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I. EPP Overview

a. Context and Unique Characteristics

The University of Arkansas - Fort Smith (UAFS) is located in the heart of the Arkansas River Valley near the Arkansas/Oklahoma border. Its 170 acre campus is in Fort Smith, the second largest city in Arkansas. It has 65 campus buildings and facilities. UAFS has a unique history. It was founded in 1928 as Fort Smith Junior College, an extension of the public school system in Fort Smith. In 1950 the school was incorporated as a private, nonprofit institution with its own governing boards. In 1966 the institution became Westark Junior College, in 1972 it changed to Westark Community College, and then to Westark College in 1998. In 2000 Westark College merged with the University of Arkansas System as a four-year institution. It became official on January 1, 2002 and the College of Education was established that year. In 2014, UAFS revised its organizational structure and changed the College of Education to the School of Education (SOE), which is housed in the College of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). Another unique feature of UAFS is the Western Arkansas Technical Center (WATC), an area secondary center that offers high school juniors and seniors in a six county area of western Arkansas an opportunity to earn up to 38 college credit hours that apply toward a technical certificate, associate, or bachelor's degree while still in high school. The School of Education offers an associate degree in Early Childhood Education in partnership with WATC. UAFS is the sixth largest university in Arkansas and one of 11 campuses in the University of Arkansas System. UAFS serves more than 20,000 people annually in credit and non-credit programs. In fall 2015 the student population was 6,707 and the student-to-faculty ratio was 18:1. UAFS offers 33 bachelor's degrees, 14 associate degrees, 28 certificates, and 1 master's degree. More than 50% of the UAFS students receive financial assistance from scholarships, grants, loans, and student employment.

b. Description of Organizational Structure

The University of Arkansas - Fort Smith includes five colleges of postsecondary education: College of Applied Science and Technology; College of Business; College of Health Sciences (includes the Carolyn McKelvey Moore School of Nursing); College of Communication, Languages, Arts, and Social Sciences; and the College of Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics (includes the School of Education). Since 2014, the UAFS School of Education has been part of the College of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). Therefore, the Dean of STEM serves as the Dean of the School of Education. The governance structure of the UAFS School of Education includes the following: Dean - College of STEM/School of Education, Executive Director - School of Education, Education Coordinator Council (ECC), Teacher Credential and Standards Committee (TCSC), Teacher Education Council (TEC), and a Superintendents Advisory Group. The Executive Director of the School of Education is the Unit Head of Teacher Education at UAFS. The Dean and Executive Director serve as ad hoc members of all committees. The Dean and Executive Director are responsible for all final products from the School of Education. The Dean reports directly to the Provost/Chief Academic Officer. The Executive Director of the School of Education reports to the Dean of STEM. The Teacher Education Council serves as an advisory body on matters of policy and curriculum for teacher education. The School of Education is most effective as it works in partnership with area school districts to meet local needs while focusing on national and state standards.

c. Vision, Mission, and Goals

The vision of UAFS is to be "a premier regional university, connecting education with careers." Its
mission is to prepare students "to succeed in an ever-changing global world while advancing economic development and quality of place." UAFS seeks to strengthen the educational, cultural, and economic development of the communities in the region. The School of Education faculty work to increase capacity through articulation and action aligned to shared goals. The School of Education faculty are actively involved in scholarly activities that support the shared vision, professional growth, and commitment to increased levels of student learning for teacher candidates and P-12 students. In addition to recruiting and admitting high quality teacher candidates, the School of Education has a rigorous and innovative curriculum that prepares candidates to respond to the challenges in P-12 education. Its integrated, whole child approach prepares candidates for diverse teaching experiences with a belief that all children can learn and the efficacy to implement action research for continuous improvement. The UAFS School of Education was ranked as one of the top two education programs in the state of Arkansas in 2016 by BecomeATeacher.org. The School of Education is one of two education preparation programs in the state to have Professional Development Schools (PDS). As a result of the preparation provided through rigorous coursework and meaningful clinical practice, UAFS School of Education graduates are sought after for employment. The School of Education graduates approximately 110 teachers each year, with a retention rate of admitted candidates at approximately 75%. In 2015-2016, approximately 60% of the previous year's completers were employed in Arkansas. Fort Smith borders Oklahoma; therefore, the School of Education also prepares candidates who choose to teach in that state.

d. EPP’s Shared Values and Beliefs for Educator Preparation

The School of Education beliefs for educator preparation are reflected in its Conceptual Framework (CF), which is derived from its mission, "Professionals United to Ensure Continuous Learning and Success." The Framework is informed by two major sources of research in best practices for educators, InTASC (Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) and Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching (FFT). The School of Education piloted the edTPA Portfolio in 2014 and adopted it as a unit assessment in 2015. InTASC and FFT are aligned with edTPA tasks. The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) adopted the InTASC Standards as the Arkansas Teaching Standards (ATS). The CF synthesizes the concepts from these models to represent the School of Education expectations for teacher candidates. The School of Education Intended Candidate Outcomes (ICOs) are the InTASC Standards, which are aligned with FFT and edTPA. The Framework's dominant feature is the teacher's "Focus on Student Learning." A teacher's decisions should be made through an analytical thought process that considers the best approaches to student learning. The concentric blue rings represent overall expectations. Technology, communication skills, and sound ethical practice are evident in all teaching decisions. Within the concentric structure, the CF divides into four quadrants. The first quadrant ensures that teachers consider student development, student differences, and the learning environment during instruction and interactions with students. The second quadrant considers the teacher's need for deep and broad content knowledge and an understanding of how to connect the content in a manner that engages learners in higher level thinking. The third quadrant delineates the instructional practice through the integration of assessment, planning, and instructional strategies in a coordinated manner. The final quadrant sets expectations for the teacher's professional learning, ethical practice, and leadership roles. It also emphasizes the importance of collaboration with learners, families, colleagues, and community leader to ensure learner growth. The CF guides candidates and pre-service teachers through each essential component of successful professional practice. School of Education faculty and staff are committed to the principles of the CF and model its tenets in their own practice.

The emphasis of the School of Education is on outcomes. Courses in the School of Education are characterized by the following criteria:

1. Frequent, multiple types of classroom assessments throughout the course with emphasis on authenticity and self-reflection leading to continuous growth.
2. Identified levels of proficiency in learning objectives candidates must demonstrate through
application of that learning in career-relevant scenarios.
3. Identification of general education competencies addressed directly either through explicit initial instruction or as reinforcement of initial instruction such as case studies or problem-based learning.
4. Accelerated learning options for candidates.
5. Consideration of individual learning styles while adhering to class expectations.
6. Opportunities for candidates to work in teams, groups, or partnerships to practice collaborative learning.

Additionally, the SOE has shared values and beliefs regarding the professional conduct of its candidates. The School of Education Dispositions for Teacher Candidates are:
1. COLLABORATION
2. REFLECTION
3. INTEGRITY
4. LEARNING INITIATIVE
5. RESPONSIBILITY
6. RESPECT
7. DIVERSITY

The School of Education tracks each candidate's disposition for teaching as they progress through their program of study. Candidates must demonstrate appropriate dispositions for admission, retention, and completion of the teacher preparation program.

e. Is the EPP regionally or institutionally accredited?

☐ Yes
☐ No. the EPP is ineligible for regional/institutional accreditation or such accreditation is not available

EPP is regionally or institutionally accredited

a. If your institution/EPP is regionally accredited, please upload a PDF copy of the award of regional accreditation here. If your institution/EPP is NOT regional accredited, please move to the next page.

See Attachment panel below.

Table 1 - Capacity

a. Institutional (EPP) ability to meet its financial obligations. The EPP uploads one of three items: (IF YOUR INSTITUTION/EPP IS REGIONALLY ACCREDITED, DO NOT COMPLETE TABLE 1, PLEASE MOVE TO NEXT PAGE)

1) Legal entity's 990 form (for non-profit EPPs) or
2) corporate income tax returns for the past year (for for-profit EPPs), or
3) equivalent evidence of financial health (for international EPPs).

b. Prepared budget for current year. The EPP uploads:

1) The most current approved budget for the current academic or calendar year whichever is most relevant for the EPP's context, or
2) equivalent evidence of revenues and expenditures.
Budget figures must be converted to USD if another currency is used.

c. Financial projections for long-term financial sustainability. The EPP uploads:
1) Revenues and expense projections for the next two years (either calendar or fiscal), including funding streams, or
2) equivalent evidence of financial sustainability.

If funding is exclusively tuition based, the EPP must upload:
1) Its tuition refund policy, and
2) its teach-out plan in the case that the EPP's programs are discontinued.

d. External audit process. The EPP uploads:
1) Clean independent audits of a full set of financial statements for the EPP, or
2) equivalent evidence of administrative budgetary oversight (for international EPPs).

e. Administrative structure. The EPP uploads:
1) A one-to-two page narrative describing the EPP's relationship with the legal entity in which it is housed (if any), and
2) an organizational chart.

Table 2. Program Characteristics

a. Complete this table of program characteristics by entering the information requested for every program or program option offered by the EPP. Cross check the list with the programs listed in the EPP’s academic catalog, if any, as well as the list of state-approved registered programs, if applicable. Site Visitors will reference this list in AIMS during the accreditation review process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 4-8</th>
<th>74</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>English grades 7-12 license</th>
<th>on campus</th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
<th>approved on February 19, 2015 by ADE</th>
<th>National Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Teacher Licensure 7-12</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>English grades 7-12 license</td>
<td>on campus</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>revised to reflect changes in ADE requirements, approved on May 9, 2016 by ADE</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Teacher Licensure K-12</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Social Studies grades 7-12 license</td>
<td>on campus</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>approval date - January 30, 2007</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology Teacher Licensure K-12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Biology grades 7-12 license</td>
<td>on campus</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>revised to reflect changes in ADE requirements, approved on April 13, 2016 by ADE</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Teacher Licensure 7-12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mathematics grades 7-12 license</td>
<td>on campus</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>revised to reflect changes in ADE requirements, approved on February 5, 2016 by ADE</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Teacher Licensure K-12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Spanish grades K-12 license</td>
<td>on campus</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>revised to reflect changes in ADE requirements, approved on February 13, 2015 by ADE</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Teacher Licensure K-12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Music grades K-12 license in one of two specialty areas ( instrumental or vocal)</td>
<td>on campus</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>revised to reflect changes in ADE requirements, approved on July 1, 2015 by ADE</td>
<td>state-only approval - no SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education P-4 and 4-12 endorsement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Special education endorsement</td>
<td>on campus</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>approved May 18, 2007, deleted in 2015 due to low-enrollment</td>
<td>National Recognition Program deleted in 2015 due to low enrollment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. EPP Characteristics

