candidates' competency in communicating with families in order to improve K-12 academic achievement. Four courses are involved in the assessment (Human Development and Learning, Clinical Experiences I and II and Internship. This will be the first full year of implementation. (table 8, 22, 23, and 24).

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the data or changes apply.

---

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

AIMS_report_2018.pdf

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or service activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

◉ Yes   ◯ No

6.3 Optional Comments

We were able to share our results at the Spring 2018 CAEP conference in Kansas City.

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2018 EPP Annual Report.*

☑ I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | Monica Riley |
| Position: | Interim Executive Director |
| Phone: | 479-788-7912 |
| E-mail: | monica.riley@uafs.edu |

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

☑ Acknowledge