

# 2020 EPP Annual Report

|                     |                                     |                   |        |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| <b>CAEP ID:</b>     | 20607                               | <b>AACTE SID:</b> | 102880 |
| <b>Institution:</b> | University of Arkansas - Fort Smith |                   |        |
| <b>Unit:</b>        | School of Education                 |                   |        |

## Section 1. EPP 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      | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 1.1.2 EPP characteristics | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 1.1.3 Program listings    | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

1.2 [For EPP seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation<sup>1</sup> applies to CAEP eligible EPPs] Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial Licensure and/or Advanced Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

## 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 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup> 83

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.)<sup>2</sup> 0

**Total number of program completers** 83

<sup>1</sup> For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

<sup>2</sup> 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 2018-2019 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:** Assessment 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       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs          | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

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 assists 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 - 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 80.87 18

MATH 78.55 20 80.48 21 78.70 24

SCIENCE 85.29 14 80.36 15 78.39 19

2016-17 2017-18 2018-19

Number of completers with growth data 29 29 33

Percent of completers with growth data 27.88 27.88 31.73

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

2017-18 2018-19 2019-20

VAS N VAS N VAS N

ELA 81.07 20 81.11 21 No data

MATH 81.01 15 81.13 19 No data

SCIENCE 82.09 6 79.95 8 No data

2017-18 2018-19 2019-20

Number of completers with growth data 27 31 NA

Percent of completers with growth data 26.21 30.1 NA

UAFS - 2018 Completer Cohort (Year 1 = 2018-19)

2018-19 2019-20 2020-21

VAS N VAS N VAS N

ELA 79.93 11 No data No data

MATH 79.15 6 No data No data

SCIENCE 78.83 5 No data No data

2018-19 2019-20 2020-21

Number of completers with growth data 18 NA NA

Percent of completers with growth data 25.71 NA NA

(Note: Changes in N are due to changes in the subjects for which a teacher has students assigned and/or attrition of teacher(s) from a cohort)

Overall, the students in the completers' classrooms are meeting expected growth. Our benchmark data from AY 15-16 looks very similar to the data presented here. UAFS graduates are consistently at the 80 mark showing expected growth or within a percentage point of that score. The 2018-19 cohort started out lower than the other cohorts, however, higher numbers make the data more reliable and the reporting numbers for the beginning of this cohort are low. 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 through 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) 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. UAFS had a 67% survey response rate. 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. All scores except one are above a 3.05 Our lowest reported score was Designing student formative assessment and use of these assessments for planning (2.95 on a 4pt scale) This score was still higher than the state score of 2.83 for this indicator. One change the program plans to make as a result is requiring students to provide pre-test data within course work and then to provide the formative assessments developed as a result of that data. Employment milestones (NBCT, graduate degrees, administrative promotions, etc.) are currently self-reported, which has been problematic.

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. Our lowest score is 3.16 on a 4 point scale in the area of managing student behavior. The state average for this score is 3.05. Students in the education program at UAFS are required to take a classroom management course early in the program. We have recently determined that additional time needs to be spent on classroom management during the internship semester.

5. Graduation Rates:

Year Cohort Semester/N 2 years 3 years

2014 Fall/73 49 - 67.1% 61 - 83.6%

2015 Spring/53 33 - 62.3% 50 - 94.3%

2015 Fall/77 62 - 80.5% 73 - 94.8%

2016 Spring/39 23 - 59% 34 - 87.2%

2016 Fall/45 26 - 57.8 42 - 93.3%

2017 Spring/60 33 - 55% 54 - 90%

2017 Fall/52 32 - 61.5%

Graduation rates of those admitted to the program between 2014-2017 show that a majority (mean of 63.3%) of the teacher candidates completed within two years of admission. An average of 90.5% graduated within three years. As all licensure tests must be passed prior to internship, there are those students who are unable to meet this requirement and may either take a sabbatical to prepare for licensure exams or decide to graduate with a non-licensure degree.

6. According to the Arkansas Department of Education's (ADE) 2019 Educator Preparation Provider Quality Report (EPPQR), UAFS teacher candidates had a 100% pass rate on assessments required for a teaching credential. Candidates are required to pass all licensure exams prior to internship, and then complete all other ADE licensure requirements through assignments in the required seminar course. This information is shared with SOE faculty/staff, school partners and on the UAFS SOE website.

7. All UAFS SOE completers are eligible to teach in Arkansas, but many choose to teach in the bordering state of Oklahoma. ADE numbers from the past three years show that UAFS first-year teachers are in AR schools at the following rates:

- 2016-2017 61%
- 2017-2018 65%
- 2018-2019 53%

These numbers are reflective of the SOE's role of serving two states, as Fort Smith is literally on the state line between Arkansas and Oklahoma.

