2019 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 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure[1]
`70`

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced 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 70

---

[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 2017-2018 academic year?

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

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 data and provide 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?*
> > *Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?*
> > *Are benchmarks available for comparison?*
> > *Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?*

1 & 2. (4.1 and 4.2) Impact on P-12 learning and Indicators of teaching effectiveness: The Arkansas Department of Education has created a new report to assist universities in the state track data in this area. A simple value added model is used to assess student growth relative to the student's individual score history and the student's expectation of growth (predicted scores). Teacher and Education Preparation Provider Value Added Scores (VAS) are the mean of student growth in each subject. An 80 transformed score means that on average, the completers at a given university are meeting expected growth.
UAFS - 2015 Completer Cohort (Year 1 = 2015-16)
2015-16 2016-17 2017-18
VAS N VAS N VAS N
ELA 79.59 29 81.72 18 81.29 20
MATH 80.09 41 79.87 29 80.48 25
SCIENCE NA NA 97.33 12 79.96 13

UAFS - 2016 Completer Cohort (Year 1 = 2016-17)

2016-17 2017-18 2018-19
VAS N VAS N VAS N
ELA 79.51 16 82.66 19 No data
MATH 78.55 20 80.48 21 No data
SCIENCE 85.29 14 80.36 15 No data

UAFS - 2017 Completer Cohort (Year 1 = 2017-18)

2017-18 2018-19 2019-20
VAS N VAS N VAS N
ELA 80.96 21 No data No data
MATH 81.01 15 No data No data
SCIENCE 82.09 6 No data No data

This is the first year that we have had access to this data. Overall, the students in the completers' classrooms are meeting expected growth. We currently only have three rounds of data for ELA and Math for the 2015 completer year. This will become our benchmark data and we will continue to watch for trends. We do not yet have permission from Arkansas Department of Education to share this data widely. Once that permission is granted we will share it with school partners.

UAFS shares data campus wide with university faculty who are involved in teacher licensure programs. We also share data with K12 school partners, community college partners, and students though the Teacher Education Council which meets every other month on the campus. Data is shared through presentations, think-tank sessions, handouts, and through a web presence which is available to the public.

3. (4.3) As the seven-year accreditation decision came in the fall of 2017, current reflections are based on the past two years of data received from the Arkansas Department of Education's (ADE) institutional reports. This data is in the form of surveys to graduates' employers, is provided to EPPs annually, and can be found on the assessment web page. Based on the four TESS (Framework for Teaching) domains, the ADE survey identifies supervisor perceptions of their novice teachers' educator preparation experience. The UAFS mean consistently exceeds the state scores in all categories, indicating that employers feel that the graduates are Adequately – Well Prepared for teaching in the first year. Employment milestones (NBCT, graduate degrees, administrative promotions, etc.) are currently self-reported, which has been problematic. The ADE has been open to suggestions for data collections, and this would be information that would be very helpful for continuous improvement.

4. (4.4) As with the above employer data, the ADE institutional report also provides survey data from UAFS SOE graduates after their first year of teaching. The survey is designed to collect information on how well they feel their EPP prepared them to teach. The survey was revised in 2015-2016, to reflect the TESS (Framework for Teaching) domains. The UAFS graduates have consistently scored their EPP as having "Adequately – Well" prepared them for teaching, with an average mean that has exceeded the state average in all components. However, the most recent data (2018) revealed a slight dip in graduate perceptions of preparation in student assessments, with a mean of 3.25 that is below the state mean of 3.43 on the four-point scale. This data was shared with the SOE faculty members, as well as with the stakeholders who are on the Teacher Education Council (TEC). As the edTPA portfolio has a task devoted to student assessment (Task 3), measures have been taken to emphasize this task earlier in the program. Elementary and Middle Level teacher candidates are now introduced to all three edTPA tasks in the first semester after admission to the SOE program.

5. Graduation Rates:

Year Fall Cohort 2 years 3 years
2013 113 80.5% 87.6%
2014 115 78.3% 83.5%
2015 118 83.1% 89.8%

Year Spring Cohort 2 years 3 years
2013 89 85% 89.9%
2014 130 80.8% 89.2%
2015 120 81.7% 93.3%

Our graduate rates of those admitted to the program stay consistently around 80-89% with the spring 2014 cohort going below this at 78.3% and the fall 2015 cohort going above this at 93.3. We are establishing a 2x2 program with two of our feeder community colleges that should help raise the 2 year graduation rate. Non-completion can be due to not passing required exams, low GPA's, being counseled out of the program due to dispositional issues, or life circumstances. This graduation rate is good, but we will continue to look for ways to improve it through programs like 2x2.

6. For this reporting period, 100% of our candidates were eligible and recommended for teacher licensure in Arkansas. During the internship semester all candidates are required to meet any licensure requirements other than testing requirements. Candidates are expected to complete all requirements from the Arkansas Department of Education through assignments and activities embedded in a required seminar course. While UAFS has had two previous years where pass rates were not 100% our target is 100% of candidates being successful.This information is shared with our school partners.

7. All completers are eligible to teach in Arkansas but not all choose to do that. Many of our graduates teach in Oklahoma which is our closest bordering state. Out of the graduates for the last reporting year we do not have employment information on 7 students. Four students are full time graduate school students and four are working in other fields unrelated to education. This information is shared regularly with our partners.

8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information: The UAFS institutional assessment does not disaggregate student loan default rates by programs, so there is no number specific to SOE teacher graduates. The overall student loan default rates that have been provided are:
• FY 2014 11.9
• FY 2015 15.2
• FY 2016 16.5

Due to the increase in the above percentages, all students are currently required to take a one-hour Personal Finance Applications (FIN 1521) class. Also, measures have been put into place to assist students in need of funding, to decrease the need for student loans.

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 UAFS system for monitoring dispositions indicates that candidates who receive 5 dispositional marks are placed on a plan of action with a variety of consequences for not meeting expectations. Dispostions are monitored in all courses after admission to the program. Faculty record dispositional issues in the LiveText system. At the end of the semester a report is produced that identifies students with emerging dispositional issues. During the fall of 2017, while reviewing the fall 2016-spring 2017 assessment report (table 9), the new Executive Director noted that data indicated that candidate's were receiving dispositional marks but that the issues were not being addressed until the middle of the following semester. The time between the issues that were noted and the action plan was too long. Candidates often indicated that they did not remember the issues that were mentioned by professors or that no one had spoken to them about the dispositions. In an effort to monitor dispostions throughout the program (CAEP 3.3) the School of Education (SOE) established individual disposition meetings with every student admitted to the SOE. These meetings take place mid-semester in conjunction with every field experience course. Faculty, who are teaching the candidate, collaborate around both positive dispositions and areas where growth is needed. Then, the candidate meets individually with the team of faculty to discuss ways to meet the required expectations. This type of dispositional support happened in the fall of 2018 and the spring of 2019. There has been a decrease in dispositional marks and candidates are more aware of the expectations at each semester. Stakeholders will be involved in a discussion in the fall of 2019 to provide feedback on the process and to guide decision making for continued development of monitoring dispositions.

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

> 3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
> 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

📎 **Assessment_Report_16.17.Final_(002).pdf**

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

◉ **Yes** ○ **No**

6.3 Optional Comments

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 2019 EPP Annual Report.*

☑ **I am authorized to complete this report.**

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Monica Riley
Position:	Executive Director of the School of Education
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**