Complete a table of EPP characteristics in AIMS to provide an expanded profile by which the accreditation process is managed by CAEP staff. EPP characteristics are also used by CAEP staff in compiling CAEP's Annual Report to the public and used as a series of filters for dashboard comparison by the EPP itself. The AIMS version of this table, in which the data are actually entered, has drop-down menus by which characteristics are selected and the table is completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control of Institution</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Body</td>
<td>Coed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Baccalaureate Colleges Diverse Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Currently offering initial teacher preparation programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Clinical Educator Qualification Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Highest degree earned</th>
<th>Field or specialty area of highest degree</th>
<th>Program Assignment(s)</th>
<th>Teaching assignment or role within the program(s)</th>
<th>P-12 certificates or licensures held</th>
<th>P-12 experiences including teaching or administration dates of engagement in these roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Shelli Henehan</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>Coordinator of Assessment Faculty</td>
<td>9 hour teaching load each semester (may include supervision)</td>
<td>Arkansas Elementary K-6 Pre-K to Grade 4</td>
<td>4th grade in 1988-1989, at Fort Smith Christian School Preschool from 2000-2004, at River Valley Christian School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Melony Francis</td>
<td>M.ED</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Director of PreK Programs</td>
<td>Administrator = 50% Teaching = 50% (may include supervision)</td>
<td>Oklahoma license - Elementary Education K-8</td>
<td>Classroom teacher for 23 years in 1st, 3rd and 4th grades; Mentor teacher to 7 interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Helen Holland</td>
<td>M.ED</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Coordinator of Teacher Licensure and Field Experiences</td>
<td>Administration with a 4 hour teaching load each year (may include supervision)</td>
<td>Arkansas license - 1-6 Elementary Principal</td>
<td>Classroom teacher for 21 years; Elementary Principal for 9 years;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Barbara Hunt</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>Ed.D. Curriculum and Instruction, University of Houston</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>(may include supervision)</td>
<td>Texas license</td>
<td>Public School Teacher (1982-1995) 6th Grade, Galena Park, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Deebe Milford</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>12 teaching load each semester (may include supervision)</td>
<td>Arkansas license - Prek-Grade 6; PK-Grade 4</td>
<td>Classroom teacher 15 years (PK, K, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ginger Osburn</td>
<td>M.ED National Board Certification</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>12 hour teaching load each semester (may include supervision)</td>
<td>Oklahoma license - K-Grade 8</td>
<td>32 Years Early Childhood Experience in Kindergarten, Watson Chapel School District, Pine Bluff, AR,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Specialty</td>
<td>Years/Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sara Davis</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>Family Relations and Child Development Faculty</td>
<td>Oklahoma City Public Schools PreK and 2nd Grade, 3 years; Putnam City Public Schools Kindergarten - 5th Grade, 16 years; Clinical supervision K-4, Oklahoma State, 2 years; Portland State Liaison for Public School field experiences, 6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ernest Barnett</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>Education Faculty</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lois Yocum</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction Coordinator of Secondary Education Faculty Administrator with a 9 hour teaching load each semester (may include supervision) Current Iowa Teaching License: All English and U.S. History and World History, grades 5-12 23 years middle school language arts/publications teacher 7 years high school English teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. April Evans</td>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>Reading Specialist Visiting instructor</td>
<td>Arkansas license P-4 and 4-8 10 years teaching experience in Van Buren School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arkansas Licensed In: Middle School Union Christian Academy, Assistant Principal K-12, 2005-2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cheryl Lehman</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Adjunct teaching and university supervisor</td>
<td>Language Arts/Social Studies 4-8; Middle School Science 5-8; Middle School Math 4-8; Family and Consumer Science 4-8; Family and Consumer Science 7-12; River Valley Christian School, Teacher and Elementary Principal. 2001-2002 4th Grade; 2002-2005 Elementary Principal K-6. Fort Smith Public Schools 1982-1991 Teacher and Department Head.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Courtney Wood</td>
<td>M.ED</td>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>Adjunct teaching and university supervisor</td>
<td>Arkansas license - K-6 and Gifted and Talented; Taught elementary school in Fort Smith Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Darren McKinney</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Adjunct teaching</td>
<td>Arkansas license - Secondary Administrator; Classroom teacher 7 years; Assistant Principal 5 years; Principal 6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Spring Stout</td>
<td>M.ED</td>
<td>Instructional Technology</td>
<td>Adjunct teaching</td>
<td>Arkansas license - Instructional Technology; Currently employed in the Mountainburg School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Marion Sherrod</td>
<td>M.ED</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Adjunct supervision</td>
<td>Greenwood Public Schools, Classroom Teacher, 5th Grade, 1996-2005 Fort Smith Public Schools, Classroom Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jenn Jennings-Davis</td>
<td>M.ED</td>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
<td>Adjunct teaching</td>
<td>Arkansas license English 7-12; Taught English in Van Buren School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael Mann</td>
<td>M.ED</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>University Supervisor</td>
<td>Supervising Biology 7-12 interns; Arkansas Biology 7-12; Completed internship and substitute in 7-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>University Supervisor</th>
<th>Supervising</th>
<th>Interns</th>
<th>Certification and Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Julie Oliver</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>University Supervisor</td>
<td>supervising</td>
<td>History 7-12 interns</td>
<td>Certified in broad field social studies 7-12, State of Georgia, ESOL endorsed, state of Georgia. In addition to social studies courses for native English speakers also taught sheltered world and U.S. history to ESOL students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Alexandra Zacharella</td>
<td>Doctor of Musical Arts in Trombone Performance,</td>
<td>Doctoral Minors: Music Education, Conducting, Jazz Studies, University of Southern California, Thornton School of Music, 2004-2007</td>
<td>University Supervisor</td>
<td>supervising</td>
<td>Music K-12 interns</td>
<td>Macomb County and Washtenaw County Public Schools, Michigan - 1999-2004 - Adjunct, Low Brass Instructor L’Anes Creuse Middle School, Michigan - 2001-2004 - Director of Bands Guest Clinician in Western Arkansas Public Schools - 2008 - Present, Fourteen years of Teaching grades 6-12 public school instrumental music private studio lessons, and guest clinics in marching band, concert band and jazz band for band around the US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 years experience at El
Dr. Brenda Ross  
Ph.D.  
Applied Linguistics  
University Supervisor  
Supervising Spanish K-12 interns  
non-licensure  
Colegio Ingles (Bilingual School) Montevideo, Uruguay, 1st through 4th grades. 1 years experience as Amity Scholar Spanish Language Assistant at Anoka Sr. High School; Anoka, MN.

Dr. Donna Scoggins  
Ed.D  
Higher Administration  
Faculty Coordinator of ELEM/MLED  
9 hour teaching load each semester (may include supervision)  
Arkansas license K-6 and 4-8  
Public School Teacher (1977-2006), grades 5-7, math, science, social studies.

Dr. Linda Fair  
Ph.D  
History  
University Supervisor  
Supervising History 9-12 interns  
Teaching Credential 1980-2015.  
Supervised and trained future geography teachers at Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, and Binghamton University New York. California Multiple Subjects Taught 1st through 8th grades for eight years in California.

Upload the clinical educator qualifications table, if not provided in the previous table.

Table 5. The Parity Table

a. The parity table of curricular, fiscal, facility, and administrative and support capacity for quality is used to satisfy requirements of the U.S. Department of Education and is completed by providing data relevant for the EPP and making a comparison to an EPP-determined comparative entity. The comparative entity might be another clinical EPP within a university structure, a national organization, the college or university as a whole or another entity identified as a benchmark by the EPP. Again, this chart offers an example of how the chart might be completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Dimension</th>
<th>EPP description of metric(s)</th>
<th>EPP data</th>
<th>Comparative entity data</th>
<th>Title and description of supplemental evidence/documentation of quality for each dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate support services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate feedback, formal and informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upload Parity Table

Parity Table.pdf

See Attachment panel below.

Table 6. Accreditation Plan
The EPP is responsible for evaluating and celebrating the quality of teacher preparation programs, with an eye toward ensuring that these programs are consistent with the established standards of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). This document outlines the requirements and standards set by CAEP for accreditation reviews, highlighting the importance of program quality and alignment.

The table provided outlines the geographic site(s) administered by the EPP, along with the programs offered at each site. This information is crucial as it helps in planning the site visit, ensuring that the reviews are comprehensive and cover all necessary aspects.

The table details the program characteristics, including whether the program is included in the accreditation review and if the program is approved by the state in which it is offered. This information is vital for the site visit planning and accreditation process.

Additionally, there is a section dedicated to proprietary assessments used by the EPP. These assessments are mapped to the appropriate CAEP standards, providing a structured approach to assessing program quality.

II. CAEP Standards and Evidence

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard and answer the following questions for each item.)
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1Unit Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2CAEP Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3Assessment Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5ADE Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7Candidate Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8Licensure Exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9EPP Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10GPA and ACT Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11Non-Academic Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12Standard 1 Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13Research Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students’ progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14SPA Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15GPA Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16Required Courses Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17At Risk Candidates Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18Field Experience Tables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.

1.5 Model and apply technology standards

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards

1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23</th>
<th>Candidate Work Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context for Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Sample 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Sample 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Sample 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
1.5 Model and apply technology standards

*ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met*

The UA Fort Smith (UAFS) School of Education (SOE) Conceptual Framework is informed by two major sources of research in best practices for educators, Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) and Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching (FFT). The Intended Candidate Outcomes (ICOs), the InTASC Standards, are assessed using multiple measures. The 1Unit Alignment and the 2CAEP Alignment provide evidence of the SOE’s Quality Assurance System (QAS). The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) uses the FFT as the teacher evaluation instrument in the public schools. SOE candidates are introduced to the FFT in the Introduction to Education course. FFT is reinforced in all education courses and used to assess candidates in all clinical experiences. The four domains and 22 components have been crosswalked with the edTPA Portfolio, another unit assessment used by the SOE to assess candidates. Faculty and university supervisors have been trained to use both assessments. FFT and edTPA, both proprietary assessments, are used both formatively and summatively.
to monitor each candidate's proficiency as he/she progresses through the program.

The QAS is designed to measure candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions derived from professional, state, and institutional standards. As noted on pp. 6-12 in the Assessment Manual and the 4Minutes, several changes were made in fall 2015 based on the recommendation of an external evaluator. The QAS is represented by a series of gates that must be cleared by candidates as they move through the program. By successfully meeting the requirements at each gate, candidates meet designated standards and complete their programs. Multiple assessment measures, both academic and non-academic, provide the support for the process and provide continual feedback data for analysis at each level. All programs of study have been approved by ADE and meet college and career ready standards (ADE Competencies).

Candidates are expected to demonstrate competency in all ten InTASC standards. The 6Assessment Report provides formative and summative data for each InTASC Standard. The 7Candidate Manual outlines the process for candidates and demonstrates the alignment of InTASC, FFT, edTPA and the Disposition Assessment. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the InTASC Standards through academic requirements in the following documents: 8Licensure Exams, 9EPP Reports, the 10GPA and ACT Table. The 11Non-Academic Requirements table lists the types of assessments used and how they are tracked. The 6Assessment Report provides FFT and edTPA scaffolded clinical experience data, all aligned with InTASC Standards and CAEP components. Disposition Assessment data in the 6Assessment Report provide an additional measure of candidate proficiency. To assist the reviewer, evidence for each CAEP Standard I component has been reported in tables that provide aggregated data aligned to the criteria of the component. 12Standard 1 Tables provide evidence the candidates understand the ten InTASC Standards, instructional practices, and professional responsibility. Each data table reports triangulated data from multiple assessments aligned to the specific CAEP component. 12Standard 1 Tables (pp. 2-3) report data from multiple measures that provide evidence the SOE candidates understand the InTASC Standards, instructional practices, and professional responsibilities of being an educator. Additional evidence is found in the 6Assessment Report pp. 24-27. 12Standard 1 Tables (pp. 4-5) provide evidence the SOE candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of teaching. Additional evidence is found in the Research Component document. 12Standard 1 Tables (pp. 6-8) report data from multiple measures that provide evidence the candidates/completers have content and pedagogical knowledge and can apply it. Additional evidence is found in 6Assessment Report pp. 40-44 and 57-62, 8Licensure Exams, 9EPP Reports, 10GPA and ACT Table, 14SPA Recognition, 15GPA Content, and 16Required Courses Chart. 12Standard 1 Tables (pp. 8-9) report data from multiple measures that are aligned with CAEP 1.4 and InTASC. Another assessment, the Candidate Disposition Assessment (6Assessment Report, pp. 24-27) allows faculty to track candidates' dispositions, an indicator of the candidates' commitment to provide all P-12 students access to rigorous college and career ready standards. The aggregated data provide valuable insight into trends and patterns. However, the most information gleaned from this assessment is the identification of individual candidates who are not performing at target level, allowing for appropriate and timely interventions during preparation, noted in the 17At Risk Candidates Summary. 12Standard 1 Tables (pp. 10-12) report data from FFT, edTPA and the Diversity Case Study that are aligned with CAEP 1.5 and InTASC.