8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information: After consulting with the UAFS Associate Vice Chancellor of

Strategic Analytics and Institutional Research, it's been confirmed that the report that comes in from the U.S. Department of Education does not disaggregate student loan default rates by programs, so there is no number specific to SOE teacher graduates. The most recent numbers are from 2016, and indicate that the overall UAFS student loan default rates are:

- FY 2014 11.9
- FY 2015 15.2
- FY 2016 16.5

All students are currently required to take a one-hour Personal Finance Applications (FIN 1521) class, to encourage fiscal responsibility. Also, supplemental funding measures have been put into place to assist students in need, 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?

Standard 3 recruitment and meeting employer needs (minority and shortage areas): Goals: We have programs in the following shortage areas for Arkansas- English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Music, and Spanish. Special Education is also identified as a

shortage area but we currently have only a resource room endorsement area. Goal 1-Begin a Masters of Special Education, Goal 2-Increase candidates in shortage areas by 2 candidates. Evidence of resource allocation: The University has faculty in each degree program who have teaching license in the area in which they teach. The teacher licensure programs are housed in a different college than the School of Education but the teacher licensure faculty work closely with School of Education Faculty to ensure competent graduates. A new committee has been formed for the English Language Arts program to develop strategies for recruitment and retention. The university hired a new faculty member with expertise in Special Education. His responsibilities include growing our Special Education Resource room program and developing a masters degree in Special Education. The Executive Director for the School of Education and the Special Education Faculty also serve on a Minority Recruitment Committee in conjunction with our largest school partner to recruit and retain minority teacher candidates. Monies are budgeted for travel and marketing regarding recruitment efforts. Communication: Our plans for recruitment and retention are communicated to future candidates through marketing and at recruiting events throughout the year. We communicate our plans and outcomes to our current students, staff, faculty, and school partners through regularly scheduled meetings throughout the academic year.

Supporting Data:

Category 16/17 17/18 18/19

Math 16 13 21

Science 14 7 21

Language Arts 18 24 17

Foreign Language 0 1 1

Music 6 4 7

Minority Graduates 7 3 6

All of our programs that are considered shortage areas have an increase from the last academic year except Foreign Language which remained flat and English Language Arts. The decrease in English prompted the new committee that was formed to increase recruitment and retention in this particular area. We continue to work to increase our minority candidates. We created a concurrent credit education course that allows us to recruit at diverse high schools.

Standard 2 partnerships: partnership agreements for candidate entry, preparation and exit: The School of Education at UAFS has a Teacher Education Council that consists of school district leadership with whom we partner. This group agrees on entry, preparation, and exit requirements. We work with our professional development schools throughout the program to determine assignments that will benefit our students and which also benefit the schools in which we serve. This year the program was expanded from watching and reflecting on teacher practice to assisting teachers with administering formative assessments. This improvement in the professional development school has been mutually beneficial. It has provided UAFS students with authentic assignments and provided our partnership school with additional resources.. We have worked with our closest partner to develop a Teacher Apprenticeship Program which is a paid yearlong internship for our candidates. Resource allocation for partnerships: The SOE has designated resources for travel to and from partnership schools. Faculty time is allocated to plan and discuss mutually beneficial assignments with principals, assistant principals, teacher leaders and classroom teachers. The Teacher Licensure and Field Experience Coordinator position is a resource dedicated to developing partnerships. Communication: Our plans for partnerships are communicated to future candidates through marketing and at recruiting events throughout the year. We communicate our plans and outcomes to our current students, staff, faculty, and school partners through regularly scheduled meetings throughout the academic year. Supporting Data: 24 students were placed at a new Professional Development School. These students were trained in the formative literacy assessments that the teachers administer. UAFS School of Education students administered these assessments to 24 struggling elementary school students and provided the data and anecdotal notes the classroom teachers for review and feedback. This mutually beneficial partnership will continue to be expanded.

Standard 1: Content Knowledge (specifically Science of Reading- INTASC standard 4): implementation of strategies for ensuring proficiency in the Science of Reading across grade levels: The University of Arkansas Fort Smith has worked to develop candidate knowledge in the area of the Science of Reading. Course work has been redesigned to include current and relevant research in the key components of the Science of Reading. A workshop to assist students in passing required Science of Reading exams has been implemented in each semester. Reading faculty at UAFS lead a Higher Education Literacy Council each semester to work with other literacy faculty across the state to ensure assignments are deepening knowledge. Resource Allocation: Finances to host the Higher Education Literacy Council are allocated. Providing training for Literacy Faculty to upskill knowledge around the Science of Reading has been provided. Communication: Our plans for deepening content knowledge are communicated to future candidates through marketing and at recruiting events throughout the year. We communicate our plans and outcomes to our current students, staff, faculty, and school partners through regularly scheduled meetings throughout the academic year. Supporting Data:

Program Year Pass Rate for UAFS # of Test Takers Pass Rate for State # of test takers

2017-Program YTD 91% 82 79% 1,392

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards

1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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 2020 EPP Annual Report.

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

### Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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**