As noted in the 12Standard 1 Tables, diversity and technology are addressed throughout the entire program of study. All candidates complete a course in educational technology. The course objectives are aligned with ISTE Standards. Candidates explore various types of instructional technology, research a technology tool, and present it to the class. A new course objective beginning fall 2016 is the inclusion of a unit on assistive technology. 16Required Courses Chart and 18Field Experiences Tables provide evidence how technology and diversity are addressed in both coursework and clinical experiences.

Collectively, 12Standard 1 Tables provide evidence from multiple measures the SOE candidates have the content and pedagogical knowledge that enables them to plan and implement differentiated lessons
Based on the needs of the diverse learner. Evidence also indicates the candidates use research to plan effective lessons and use technology to implement them. Lastly, the candidates are able to evaluate their impact on student learning and reflect on ways to improve. FFT Domain 1 and edTPA Task 1 provide candidates opportunities to hone their skills in creating differentiated lesson plans that are appropriate to the needs of their students. During Internship, candidates create a unit of study based on the needs of their students and following their discipline-specific edTPA guidelines. They teach the unit, collect data, reflect on their experiences, and complete the portfolio assignments. Reflection is a vital part of the process and leads to professional growth. A final summative conference is held with the mentor teacher, university supervisor, and pre-service teacher. Aggregated data are reported in the Assessment Report. Therefore, evidence from the 12Standard 1 Tables clearly indicates candidates understand the ten InTASC Standards, instructional practices, and professional responsibilities. Pages 4-5 in the tables provide data specifically aligned to the use of research and understanding the teaching profession. FFT Domain 1 and edTPA Task I provide data demonstrating the candidates' proficiencies in using research to plan appropriate lessons for their students and then design appropriate assessments (FFT Domain 1e and edTPA Rubric 5).

As noted, candidates scored at target in every FFT component except 4c, communicating with parents. Faculty have discussed the scores and identified ways to enable the candidates to have more opportunities to interact with the parents. A major focus of FFT Domain 4a, is the reflection component. The progression of FFT assessment data indicate candidates are showing an improvement in reflection (6Assessment Report, FFT 4a pp. 22-23) from Practicum I through Internship. Since full implementation of edTPA in fall 2015, the mean score for edTPA Task 2, Rubric 10 has been at target (12Standard 1 Tables pp. 6-8). Novice Teacher Surveys (6Assessment Report, pp. 57-58) indicate the UAFS interns rated themselves 4.40 in reflection, which was higher than the state mean of 4.20. 12Standard 1 Tables (pp. 6-8) provide data that indicate candidates meet the target with both assessments. edTPA Task 3 also requires candidates to show examples of their students' work and provide evidence through pre-and-post testing of their impact on student learning.

All UAFS teacher licensure programs have been nationally recognized at some level by their respective SPAs. Each program has been approved by the ADE and has met the career ready competencies for the discipline, which are aligned with Praxis tests and SPA standards (14SPA Recognition). Candidates in every program must meet their discipline specific SPA requirements, SOE requirements, and ADE teacher licensure requirements. Candidates must meet target on all unit assessments and meet the academic and non-academic requirements. 12Standard 1 Tables (pp. 6-8) provide data concerning the candidates' application of content and pedagogical knowledge using both FFT scores and edTPA scores. The 6Assessment Report provides data demonstrating the progression of those skills from Practicum I through Internship (pp. 47-55). All programs of study have matrices aligned with discipline specific competencies and SPA standards. Candidates must demonstrate strong content knowledge and pedagogical skills by passing the Praxis II Specialty exam and Principle of Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam. Since 2014, the SOE requires candidates to pass all Praxis II exams for admission into Internship; therefore, 100% of the teacher licensure graduates have demonstrated their knowledge and skills. ADE requires additional licensure trainings during Internship in the following areas: Teen Suicide Prevention, Child Maltreatment, Code of Ethics for Arkansas Educators, Parental Involvement, Dyslexia Awareness, Child Maltreatment, and TESS (Danielson Framework for Teaching).

10GPA and ACT Table provides the GPA and ACT scores of each discipline and 15GPA Content data shows a comparison of the GPA of teacher licensure candidates and their non-licensure colleagues (when possible). Page 45 in the 6Assessment Report reports the mean cumulative GPA from admission to graduation for spring 2013-spring 2016, providing evidence the candidates are meeting content standards. Candidates demonstrate their pedagogical skills in the classroom by creating a positive learning environment (InTASC 3/FFT Domain 2e/edTPA Task 2 Rubrics 6, 7, 8, 10) and by engaging students in learning by using higher order thinking skills (FFT Domain 3 b and c). Progression data
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(formative) from Practicum I through Internship is reported in the 6Assessment Report (pp. 22-23, 28-34 and 47-55). The FFT data indicate SOE candidates' summative evaluations are at or above target in those criteria. edTPA assessments are discipline specific and provide candidates the opportunity to use academic language appropriate to their discipline.

As noted earlier, Novice Teacher Surveys indicate SOE graduates are well-prepared in all areas and Employer Surveys indicate the graduates have a positive impact on student learning (6Assessment Report, 57-58 and 40-44). FFT Components 1a, 2a, 3a, b, c, e and the Lesson Planning data found in 12Standard 1 Tables (pp. 10-12) provide evidence SOE candidates are meeting target in the use of technology, a required component for the lesson plans (19Lesson Plan). Candidates videotape themselves teaching the lesson they created for edTPA Task 1 during Practicum I. They hone those skills in Practicum II as they complete edTPA Tasks I and 2. During Internship they complete all three edTPA Portfolio tasks, which include other videotaped lessons. One specific assessment that requires candidates to explain their use of technology in lesson planning is found on Table 6 in the 6Assessment Report. The selected Lesson Plan component data are reported in 12Standard 1 Tables (p. 12). Additionally, the 6Assessment Report provides data from the Novice Teacher Survey. SOE graduates rated themselves as well-prepared in the use instructional technology, which is above the ADE mean. Although the 6Assessment Report (p. 35) indicates candidates demonstrate knowledge of effective teaching techniques and how to utilize technology (criteria 3, 11), faculty plan to include a unit on assistive technology in the technology course.

The SOE faculty were trained to be edTPA local evaluators in fall 2015. The SOE is establishing inter-rater reliability by selecting candidate portfolios to be submitted to edTPA national scorers. Thus far, a total of 10 candidate portfolios have been submitted for external evaluation. Those submitted prior to fall 2015 during the pilot period were randomly selected. In fall 2015, only those who were rated highest by the local evaluators were submitted for external evaluation to establish interrater reliability. Arkansas does not require edTPA and UAFS is the only public EPP using it at the undergraduate level. Arkansas has established the passing score at 37 or 32, depending on the number of rubrics. Based on that score and beginning with the fall 2015 full implementation date, 100% of the SOE submissions met the required passing score.

The SOE made many significant changes since fall 2014, beginning with restructuring the governance structure. The College of Education became a School of Education, housed in the College of STEM. ADE also made significant program and licensure changes during 2014 and NCATE was transitioning to CAEP. The SOE hired an educational consultant to complete an analysis of the quality assurance system. The reports (20SWOT Analysis, 21Key Findings) provided the faculty an opportunity to critically review the QAS and make needed improvements. As noted by the 20SWOT Analysis, 4Minutes, the 7Candidate Manual, the 6Assessment Report, the alignment charts, revised assessments, the 3Assessment Manual and the timeline of changes, it is apparent the SOE has made significant improvements. Several programs were redesigned to meet ADE licensure requirements. At the 2016 Faculty Retreat, faculty and TEC members reviewed the data and noted a decrease in FFT 4c - communicating with families. Candidates who attended the meeting agreed they felt under-prepared in communicating with parents. They identified this area for the CAEP Selected Improvement Plan (SIP) submitted in this Self-Study. Another weakness was noted in the Diversity Case Study data. The SOE candidates' scores dropped from 2014 to 2016. A study of the SOE practicum candidates' understanding of diversity conducted by an adjunct professor (22Lehman Study) indicates a weakness in the area of diversity. The new K-6 program of study includes an additional special education course focusing on differentiation. The faculty will continue to monitor these areas.

Data indicate candidates are strong in content and pedagogical knowledge and demonstrate effective instructional planning skills based on the needs of their students. Overall, based on multiple academic and non-academic measures, both formative and summative, UAFS SOE candidates are performing at or
above target level.

Specialty Licensure Area Data

Program Review Option (per state partnership agreement)
- CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)
- CAEP Program Review with Feedback (State-selected standards)
- State Program Review (State-selected standards)

Answer the following prompts for programs reviewed for National Recognition (SPA) and Program Review with Feedback. Upload state reports for state reviewed programs.

1. Based on the analysis of the disaggregated data, how have the results of specialty licensure area or SPA evidence been used to inform decision making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes?

The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) requires program approval for all licensure areas. The EPP must submit a matrix for each program showing its alignment to state competencies for the discipline, the ADE Teaching Standards (InTASC), and the Teacher Evaluation and Support System (TESS) components. When new Praxis tests are adopted by ADE, university faculty participate in critiquing and approving the tests. The UAFS School of Education encourages faculty from each discipline to take the Praxis specialty area exam to ensure the programs of study are aligned with the licensure tests.

The SOE Teacher Education Council (TEC) is comprised of representatives from the public schools, candidates in the teacher education program, SOE faculty, and faculty from the specialty areas. The Assessment Coordinator reports to the TEC each semester and is always available to answer questions concerning the unit wide assessments. The Administrative Analyst is always available to provide Praxis data for each program area. As noted in the Assessment Manual, the SOE made significant changes in the Quality Assurance System during 2014-2016. Several unit assessments were changed based on a SWOT analysis of the system and ADE licensure and policy changes. Two major changes were the adoption of the Danielson FFT assessments and the edTPA Portfolio. Faculty from all areas approved both unit wide assessments in 2015. ADE requires all teachers in Arkansas to be trained in the FFT, which is used as the evaluation for all educators. All pre-service teachers must also be trained in the framework, which provides a seamless transition from pre-service teacher to classroom teacher. The edTPA Portfolio differentiates for each specialty area and prepares pre-service teachers in their discipline's academic language. The disaggregated data are reported in the Assessment Report and faculty are encouraged to use the data to improve programs. The SOE Alignment Chart aligns InTASC (SOE Intended Candidate Outcomes), Danielson FFT, edTPA, and SOE Dispositions. Faculty can track discipline level candidates' scores to the specific question in edTPA and/or the specific component in the FFT. If further analysis is needed, they can ask the Administrative Analyst for a specific candidate's scores. They can "dig deep" into the data to identify data to very specific skills.

The ADE does not require EPPS to have National Recognition for its specialty licensure area programs. However, UAFS School of Education has consistently sought SPA approval for each program. Faculty in each program analyze its SPA report for program improvement. The SOE has copies of each report on file. Several programs use unit-wide assessments in their SPA reports. The status of each specialty licensure programs is listed below:
History/Social Studies (NCSS) --- Recognized 7-30-14
Mathematics (NCTM) --- Recognized 7-31-14
Middle Childhood (AMLE) --- Recognized 7-30-14
English (NCTE) --- Recognized - 8-1-16
Spanish (ACTFL) --- Recognized - 2-1-16
Biology (NSTA) --- Recognized with Conditions - 8-1-14 The Biology with Teacher Licensure Program has been a low-enrollment program, although efforts have been made to recruit into this teacher shortage area. ADE made several changes in licensure programs in 2014 which required changes in the Biology with Teacher Licensure Program. The revised program of study was approved by ADE on 2-5-16. The Biology faculty plan to submit the program to NSTA for national recognition.

Early Childhood (NAEYC) --- Recognized 7-14-09 The ECED Program was discontinued by ADE and candidates were not admitted after fall 2015. The last P-4 candidates should complete the program by spring 2018. The K-6 Program was added in fall 2015 and the first completers are expected in 2018. The SOE has been waiting for CAEP to complete its elementary standards. A SOE representative will attend the CAEP 2016 Fall Conference to learn more about the process. The SOE plans to submit the SPA in 2017.

State Approved Programs: Music Education Instrumental K-12 and Music Education Vocal K-12. Since music does not have a SPA, the ADE approves it for licensure.

Endorsements: Special Education P-4 and 4-12 (CEC) Recognized - 8-1-14 This program of study was an endorsement to be added to an existing teacher licensure. The program was deleted in 2014 due to a change in ADE licensure and low-enrollment.

2. Based on the analysis of specialty licensure area data, how have individual licensure areas used data for change?

In 2014 the ADE made significant program and licensure changes, which required EPPs to make significant program changes. EPPs were required to submit new programs of study proposals aligned with the curriculum competencies for the discipline, Arkansas Teaching Standards (ATS, which are InTASC), and the Teacher Excellence Support System (TESS) Components. The competencies were aligned with SPA Standards and Praxis exams. Faculty began mapping curriculum in 2014-15. They submitted several program proposals to ADE for approval that year. Other programs made changes based on curriculum mapping. The English Teacher Licensure faculty analyzed its program of study and made several course changes based on the analysis. The Mathematics Teacher Licensure faculty reviewed its 7-12, 4-8, and P-4 courses to identify areas for improvement and to identify courses to implement the edTPA Portfolio. The Spanish with Teacher Licensure Program reviewed the data and made several program changes.

Faculty have always been cognizant of the teacher licensure exams. They have monitored the exams and revised curriculum as needed. The Middle Childhood program made extensive changes based on ADE licensure requirements. Additionally, the new K-6 program of study was approved and implemented in 2015. It has no completers at this time. The faculty are closely monitoring the new programs to identify areas of strength and weaknesses.

ADE reports an Educator Preparation Provider Report (EPPR) each year for each EPP in the state. The EPP reports the Praxis data for first time test takers in each licensure area. The report can be somewhat misleading because of the testing windows and the difficulty in identifying and deleting candidates who shouldn't be on the EPP roster. Specifically, candidates who graduate from UAFS (non-education degree) and enter a non-traditional licensure program are sometimes grouped with UAFS test-takers. The ADE is implementing policies this year that should assist EPPs in the deletion process. The EPP reports are shared with faculty and reported to the TEC. Kathy Pruner from ETS showed faculty ways to
utilize the data more effectively. Faculty are able to dig into the data to identify patterns, which can lead to program improvement. Several discipline level faculty provide test preparation sessions for candidates. Additionally, candidates are provided resources to assist them in their preparation. However, the SOE discussed the need to provide more preparation sessions for the candidates, specifically in test-taking strategies. The SOE has requested assistance from the STEM Education specialists and the Guy Fenter Educational Service Cooperative specialists. Beginning fall 2016, the specialists at the cooperative have agreed to partner with the SOE to assist struggling candidates. The SOE also noted a slight decrease in the PLT test scores and discussed implementing PLT test preparation sessions in fall 2016.

The SOE requires its candidates to pass both the Praxis specialty area exam and the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam for admission into Internship. SOE faculty recognize the time and financial challenges this poses for candidates, particularly the non-traditional candidates. With this in mind, they plan to offer test-taking strategy sessions early in the program to better prepare the candidates in those important skills. In spring 2016, the SOE hired a LiveText consultant to present a training to the SOE faculty and the specialty area faculty. The goal of the training was to support the faculty in the use of LiveText and its data analysis functions. By using LiveText, ETS resources, and partners, the SOE will be able to better assist candidates as they progress through the Teacher Education Program.

3. For Program Review with Feedback only: How does the specialty licensure area data align with and provide evidence for meeting the state-selected standards?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. For National Recognition only: How are SPA reports that are not Nationally Recognized being addressed?

As noted earlier, the Biology with Teacher Licensure program is a low-enrollment program. ADE made several changes in the program of study requirements in 2014-2015. UAFS resubmitted its program to ADE in 2015 to meet the new requirements. It was approved in 2016. Biology faculty plan to resubmit for national recognition in fall 2016.

Since ADE changed the licensure from PK-Grade 4 to K-6 in 2014, UAFS made the required changes in its program of study. The PK-Grade 4 program is being phased out and the last candidates should graduate by spring 2018. Candidates in the PK-Grade 4 program were given the opportunity to switch to the K-6 program in fall 2015. A few candidates decided to switch; therefore, there are a few candidates in the K-6 program of study. The PK-Grade 4 program is recognized by NAEYC through the CAEP visit in 2017. A faculty member is attending the CAEP 2016 Conference to learn more about the CAEP Elementary Standards. The SOE will submit the report in spring 2017 for national recognition (depending on CAEP's approval of the Elementary Standards.)

State Review Only: Upload State Program Reports here.

**Standard 2: Clinical Partnership and Practice**

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1Unit Alignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2CAEP Alignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 3Assessment Manual

4 6Assessment Report

5 7Candidate Manual

6 8Licensure Exams

7 9EPP Reports

8 10GPA and ACT Table

9 11Non-Academic Requirements

10 12Standard 1 Tables

11 23Minutes

12 24Orientation Meetings

13 25Faculty Retreat

14 26MOU

15 27Internship Handbook

16 28Disposition Minutes

17 29Disposition Assessment

18 30Disposition Rubric

19 31PDS Partnership

20
### 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

21. Licensure Regs

22. Standard 2 Tables

23. Partnership Map

24. Partnership Document

25. At Risk Table

26. Plan of Action

27. Strategic Plan

28. Recruitment and Retention Plan

---

*ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met*

The UA Fort Smith (UAFS) School of Education (SOE) invites P-12 stakeholders to participate in teacher candidates' clinical preparation through several different means, such as Teacher Education Council (TEC) and Teacher Credentials and Standards Committee (TCSC) 23Minutes; 24Orientation Meetings each semester for university supervisors, P-12 mentors and interns; and annual 25Faculty Retreats in which P-12 educators are invited to collaborate in decision-making to improve clinical experiences. In June 2015, representatives from partner schools contributed ideas for revisions to the SOE's lesson plan format (25Faculty Retreat). In addition to this collaboration, P-12 schools sign a Memorandum of Understanding (26MOU) that outlines the university's and school districts' general policies and understandings for all clinical experiences. These expectations are outlined and specifically described in the 7Candidate Manual and 27Internship Handbook. The SOE assesses the candidates' dispositions for teaching from the first education course through Internship. The disposition assessment was revised by an adhoc TEC Committee in 2013 and implemented in spring 2014 (28Disposition Minutes). The 29Disposition Assessment (7Candidate Manual pp. 27-30; 6Assessment Report, pp. 24-27) allows faculty to track candidates' dispositions. The aggregate data provide valuable insight in trends and patterns. However, the most important information gleaned from this assessment is the identification of individual candidates who are not performing at target level, thus allowing for appropriate and timely interventions. The 29Disposition Assessment criteria and 30Disposition Rubric, a Non-Academic Requirement, are introduced in the Introduction to Education course and outlined in the 7Candidate Manual. Other non-academic requirements are listed in the 11Non-Academics Requirements. Resources along with evaluation forms are accessible online in LiveText Field Experience Module (FEM). LiveText allows university supervisors, pre-service teachers, and P-12 clinical educators/mentors to collaborate, communicate, share documents and evaluations electronically. The SOE invites P-12 partners to assist in interviewing applicants for admission to the Teacher Education Program (TEP) each semester. In this way P-12 teachers/administrators provide input regarding the quality of teacher
candidates. The SOE has partnered with two school districts to establish Professional Development Schools (PDS) in which teacher candidates attend university classes taught by SOE professors within the public school building and regularly observe and participate in classrooms (31PDS Partnership).

Candidates' competencies are assessed in Practicum I and II (formative) and Internship (summative) by both clinical educator/mentor teachers and university supervisors using the Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT) assessment rubrics and edTPA portfolio rubrics. The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) requires all teachers in Arkansas to be trained in the FFT, and it is used as the teacher evaluation instrument in the public schools. SOE candidates are introduced to the FFT components in the Introduction to Education course and they are reinforced in all education courses. The scoring rubrics are introduced to candidates in Practicum I and they are used to assess candidates in all clinical experiences. The four domains and 22 components have been crosswalked with the edTPA Portfolio assignments and assessment rubrics. Faculty and university supervisors complete trainings to use the both assessments and inter-rater reliability activities to hone their skills in using the instruments. All mentor teachers must be proficient in the use of the FFT assessment. FFT and edTPA, both proprietary assessments, are used both formatively and summatively to monitor each candidate's proficiency as they progress through the program. The data are reported in the annual 6Assessment Report (pp. 28-34, & 47-55).

Coherence across clinical and academic components is maintained incrementally as students complete formative tasks in edTPA (1Unit Alignment, 2CAEP Alignment). Summatively, candidates complete all three edTPA tasks during Internship. At the conclusion of Internship, mentor teachers, interns, and university supervisors conduct a three-way conference based upon shared evidence from performance assessments derived from FFT criteria (6Assessment Report, pp. 22-23). Dispositions of the candidate are assessed in LiveText at this time by all three conference participants. The SOE, in conjunction with clinical partners, select clinical educators/mentors who are highly effective based on the ADE's 32Licensure Regs. To identify high quality clinical educators/mentors, the SOE surveys interns and university supervisors regarding their perceptions of mentors in order to highlight trends that might lead to retention of or alternate selections. To support and retain high-quality mentors, the SOE provides face-to-face and electronic orientation options at the beginning of each semester. The orientations outline expectations for both mentor and intern. Mentors and university supervisors complete an online survey at the end of the semester in which they are given the opportunity to evaluate the quality of the internship experience (6Assessment Report, p. 56). The survey results indicate the strengths and weaknesses of the internship experience and drive a shared decision-making process to affect program changes. In addition to these requirements, the SOE collaborates with P-12 building administrators to effectively assign mentor and interns based on common characteristics and/or dispositions such as content knowledge, interests, personalities, and cultural backgrounds. The SOE collaborates with P-12 partners in multiple ways including the annual Faculty Retreat to which school administrators, alumni, and teachers are invited, quarterly meetings of the Teacher Education Council, and the Teacher Credentials and Standards Committee (23Minutes). During these meetings the SOE and school partners discuss strengths and weaknesses in the education program. For example, the idea of a PDS originated in a TEC meeting and evolved to the current establishment of three PDS sites.

Candidates are expected to complete three levels of clinical experiences: Practicum I, Practicum II, and Internship. The placements in P-12 schools must meet ADE 32Licensure Regs and must include at least one experience in each of the following settings: demographically diverse, rural/small school, suburban/urban school, and one placement in lower and one in upper licensure grade levels. 33Standard 2 Tables provide information about site selection, type of experience, length of experience, and course expectations to ensure candidates meet program and licensure requirements. The tables provide relevant information regarding objectives for each course requiring clinical experiences as well as how technology and diversity are addressed. The 34Partnership Map provides a visual of the SOE placement sites. Observation hours are logged in LiveText and approved by clinical educators/mentors. Formative and summative assessment data for each candidate are tracked throughout the clinical experiences. Target levels increase as candidates progress through Practicum I, Practicum II, and Internship. SOE faculty are able to track the developing effectiveness and positive impact candidates are having on all of
their P-12 students' learning and development. Candidates create an integrated unit of study (edTPA Task 1), teach the unit using differentiated lessons for their particular students (edTPA Task 2) and assess their impact on student learning by providing student work samples (edTPA Task 3). The 6Assessment Report, pp. 28-34, indicates candidates are scoring at the Target level. During Internship, if a candidate does not meet target, a backup reviewer scores the assignments to ensure accuracy. The SOE and its partners have made significant positive changes in the programs over the past three years (3Assessment Manual pp. 6-12). Evidence in the following documents demonstrate the level of interaction between the SOE and its partners: 23Minutes, 25Faculty Retreat, 35Partnership Document, and 36At Risk Table 37Plan of Action. A major change recommended by the school partners was revising the lesson plan. Additionally, partners had input into creating the 38Strategic Plan and 39Recruitment and Retention Plan. Other changes include implementation of the Danielson FFT and edTPA Portfolio, which provide partnership opportunities for faculty, candidates, university supervisors, and clinical educators/mentors. Establishment of three PDS sites in two districts was a monumental change, which culminated from shared vision and collaborative partnerships. As noted by the evidence submitted, it is obvious the SOE seeks partnerships to prepare effective educators.

### Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity

**i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)**

1. 1Unit Alignment

2. 2CAEP Alignment

3. 3Assessment Manual

4. 4Minutes

5. 5Assessment Report

6. 6Candidate Manual

7. 7Licensure Exams

8. 8EPP Reports

9. 9GPA and ACT Table

10. 10Non-Academic Requirements

11. 11Recruitment and Retention Plan

12. 12Standard 1 Tables
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16 Required Courses Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>17 At Risk Candidates Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18 Field Experience Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20 SWOT Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Sets selective admission requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>28 Disposition Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>29 Disposition Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>32 Licensure Regs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>33 Standard 2 Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>35 Partnership Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>38 Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>39 Recruitment and Retention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>40 To Become a Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Sets selective admission requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>41 Demographics Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>42 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>43 Recruitment Retention and Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>44 Faculty Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>45 Diversity Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UA Fort Smith (UAFS) School of Education (SOE) faculty recognize the importance of recruiting high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations and supporting them to completion. In 2016, 40To Become a Teacher rated UAFS SOE as the second best EPP in Arkansas. Its Expense Score was 10, Acceptance Rate 7, and ROI/Value 10, with 10 being the highest rating in each area. However, the SOE also recognizes challenges in this area. The most current demographic data for Fort Smith indicate 63.2% of the residents are White, 17% are Hispanic, and 8.5% are African-American (http://www.arkansas-demographics.com/fort-smith-demographics). Table 4 in 33Standard 2 Tables identify the racial makeup of the School of Education (SOE) partner schools. 41Demographics Table provides a snapshot of the UAFS student population, the SOE enrollees, the Arkansas (AR) EPP enrollees, UAFS SOE faculty, AR teachers, AR students, and the general population in Fort Smith. As noted in the table, there are differences between the demographic makeup of the SOE teacher candidates and the general population. The challenge has been discussed in faculty and TEC meetings (42Minutes) and steps have been taken to recruit a more diverse student population.

As noted in 43Recruitment, Retention, and Partnerships, a brief summary document of many of the SOE initiatives, the faculty have taken a proactive approach. The SOE faculty have sought partnerships and collaborations that will lead to recruiting quality candidates into the teaching profession, as outlined in the document and presented in this narrative. They have actively participated in high school college fairs, recruitment events, and local school committees, SOE events for high school students,
partnerships, alumni events, and Advancement Council activities. The SOE has been responsive to the needs of its partner schools in regards to preparing teachers to work with diverse K-12 students. As noted in the minutes and the document referenced above, the SOE has worked with its partner schools to create a Special Education Resource Teacher endorsement to meet the shortage of qualified teachers who work with the diverse student population. Additionally, the SOE has partnered with the Western Arkansas Technology Center (WATC) to provide area high school juniors and seniors with the unique opportunity to earn college credit and/or credentials in Early Childhood Education while still in high school (http://academics.uafs.edu/watc/early-childhood-education). Another partnership is with the Educational Renewal Zone (ERZ), located on the UAFS campus (https://education.uafs.edu/education-renewal-zone/erz-home-page). ERZ provides multiple opportunities for SOE faculty to collaborate with K-12 partners. Each collaboration provides the SOE an opportunity to recruit future teachers.

Retention is another challenge in teacher preparation. The SOE has policies and procedures in place to identify candidates who may be at-risk and to provide resources to help them be successful (7Candidate Manual). Additionally, resources are available to enhance the educational opportunities for SOE pre-service teachers. The Babb Center for Student Professional Development (CSPD) provides education majors multiple opportunities to hone their professional skills (http://academics.uafs.edu/CSPD/babb-center-student-professional-development-home). The CSPD offers a variety of services connecting students with employers, thereby supplying local and regional employers with highly valued professional employment candidates. The CSPD hosts trainings and mixers for SOE pre-service teachers (43Recruitment, Retention, and Partnerships). These efforts provide another avenue to retain pre-service teachers by providing the supports they need to succeed. It also provides an opportunity to meet the employment needs of the public school partners. Another partnership is with the STEM Education Center, located on the UAFS campus (https://education.uafs.edu/education/uafs-stem-education-center). Math and Science Specialists provide professional development in science, technology, engineering and mathematics content for Arkansas pre-service and certified teachers, as well as technology trainings for the UAFS faculty. SOE faculty and pre-service teachers utilize the resource center and the expertise of the specialists (43Recruitment, Retention, and Partnerships).

Another aspect of recruitment is ensuring SOE pre-service teachers are prepared to teach a diverse population. Their role in recruitment is vital because they represent the teaching profession to the K-12 students they teach as they provide a quality education that will prepare them to be productive citizens. An adjunct faculty member conducted a qualitative research study using UAFS early childhood education pre-service teachers (22Lehman's Study). The study's focus was the gap between the increased cultural diversity of students and the level of competence of UAFS early childhood education pre-service teachers. She reported her findings to the faculty (42Minutes). The research provided ideas and strategies for program improvement. The faculty also recognize the importance of having a diverse faculty and efforts have been made to recruit a more diverse SOE faculty. Recruitment efforts have increased the diversity to approximately 46% diverse; however, gender diversity is still a challenge (44Faculty Database). In order to have diverse, high-quality candidates in the future, we must be able to provide engaging, educational opportunities for the diverse students in our P-12 public schools. Diversity is woven throughout the program (1Unit Alignment, 12Standard 1 Tables, 16Required Courses Chart, 18Field Experiences Tables) with a checkpoint at Gate 4. All candidates complete a 45Diversity Case Study (46Diversity Rubric). The assessment has been in place for several years and has provided faculty consistent data (6Assessment Report, p. 16).

In Spring 2016, the SOE faculty created both a 38Strategic Plan and a 39Recruitment and Retention Plan. The 38Strategic Plan is based on the UAFS Academic Affairs Goals. The 39Recruitment and Retention Plan outlines specific objectives, with a timeline, to recruit and retain a diverse student population. Several initiatives have already been implemented, as noted in the plan.

UAFS SOE admission requirements are outlined in the 7Candidate Manual. 11Non-Academic
Requirements provides a summary of additional requirements. Copies of admission forms are provided in the 7Candidate Manual, pp. 54-65. Candidates are given the 7Candidate Manual and a packet containing all admission forms when they take Introduction to Education, the first education course in the Teacher Education Program (TEP). The requirements for unconditional admission to the undergraduate teacher education program are outlined in the 7Candidate Manual, p. 38. Typically, candidates are admitted to the TEP during their sophomore year. 10GPA and ACT Table reports the cumulative GPA mean for the SOE candidates upon admission to (TEP) for Spring 2013-Spring 2016. The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) 32Licensure Regs require a 2.70 GPA (on a 4.0 scale), which is below the UAIF SOE requirement of 2.75 GPA. SOE candidates' mean GPA scores for all seven cohorts are above CAEP's 3.0 GPA requirement. A further analysis of the table indicates all discipline area cohorts consistently met the CAEP 3.0 GPA requirement. The SOE Composite ACT Mean scores upon admission to the TEP from spring 2013-Spring 2016 are reported by discipline level and SOE totals. As noted in the discipline cohort scores, the scores range from 18-30. The total mean scores range from 22-25 for the seven cohorts. To determine the percentile ranking, the SOE used the 47ACT Scoring Scale. The scoring guide was used to determine the percentile rankings for the SOE Spring 2013 to spring 2016 candidates. The percentiles are reported by discipline area means. As noted in the table, the cohorts scored well above the 50th percentile. Based on the GPA data and the ACT data, it is apparent the UAIF SOE is recruiting capable candidates into the programs.

Candidates must also complete an interview for admission into the TEP. Admission interviews are held each fall and spring. Candidates are interviewed by faculty and public school partner representatives and scored using a rubric (48Interview Questions and 49Interview Rubric). The results are kept in LiveText and reported in the 6Assessment Report, p. 4. Candidates may be admitted with conditions if an area of concern is identified; thereby, allowing the faculty to provide support and/or resources to assist the candidate. Candidates must pass the Praxis Core assessments (or required ACT scores) for admission into the TEP. SOE monitors its candidates as they progress through the program using both academic and academic measures. Requirements for Retention in the TEP are listed on p. 38 of the 7Candidate Manual.

Dr. Lance Tomei, an educational consultant, was hired in fall 2014 to conduct a SWOT analysis of the SOE Quality Assurance System (20SWOT Analysis). Based on the SWOT report, SOE faculty and partners attended a Faculty Retreat in June 2015 and revisited the assessment system and rubrics. The 7Candidate Manual and 3Assessment Manual outline the gates and process for tracking candidates throughout the program. Candidates are assessed by the faculty, university supervisors, and clinical practice supervisors each semester in education courses and field placements using the 50Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT), and the 29Disposition Assessment (7Candidate Manual, pp. 26-30), edTPA assignments, and other unit assessments, both academic and non-academic. The data are used to identify candidates who are not meeting target on unit assessments.

The 51ADE Policies Governing Programs for Educator Licensure offered by institutions of higher education require candidates who apply for a teaching license to have an appropriate disposition for teaching (32Licensure Regs). A major non-academic assessment is the Disposition Assessment, which begins with the Introduction to Education and continues throughout the program. SOE faculty and partners invested time and effort to research appropriate teacher dispositions and create the rubrics to appropriately assess them (28Disposition Minutes). Candidates are tracked by number of reports and level of proficiency each semester. Appropriate action is taken, based on the process outlined in the Teacher Candidate Manual. The revised process has been in place for two years and has produced positive results. As noted in the 7Candidate Manual pp. 66-72, the tracking system provides the SOE an opportunity to intervene with candidates who are not reflecting professional dispositions. The 17At Risk Candidates Summary provides a summary of academic and non-academic appeals and/or plans of action. The retention of SOE admitted candidates who completed their program of study from 2012-2016 is approximately 75%. The number of dispositional plans-of-action have increased due to the tracking
system. Dispositions are also assessed using Danielson's Framework (FFT), which are aligned with InTASC (1Unit Alignment). Candidates are assessed by faculty, clinical practice supervisors, and university supervisors throughout the program using the Danielson FFT. Progression data from Practicum I through Internship are found on pp. 47-55 of the 6Assessment Report. Faculty have found candidates who are identified as at-risk on the Disposition Assessment also have difficulty in Danielson FFT Domain 4 - Professionalism. The Coordinator of Teacher Licensure and Field Experiences conducts a one-to-one Internship Interview prior to placement and any dispositional issues are discussed and must be resolved before Internship. The interview also assesses the candidate's dispositions (6Assessment Report p. 35) and candidates complete a self-assessment (6Assessment Report pp. 7-11).

Diversity is interwoven throughout the Disposition Assessment and the FFT assessment (1Unit Alignment). Another assessment used to address Diversity is the 46Diversity Rubric (6Assessment Report, p. 16). Additionally, candidates complete the edTPA Portfolio, which has a diversity component in Task One (6Assessment Report pp. 28-34). The SOE has several admission into Internship requirements, including passing scores on both 8Licensure Exams (6Assessment Report, p. 46 and 7Candidate Manual, pp. 42-43). As outlined in this narrative and in the evidence provided, multiple academic and non-academic assessments are used throughout the program to assess knowledge, skills, and disposition.

The SOE Quality Assurance System provides an efficient and effective means to gather data to monitor applicants and candidates as they progress through the program. Banner and LiveText are used to house the data. Data are disseminated to faculty, public school partners and the general public through several avenues. The following annual reports are used to monitor candidates and the TEP: SOE 6Assessment Report, ADE 9EPP Reports, 52CAEP Annual Reports. 53Title II Reports, and 54PEDS Reports. Program and assessment changes are made as needed, based on the data. For example, the admission process was revised in 2014 to gather GPA and ACT data. Each year, SOE reports its progress toward meeting annual goals in the preparation of Math, Science, and Special Education, and Limited English Proficient educators in the Title II reports (9EPP Reports, 52CAEP Annual Reports, 53Title II Reports).

The SOE added a special education endorsement in response to the critical need for special education teachers. SOE is receptive to the needs of its school partners in western Arkansas and eastern Oklahoma (35Partner Map). Public school administrators serve on TEC, TCSC, Principal Roundtable, Admission Interviews, and other SOE committees. Likewise, SOE faculty serve on various public school committees. The SOE, ERZ, and STEM Education work together to create recruitment and retention opportunities. Adopt-A-Professor, recruitment fairs, grants, and other partnerships have been valuable in increasing the number of candidates in science and mathematics education. Additionally, the SOE and Arkansas public schools use the same assessment instrument, Danielson FFT. Faculty were trained in Danielson FFT and edTPA Local Evaluation in fall 2014 and recalibrated during 2015-2016. Inter-rater reliability activities have been conducted each semester. Sample edTPA portfolios have been submitted for external evaluation to establish inter-rater reliability. (55QAS Report).

Non-academic measures are also used to monitor candidate performance. Disposition data have enabled the SOE to identify candidates who are at-risk and take appropriate measures. The revised Disposition Assessment has been administered for five semesters and has been consistent with other metrics in identifying candidates who have demonstrated deficiencies and/or concerns.

The 6Assessment Report provides four years of data, from admissions through completion. Using multiple formative and summative measures, both academic and non-academic, candidates' content knowledge, skills, and dispositions are assessed and monitored throughout the program. Candidates must successfully pass Praxis Specialty assessments and the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) for admission into Internship. Therefore, candidates must demonstrate expertise in the discipline. Candidates are evaluated using the FFT multiple times throughout their preparation, both formatively
and summatively. The target level of performance is scaffolded from Practicum I, Practicum II and Internship, allowing for growth in their teaching skills. Candidates complete an edTPA portfolio which includes creating, teaching, and assessing a unit of study. They must be able to provide evidence of a positive impact on student learning. Candidates have multiple opportunities to understand the expectations of the profession, beginning with the Introduction to Education courses. Professionalism is addressed in multiple classes, demonstrated in field experiences, and assessed in multiple ways (2CAEPAlignment), particularly FFT Domain 4. All candidates complete a course in special education and educational technology. Diversity and Technology are addressed and assessed in core and education courses, as noted in documents 12Standard 1 Tables, 16Required Courses Chart, and 18Field Experiences Table. All ADE licensure requirements must be met before candidates are recommended for licensure. Trainings are conducted during the Seminar class for Teen Suicide Prevention, Child Maltreatment, Code of Ethics for Arkansas Educators, Parental Involvement, Dyslexia Awareness, Child Maltreatment, and TESS (Danielson FFT).

Based on the evidence documented, it is apparent SOE recruits and supports high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations. Although the admitted pool of candidates does not reflect the diversity of the P-12 students in its partnership schools, the SOE is making focused and strategic efforts to reach out to the underserved populations and recruit viable candidates who can represent those populations and serve as role models for future teachers. Poverty is a reality for many of the UAFS SOE candidates from all populations, therefore; faculty are cognizant of the challenges they face and they make efforts to assist them, and all candidates, in fulfilling their professional goals.

### Standard 4: Program Impact

1. **Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)**

1. **1Unit Alignment**
2. **2Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys**
3. **3Assessment Report**
4. **4Completer impact on student growth and learning**
5. **5Candidate Manual**
6. **6EPP Reports**
7. **7At Risk Candidates Summary**
8. **8Disposition Minutes**
9. **9Danielson Framework for Teaching**
10. **10Employer satisfaction**
11. **11IRB Case Study**
12. **12Alumni Panel Focus Groups**
4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys

10  58Pilot Group

4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys

11  59Guy Fenter Educational Cooperative Partnership

4.3 Employer satisfaction

12  60Informed Consent

4.3 Employer satisfaction

13  61Impact on Student Learning Pilot Study

4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys

14  62IRB Approval

4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning

15  63Employer Survey

4.3 Employer satisfaction

16  64Intern Exit Interview

4.4 Completer satisfaction

17  65Graduate Surveys

4.4 Completer satisfaction

*ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met*

The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) does not collect, disaggregate, or disseminate data specific to individual teachers within a school district making it difficult for Education Preparation Providers (EPPs) to gather data based on completers' contributions to student learning growth, such as value-added modeling (VAM) or student growth percentiles tied to individual teachers [completers of University of Arkansas - Fort Smith (UAFS) School of Education (SOE) program]. Consequently, in order to provide evidence of completers' teaching effectiveness and positive impact on student learning, the SOE has chosen to collect a variety of evidence supplied by completers to show how they have impacted students' learning within their classrooms. Examples of multiple measures are completers' Teacher Excellence Support System (TESS) annual evaluations, survey data from principals and completers, and an analysis of the evidence completers submit to demonstrate improvement in academic achievement of their students. The last measure of completers' evidence of students' growth will be gathered by way of voluntary participation in collaborative cohorts facilitated online. Data measuring student academic growth related to the Arkansas State Standards will be exchanged for SOE faculty support. The exchange of individual completer's student data for SOE faculty support will be the topic of an IRB-approved case study designed to collect and analyze evidence of completers' teaching effectiveness over a three-year period.

As noted earlier, EPPs in Arkansas do not have access from the ADE regarding completers' impact on P-12 student learning. Consequently, the SOE uses the Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT) assessment to evaluate teacher effectiveness. The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) requires all teachers in Arkansas to be trained in the FFT, and it is used as the teacher evaluation instrument in the public schools (TESS). 50Danielson's Framework for Teaching is a proprietary assessment and has been determined to be reliable and valid. The SOE uses the Danielson assessment to formatively and summatively assess candidates at three levels of pre-service clinical experiences: Practicum I, Practicum
Data specific to each pre-service teacher's impact on student learning are collected in LiveText and reported in the annual Assessment Report, pp. 22-23; 47-55. Specific criteria relevant to each teacher's impact on student learning is found in 1f, Designing Student Assessment; 3a, Communicating with Students; 3b, Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques; 3c, Engaging Students in Learning; 3d, Using Assessment in Instruction; and 4a, Reflecting on Teaching. The SOE has limited data from completers (Assessment Report, pp. 57-61).

The SOE approved 56IRB Case Study requests that participants share their TESS evaluations completed by building principals. Although the ADE requires school districts to collect TESS evaluation data on all Arkansas teachers, the department does not collect or share the data on individual teachers with EPPs. The Case Study was formulated using the following steps: conducted a focus group of alumni to identify what school partners require from teachers to demonstrate their impact on student learning (Alumni Panel Focus Groups); contacted graduates and asked if they would be willing to share their annual TESS evaluation scores (Pilot Group); submitted a proposal to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval to conduct a three-year case study of SOE graduates to determine their impact on student learning; partnered with the 59Guy Fenter Educational Cooperative Partnership to offer professional development for graduates in the case study; and, requested the 2016 interns to participate (Informed Consent, Impact on Student Learning Pilot Study). The SOE received approval from the IRB to complete a case study involving completers within their first three years of teaching (IRB Approval).

The first of three planned focus groups was recruited from the spring 2016 graduating class. Approximately 40 graduates volunteered to participate in the study which will follow them through their first three years of teaching. A new cohort will be recruited each academic year, allowing the SOE to gather data specifically related to the impact each completer has on student learning within his or her classroom. It is expected that completers will provide many different forms of alternative, authentic, formative and summative assessments in order to document their impact on student learning. Based on the feedback received, the SOE will phase in standardized assessments developed by a collaboration among completers and faculty members. For example, student surveys, course projects, end of course exams, standardized developmental reading/math assessments, and/or standardized exams might be used as evidence of completers' impact on student learning. This case study provides a means by which the SOE can collect the TESS data from completers and in return provide opportunities for collaboration among completers, university faculty, and K-12 partners.

Since UAFS is located on the border of Arkansas and Oklahoma, many graduates find employment in Oklahoma where teacher effectiveness evaluations are not standardized. However, the criteria used in surrounding school districts are often based on research (Marzano, 2012) similar to Charlotte Danielson's FFT and can be directly aligned to the TESS evaluation form used by Arkansas and the SOE at UAFS. In addition to the observation evaluations, pre-service teacher candidates are evaluated on their effectiveness in impacting student learning using data collected from edTPA Task 2: Instruction completed as a formative assessment in Practicum II and as a summative assessment during Internship and in Task 3: Assessment in an assessment course (formative assessment) prior to Internship and again during Internship (summative) when candidates are required to complete edTPA Portfolio Tasks (1: Planning, 2: Instruction, 3: Assessment). Task 2 asks teacher candidates to demonstrate their abilities to create a safe and respectful learning environment, engage students in learning, deepen student learning, facilitate students' analysis of content, and to reflect on and analyze their own teaching effectiveness in order to improve pedagogically. The edTPA Task 3 asks teacher candidates to analyze student learning, provide feedback to guide learning, observe students' use of feedback, analyze students' use of academic vocabulary and use assessment to inform instruction. Feedback from this assessment provides quantitative data (edTPA Assessment Report pp. 28-34) which can be analyzed by the SOE to determine how effectively candidates are impacting their students' learning and to affect changes in the program in areas in need of improvement.

The UAFS SOE identified seven professional dispositions and developed rubrics by which candidates
are evaluated each semester by all faculty teaching education courses (6Assessment Report, pp. 24-27; 7Candidate Manual pp. 26-30; 28Disposition Minutes). The dispositions: collaboration, reflection, integrity, learning initiative, responsibility, respect and diversity are emphasized at the beginning of each course and are aligned with the FFT assessment (1Unit Alignment). Analysis of the pre-service teacher candidate data allow faculty to address growth areas needed by individual teacher candidates and to create Plans of Action to facilitate the candidates' successful completion of the program (7Candidate Manual pp. 66-72; 17At Risk Candidates Summary). The alignment with FFT also allows the SOE to measure whether completers are effectively applying the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. Analysis of the TESS evaluation data received from completers allows the SOE to measure the degree to which they are applying the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in practice. The 58Pilot Group data provided a positive snapshot of graduates' level effectiveness.

As noted earlier, the SOE sends building principals an employer survey at the end of UAFS Teacher Education Program completers' induction year (6Assessment Report, Employer Survey pp. 40-44 and Graduates' Impact on Student Learning Data, pp. 58-62). Principals are asked to evaluate how well each novice teacher was prepared to complete assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students (63Employer Survey). The highly specific survey questions align with the SOE's Intended Candidate Outcomes (ICOs - InTASC Standards), Danielson's FFT, and the edTPA Portfolio. Data collected from these surveys are interpreted and analyzed collaboratively by the faculty and used to identify trends emerging over time that highlight program strengths and detect weaknesses. Based on the resulting faculty recommendations made from evidence provided by the surveys, program changes are made in curriculum and instruction.

In addition to the Employer Survey, the approved 56IRB Case Study encourages participants to report any employment milestones, such as being promoted and/or retained, earning advanced degrees, serving in leadership roles, and volunteering within the community, all of which contribute to employers' confidence in their professional competencies. Although the Case Study is designed to collect data on completers during their first three years of teaching, the SOE will also encourage them to plan a career trajectory that might include becoming National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). The SOE also collects data from its program completers regarding their professional preparation at UAFS. The SOE administers the 64Intern Exit Interview (6Assessment Report, p. 38) to collect evidence that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to their responsibilities as effective P-12 educators. The data gathered in the survey indicate current graduates' perceived levels of satisfaction with their preparation. In addition to the current intern graduate surveys, the SOE also sends 65Graduate Surveys to alumni who have completed one year of teaching and again to those who have completed three years of teaching (6Assessment Report, pp. 40-44). Another source of data used to determine completers' satisfaction with their preparation is the 9EPP Reports which includes the results of a survey administered online by ADE, asking teachers to evaluate their education preparation programs. The data are collected by the ADE, and the item analysis shows how UAFS SOE graduates' responses compare and contrast with the state averages (6Assessment Report, pp. 57-58 and 9EPP Reports). Using the data allows SOE faculty to measure their effectiveness in relation to other EPPs in Arkansas. For example, in the 2014-2015 data, UAFS SOE novice teachers scored higher than the state average in all criteria. The data indicate UAFS-prepared novice teachers' high degree of satisfaction with their teacher preparedness. The ADE Novice Survey questions align with the SOE's ICOs (InTASC Standards) and Danielson's FFT.

The final source of evidence that completers consider their preparation relevant to the responsibilities they encounter teaching P-12 students and that their preparation was effective will be collected during the IRB approved Case Study. The cohort of participants in the study will report employment milestones, such as being promoted and/or retained, earning advanced degrees, serving in leadership roles, and volunteering within the community and how their teacher preparation program directly contributed to their professional growth. The qualitative feedback from the case study participants will be analyzed by faculty to determine necessary program improvements. Conclusions supported by the data will drive program changes.
i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | 1Unit Alignment
| 2 | 2CAEP Alignment
| 3 | 3Assessment Manual
| 4 | 4Minutes
| 5 | 5ADE Competencies
| 6 | 6Assessment Report
| 7 | 7Candidate Manual
| 8 | 9EPP Reports
| 9 | 17At Risk Candidates Summary
| 10 | 19Lesson Plan
| 11 | 20SWOT Analysis
| 12 | 25Faculty Retreat
| 13 | 29Disposition Assessment
| 14 | 30Disposition Rubric
| 15 | 40To Become a Teacher
| 16 | 43Recruitment Retention and Partnerships
| 17 | 55QAS Report

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
The UA Fort Smith (UAFS) School of Education (SOE) Quality Assurance System (QAS) is an ongoing process that uses multiple, comprehensive, and integrated assessment measures to evaluate the achievement of the SOE mission and goals. In developing the system, university faculty, staff, and the Pre K-12 community integrated ideas from their professional backgrounds. The QAS provides data for use in decision making to determine applicant qualifications; interpret aggregated data to monitor, evaluate, and improve instructional programs; ensure and maintain the quality of candidates and graduate performance; and manage and improve unit operations. The QAS monitors candidates as they progress through their approved programs. Both academic and non-academic data related to candidate and graduate performance are utilized in making needed changes in all aspects of the teacher preparation program. Candidates are expected to demonstrate competency in all ten InTASC Standards (ICOs). The QAS is represented by a series of gates or benchmarks that must be cleared by candidates as they move through the program. By successfully meeting the requirements at each gate, candidates meet designated standards and complete their programs. At each of those gates, data are collected by multiple evaluators and multiple modes of assessment and instrumentation. Candidates meet the program exit criteria and enter a continuous learning process. Professional, state, and institutional standards and multiple assessment measures provide the support for the process and provide multiple assessment measures which provide continual feedback data for analysis at each level (1Unit Alignment, 2CAEP Alignment, 66Conceptual Framework). A detailed discussion of the validity and reliability of the instruments used in program assessment can be found in 55QAS Report. Tables in 3Assessment Manual illustrate the decision points in the teacher education program.

Data are compiled and formally reported by the Assessment Coordinator to faculty and administrators semi-annually. 67Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Reports, provide additional data for
program improvement. Faculty and administrators make recommendations to the Executive Director regarding program changes based upon their analysis of the data. The Teacher Education Council (TEC) analyzes the data semi-annually and makes formal recommendations to the Executive Director. Unit assessment data, both academic and non-academic, are collected throughout the year and housed in Banner, Argos, and/or LiveText. The Administrative Analyst collects the assessment data and submits aggregated reports to the Assessment Coordinator. Title II, Praxis, Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) reports, and other external data are also collected by SOE administrative personnel and reported to stakeholders. The Assessment Coordinator compiles the data, creates a semester report by cohort, and presents it to the Education Coordinators' Council (ECC) and the SOE faculty, where it is analyzed for unit and program improvements. The Assessment Coordinator meets with the ELEM, MLED and Secondary Coordinators and faculty of each program area to review the data. The Assessment Coordinator documents the strengths and weaknesses of the program, in addition to the plans for improvement, and presents a summary to the ECC, SOE and TEC each fall. The Assessment Coordinator also creates the 6Assessment Report and presents it to the TEC each fall. The annual 6Assessment Report and all related data are posted on the SOE website. Finally, the QAS is reviewed each spring by ECC, SOE and TEC. Any changes are noted by the Assessment Coordinator, and the 3Assessment Manual (pp. 6-12) is updated to reflect the changes. The updated Assessment Manual and the annual Assessment Report are presented to the TEC each fall (68Minutes). The cycle continues as demonstrated in the 69CAEP 5.1 Assessment Loop.

The QAS provides a structure for collecting data that are relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable. The QAS has been revised when deemed appropriate and necessary by the stakeholders, as noted in the timeline (3Assessment Manual pp. 6-10). However, the SOE Intended Candidate Outcomes (ICOs) have not changed. The ICOs are assessed by using multiple assessments throughout the program. Both formative and summative assessments are used systematically to assess the performance of its candidates against the goals and relevant standards.

The QAS is based on seven gates to track candidate performance. Gate One is the University General Admission Assessment. Information generated from these measures is used in determining candidate course selection, overall candidate advisement, and curriculum design. Gate Two is the pre-professional assessment that provides faculty an opportunity to complete an assessment of candidate ability prior to formal admission to the teacher education program. Information generated from the assessment criteria in this gate is used to monitor the effectiveness of the general education curriculum, advise candidates who may need additional assistance, and monitor enrollment. Gate Three is admission into the Teacher Education Program (TEP). Candidates must successfully meet admission requirements before enrolling in most professional education coursework in the early childhood, middle childhood, and secondary programs. Multiple, performance-based measures are used, including appropriate Praxis Core scores in reading, writing, and mathematics and a satisfactory admission interview scored with a rubric. In addition, candidates must have a cumulative GPA of 2.75 and a grade of "C" or better in all courses in the degree plan. Information generated from these measures is used to make admission decisions, provide needed assistance to candidates, and to guide the program change process.

Candidate performance is monitored between the time of admission to the teacher education program and admission to the internship/student teaching semester during Gate Four. Candidates must maintain a cumulative 2.75 grade point average during this interim period as well as earn satisfactory ratings on the 29Disposition Assessment (7Candidate Manual pp. 26-30), score satisfactorily on a 30Diversity Rubric, and score at target on all unit assessments. Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT) and edTPA are used formatively during Gate Four. Both proprietary assessments are aligned with InTASC, which are the SOE ICOs (1Unit Alignment and 2CAEP Alignment). Data generated from both assessments are used to assist and support candidates who are having difficulty in coursework or in clinical experiences. Gate Five is Admission to Internship. Prior to beginning this capstone experience, candidates must have maintained a 2.75 cumulative GPA. Candidates must have completed all required coursework for their degree with a minimum grade of "C", earned satisfactory Disposition Assessment scores, scored at target on all unit assessments, successfully completed the Internship Admission Interview, successfully completed the appropriate Praxis II Specialty Area and Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT)
exams, and successfully completed an Arkansas FBI Background and Child Maltreatment check. Results provide information for decisions regarding candidates' readiness to begin teaching with supervision as well as professional development needs. Gate Six is the Internship Assessment. Candidates are assessed summatively during Internship by the University Supervisor and mentor teacher using the FFT rubrics and the edTPA rubrics. The Disposition Assessment is used by both mentor teachers and university supervisors to evaluate candidate dispositions during Internship. In addition to successful completion of the internship, other exit requirements include completion of the teacher licensure application and all Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) required trainings, and satisfactory completion of all degree requirements reflected by official posting of the degree on the official transcript. Results of the internship assessments provide information regarding areas of strength and the need for future professional development for the candidate as well as feedback to the SOE, arts and sciences, and P-12 partner schools to determine needed program changes. Gate Seven is the post-graduate assessment. It involves information generated after program completion. Annually, the SOE submits Praxis information for each program completer to Title II, which is used by ADE for its annual 9EPP Reports. Other information is derived from follow-up studies of graduates at the time of graduation as well as after one and three years of employment and an employer survey completed after one and three years of service (6Assessment Report, pp. 40-44).

In the 70Accreditation Report 2010, UAFS SOE selected Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice as a target for Continuous Improvement. Since that time, tremendous progress has been made in that area. The EPP initiated a site-based Professional Development School (PDS) in spring 2013. The Van Buren School District and the SOE entered into a partnership agreement for a PDS at two sites, Central Elementary and Butterfield Middle School. In 2016, the SOE added another PDS site in the Fort Smith School District, ensuring all K-6 candidates will have a PDS experience during their educational preparation.

The SOE has made every effort to include its school partners in decisions concerning recruitment, admission, placements, candidate performance, and candidate retention in its programs through the TEC, which is comprised of SOE faculty and public school partners. The SOE held a Faculty Retreat in June, 2015. School partners, TEC members, and alumni were invited to attend. Those who attended reviewed external reports, assessment reports, curriculum, assessments, policies, programs, and intended candidate outcomes. The attendees provided valuable feedback for the SOE. Based on the feedback, changes were made in many areas (25Faculty Retreat). Several assessments and rubrics were revised. Policies and procedures were updated based on the feedback from the partners. The open forum, honest dialogue, and formative feedback strengthened the partnerships and provided feedback that led to program improvement. Based on feedback, the Coordinator of Teacher Licensure and Field Placements hosted several focus groups with school partners to revise the SOE Lesson Plan format. The new lesson plan was approved and implemented in fall 2015 (19Lesson Plan, 71Lesson Plan Minutes).

As noted in the 3Assessment Manual pp. 7-12, other significant changes have been made in the past two years based on the recommendations of an external evaluator (20SWOT Analysis, 25Faculty Retreat). Since FFT is a required ADE assessment for all teachers in the state and it has been crosswalked to the InTASC Standards, the SOE voted to use the FFT assessment rubrics to assess the candidates' performance against its goals and standards (ICOs). Prior to that time, the SOE ICOs, which are the InTASC Standards, had been assessed using an outdated checklist matrix. The SOE has been using the FFT rubrics to assess the candidates since fall 2014, but had not aligned its QAS to the rubrics. Another change was the adoption of the edTPA Portfolio to replace the SOE portfolio. UAFS SOE was the first institution in Arkansas to pilot the edTPA Portfolio. However, because the SOE faculty understood the economic challenges faced by many of their candidates, they were concerned with the cost. They recognized the value-added of the portfolio and during the 2015 Faculty Retreat the SOE and specialty area faculty voted to adopt edTPA. They also agreed to become local evaluators. The SOE Executive Director, an edTPA Local Evaluation Trainer, conducted face-to-face trainings in fall 2015 and inter-rater reliability activities in spring 2016. Faculty scored and selected the highest rated portfolios from different licensure programs to be externally evaluated (6Assessment Report pp. 28-34) The SOE paid for the external evaluation of the portfolios and will continue to do so in an effort to establish and retain
local evaluation inter-rater reliability. Although Arkansas does not provide impact on student learning data or teacher effectiveness data, the SOE has requested feedback from graduates and employers (6Assessment Report pp. 59-62). As noted in Standard 4, the SOE met with alumni to elicit information about the evidence they submit to demonstrate a positive impact on student learning and teacher effectiveness. SOE used the information from the pilot group to collect evidence from recent graduates (58Pilot Group). SOE faculty created a pilot Case Study to track graduates, beginning with spring 2015 graduates. The SOE also updated its graduate and employer survey in spring 2016 to include questions concerning impact on student learning and teacher effectiveness (6Assessment Report, pp. 40-44).

The ADE provides Educator Program Provider Reports annually, including comparison data (9EPP Reports). Assessment data, ADE reports and other data are reported to its stakeholders at various internal and external meetings, including Teacher Credential and Standards Committee (TCSC), and Education Renewal Zone (ERZ) Advisory Group meetings, STEM Education Advisory Committee Meetings and Superintendent's Meetings. Assessment reports, EPP reports and Annual Reports, which includes eight annual measures, are also posted on the SOE website (http://education.uafs.edu/). Data from the measures are collected, used, reported, and disseminated as noted in 72CAEP 5.4 Table. The SOE seeks input and feedback from multiple stakeholders. Examples include public school administrators, teachers, and alumni who serve on interview panels, admission committees, TEC, TCSC, trainings, faculty retreats, and committees. Likewise, the SOE faculty are involved in public school activities, committees, and functions. The SOE faculty and public school partners collaborate to identify areas of need or improvement, as noted in the addition of the special education endorsement and the revision of the SOE Lesson Plan. In 2016, 40To Become A Teacher rated UAFS SOE as the second best EPP in Arkansas. This was highlighted on the UAFS website and reported in the local paper. The retention rate of SOE admitted candidates from 2012-2016 is approximately 75% (17At Risk Candidate Summary). Based on the evidence provided in this report, it is apparent the QAS is operating in an effective and efficient manner; thereby, providing the SOE the data needed to collect, analyze, monitor, and report its candidates' proficiency on all CAEP Standards.

III. Cross-cutting themes

a. Statement of integration of diversity

*i. Analysis of evidence that demonstrates diversity integration

UAFFS School of Education provides multiple opportunities for candidates to interact with diverse populations. As noted throughout the 12Standard 1 Tables, diversity is integrated across all programs and assessed using multiple measures. Diversity is embedded in both Danielson FFT and edTPA, as demonstrated in the tables. Diversity is a School of Education Disposition and each candidate's disposition, including diversity, is tracked from the first education course through Internship. Diversity is defined as "Differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area." The dispositions, including Diversity, are aligned with the FFT and edTPA, as noted in 1Unit Assessments Alignment chart and assessed throughout the program. In depth data are reported in 6Assessment Report.

The university recognizes the need of all students to embrace diversity. The university expresses this in the Academic Catalog as a Student Learning Vision: "Graduates who embrace change, welcome diversity, and are enthusiastically engaged in lifelong learning and who have the ability and desire to transfer those skills to the workplace and the community." The university requires each program to address diversity (Global and Cultural Perspectives) in the coursework. As noted in Standard 2, all candidates complete a field experience in a diverse setting. In many cases, they experience diversity in multiple settings. Additionally, to demonstrate how diversity is addressed in the coursework and field
experiences, the SOE created tables for the Self-Study Report indicating those University Learning Outcomes (ULOs). The 16Required Courses Chart and the 18Field Experiences Tables provide overwhelming evidence diversity is addressed in coursework and clinical experiences.

All candidates complete a Diversity Case Study and the assessment data reflect this is an area below expectations. Also, a qualitative research study conducted by an adjunct faculty member (22Lehman Study) indicates candidates may need additional preparation in this area. Although all candidates complete field experiences in diverse schools and those experiences are linked to specific objectives in the coursework, as noted in the 18Field Experiences Tables, faculty recognize the need additional preparation in the area of diversity. Therefore, the faculty included another diversity course in the new K-6 program of study. Additionally, a unit of study on assistive technology has been added to the Educational Technology course.

In Standard Three, the SOE provided evidence of its efforts to recruit, support, retain, and graduate candidates who are diverse. The SOE recognizes the importance of preparing teachers to not only teach diverse students, but also serve as roles for diversity. Several initiatives were outlined in the 43Recruitment, Retention, and Partnerships document. The partnerships provide opportunities for the SOE candidates to interact with diversity in various settings, to respect and apply multiple perspectives, to recognize their own bias, and to grow professionally. Additionally, the support systems enable the SOE to identify struggling candidates and to provide the resources they need to be successful. The SOE implemented a 38Strategic Plan and a 39Recruitment and Retention Plan in 2016. Both documents address diversity as it relates to candidates and faculty.

Standard Five outlines the QAS and how it operates. As noted earlier, FFT and edTPA have Diversity components that are aligned with InTASC, the SOE's Intended Candidate Outcomes (ICOs). Assessment data are reported in the 6Assessment Report. Standard Five outlines the use of the Disposition Assessment data to identify at-risk candidates and provide the support they need to be successful.

Poverty is a primary concern in the geographical area and faculty are cognizant of the importance of understanding the needs of first-generation college students from all cultural backgrounds.

b. Statement of integration of technology

*i. Analysis of evidence that demonstrates technology integration

UAFS School of Education provides multiple opportunities for candidates to use technology. As noted in the 12Standard 1Tables, technology is addressed throughout the program of study. By using the 2CAEP Alignment crosswalk table, the SOE documented the criteria that included an alignment with specific CAEP Standard One components/FFT/edTPA. Data are found in 6Assessment Report. All candidates complete a course in educational technology. The course objectives are aligned with ISTE Standards. Candidates explore various types of instructional technology, research a technology tool, and present it to the class. A new course objective beginning fall 2016 is the inclusion of a unit on assistive technology. The university requires each program to address technology in its coursework. To demonstrate how technology is addressed in the coursework and field experiences, the SOE created tables for the Self-Study Report indicating those University Learning Outcomes (ULOs). 16Required Courses Chart and 18Field Experiences Tables provide evidence of how technology is addressed in coursework and clinical experiences. Also noted in Standard One, Novice Teacher Surveys indicate SOE graduates are well-prepared in all areas and Employer Surveys indicate the graduates have a positive impact on student learning (6Assessment Report, 57-58 and 40-44). FFT Components 1a, 2a, 3a, b, c, e and the Lesson Planning data found in 12Standard 1Tables (pp. 10-12) provide evidence SOE candidates are meeting target in the use of technology, a required component for the lesson plans.
(19Lesson Plan). Candidates videotape themselves teaching the lesson they created for edTPA Task 1 during Practicum I. They hone those skills in Practicum II as they complete edTPA Tasks I and 2. During Internship they complete all three edTPA portfolio tasks, which include other videotaped lessons. One specific assessment that requires candidates to explain their use of technology in lesson planning is found on Table 6 in the Assessment Report. The selected Lesson Plan component data are reported in 12Standard 1 Tables (p. 12). Additionally, the Assessment Report provides data from the Novice Teacher Survey. SOE graduates rated themselves as well-prepared in the use instructional technology, which is above the ADE mean. Although the Assessment Report (p. 35) indicates candidates demonstrate knowledge of effective teaching techniques and how to utilize technology (criteria 3, 11), faculty plan to include a unit on assistive technology in the technology course.

As noted in Standard Four, the SOE has entered into a partnership with the Guy Fenter Educational Service Cooperative. The partnership will enable interns to access professional development trainings (usually only offered to licensed teachers) at the cooperative, including trainings in educational technology. Additionally, candidates have opportunities to use technology at the partner school sites (34Partnership Map) and at the 31PDS Partnership.

Based on 16Required Courses Chart, 18Field Experiences, and the FFT and edTPA assignments and scores, it is apparent the UAFS SOE candidates have multiple opportunities to explore and utilize technology in various settings. Each opportunity enables them to hone their skills in the use of technology.

A candidate work sample has been provided in the evidence folder for the reviewer. The work sample is an edTPA Portfolio submission that demonstrates the SOE’s expectations for all candidates, including proficiency in the use of technology. The video could not be loaded into AIMS; therefore, candidate work samples and videos will be available for the team visitors.

IV. Areas for Improvement (AFIs) from previous accreditation decisions, if any

a. Statement of progress in support of removing the AFI(s)

N/A

b. Overview of evidence in support of removing the AFI(s)

No Evidence found.

c. Holistic summary statement (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that provides a narrative explication for how the evidence collection, taken as a whole, demonstrates that area(s) for improvement are corrected.

N/A

V. Selected Improvement Plan

a. Provide a description of the selected area for improvement and a rationale for selection.

The School of Education (SOE) faculty, Teacher Education Council members, and teacher candidates currently enrolled in the program participated in the Faculty Retreat on August 10, 2016, to review the CAEP report and unit assessment data. They identified areas in need of improvement based on the data. In CAEP Standard I, they noted the candidates scored lowest in Danielson's Framework for Teaching (FFT) Domain 4c - Communication with Families. The candidates who attended confirmed they felt under-prepared in this area. Additionally, they discussed a weakness in research opportunities for
candidates. Faculty serve as advisors to candidates who complete research projects for the annual UAFS Research Symposium, and this participation has been very beneficial for those candidates. Some faculty members also advise honors students who complete in-depth research in specific content areas. In response to candidates' expressed need for more collaboration and support in learning academic research writing skills, the SOE faculty planned and developed a new independent study course for educational research, which was implemented in 2016. Although some programs in the SOE offer in-depth research projects, they are not unit-wide. Therefore, the faculty reached a consensus to connect the two areas (Communication with Families and Research Writing) in the Selected Improvement Plan.

*b. Identify goals and objectives aligned with the selected area for improvement
See attachment.

*c. Describe the specific strategies and interventions to be implemented in the Selected Improvement Plan along with a timeline for implementation
See attachment.

*d. Present a complete description of the assessment plan that details how each goal or objective is to be assessed
See attachment.

*e. Describe the resources available to implement the plan. This includes staffing and faculty cost (time, salary, or reassignment time), budgeting impacts such as travel or training costs, expertise, and other resources
See attachment.

If preferred, please upload entire SI plan as an attachment here.

See Attachment panel below.

Selected Improvement Plan Evidence
No Evidence found.

State Standard(s) Evidence

Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard and answer any questions provided by the state.)
No Evidence found.

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the Self-study Report. You may log out at any time and come back to continue; your report will be saved.

When you are ready to submit the report click "Next" below. This will take you to the submit button on the next page. Once you click on "Submit" you will not be able to make changes to the report and
evidence.