

2017 EPP Annual Report

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

Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2015-2016 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure 104

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.) 0

Total number of program completers 104

**2.2 Indicate whether the EPP is currently offering a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure.*

Yes, a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification is currently being offered.

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2015-2016 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the published mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
No Change / Not Applicable

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

The Arkansas Department of Education made licensure changes that led EPPs to change degree plans. The ECE PK-Grade 4 program of study is being deleted (effective spring 2018) and the Elementary K-6 program of study was approved and implemented in 2014. The Middle Level programs were changed to reflect ADE licensure changes. Candidates may now choose any 2 disciplines from a four option (LA, SS, Math, Science). The old licensure forced them into 2 tracks of LA/SS or Math/Science. The Music and Spanish licensure programs were revised to K-12 to meet new licensure requirements.

3.3 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable

3.4 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
No Change / Not Applicable

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

3.5 Change in regional accreditation status
No Change / Not Applicable

3.6 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of candidate performance data.

Provide a link that demonstrates candidate performance data are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the school, college, or department of education homepage.

School of Education Accreditation and assessment data:

<http://education.uafs.edu/education/accreditation-information>

Section 6. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Waived

Section 7. Accreditation Pathway

Waived

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2017 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Dr. Glenda Ezell

Position: Executive Director, School of Education

Phone: 479-788-7912

E-mail: glenda.ezell@uafs.edu

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

2018 EPP Annual Report

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

Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 2. Program Completers

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

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹ 103

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)² 0

Total number of program completers 103

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
No Change / Not Applicable
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.
No Change / Not Applicable
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
No Change / Not Applicable

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://education.uafs.edu/education/accreditation-information>

Description of data accessible via link: Both the assessment manual and the quality assurance reports are available at the link. These documents show the data and provided a description of changes that were made based on the data.

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

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

University of Arkansas Fort Smith went through the rigorous process of CAEP accreditation, culminating in our site visit in spring, 2017. In preparation, the entire assessment system was analyzed, scrutinized and updated beginning fall 2014. The updates/programmatic changes over the 2016-2017 academic year follow:
 In response to the CAEP Formative Feedback Report, the faculty met to address each standard, including Standard 5, over the Quality Assurance System (QAS). Beginning with Fall 2016 data, analyses would be provided in the assessment report after each semester, to summarize patterns, trends and issues after collaboratively meeting with School of Education faculty, secondary-level content area faculty, school partners and students.
 The question was asked concerning the ability of the EPP to have the capacity to manage the QAS: Initially, assessments and accompanying rubrics were used for objectivity of scoring, but are now being used to analyze student and programmatic outcomes. Currently, the assessment coordinator receives a three-hour reduction in load and the position of Administrative Analyst was added to assist the Assessment Coordinator with data collection in order to support the QAS. Since this infrastructure has been established, the SOE has been able to maintain the QAS.
 Many of the UAFS SOE assessments are proprietary and were aligned with EPP standards required by the Arkansas Department of Education. The EPP-created assessments are also all aligned with CAEP and state teaching standards (InTASC). The EPP has

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

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

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

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 AIMS_report_2018.pdf

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

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

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

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

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

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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

Acknowledge

2019 EPP Annual Report

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

Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹ 70

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)² 0

Total number of program completers 70

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 academic year?

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP _____
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP. _____
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited _____
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited _____
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements _____
- Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:
- 3.6 Change in regional accreditation status _____
- 3.7 Change in state program approval _____

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://education.uafs.edu/education/accreditation-information>

Description of data accessible via link: Both the assessment manual and the quality assurance reports are available at the link. These documents show data and provide a description of changes that were made based on the data.

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

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

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

1 & 2. (4.1 and 4.2) Impact on P-12 learning and Indicators of teaching effectiveness: The Arkansas Department of Education has created a new report to assist universities in the state track data in this area. A simple value added model is used to assess student growth relative to the student's individual score history and the student's expectation of growth (predicted scores). Teacher and Education Preparation Provider Value Added Scores (VAS) are the mean of student growth in each subject. An 80 transformed score means that on average, the completers at a given university are meeting expected growth.

UAFS - 2015 Completer Cohort (Year 1 = 2015-16)

2015-16 2016-17 2017-18

VAS N VAS N VAS N

ELA 79.59 29 81.72 18 81.29 20

MATH 80.09 41 79.87 29 80.48 25

SCIENCE NA NA 97.33 12 79.96 13

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

2016-17 2017-18 2018-19

VAS N VAS N VAS N

ELA 79.51 16 82.66 19 No data

MATH 78.55 20 80.48 21 No data

SCIENCE 85.29 14 80.36 15 No data

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Graduation Rates:

Year Fall Cohort 2 years 3 years

2013 113 80.5% 87.6%

2014 115 78.3% 83.5%

2015 118 83.1% 89.8%

Year Spring Cohort 2 years 3 years

2013 89 85% 89.9%

2014 130 80.8% 89.2%

2015 120 81.7% 93.3%

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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

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

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2019 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses,

and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

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

Acknowledge

2020 EPP Annual Report

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

Section 1. EPP Profile

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

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.2 [For EPP seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation¹ applies to CAEP eligible EPPs] Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial Licensure and/or Advanced Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹ 83

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)² 0

Total number of program completers 83

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2018-2019 academic year?

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://education.uaafs.edu/education/accreditation-information>

Description of data accessible via link: Assessment Data

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

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

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

1 & 2. (4.1 and 4.2) Impact on P-12 learning and Indicators of teaching effectiveness: The Arkansas Department of Education assists universities in the state track data in this area. A simple value added model is used to assess student growth relative to the student's individual score history and the student's expectation of growth (predicted scores). Teacher and Education Preparation Provider Value Added Scores (VAS) are the mean of student growth in each subject. An 80 transformed score means that on average, the completers at a given university are meeting expected growth.

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

2016-17 2017-18 2018-19

VAS N VAS N VAS N

ELA 79.51 16 82.66 19 80.87 18

MATH 78.55 20 80.48 21 78.70 24

SCIENCE 85.29 14 80.36 15 78.39 19

2016-17 2017-18 2018-19

Number of completers with growth data 29 29 33

Percent of completers with growth data 27.88 27.88 31.73

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

2017-18 2018-19 2019-20

VAS N VAS N VAS N

ELA 81.07 20 81.11 21 No data

MATH 81.01 15 81.13 19 No data

SCIENCE 82.09 6 79.95 8 No data

2017-18 2018-19 2019-20

Number of completers with growth data 27 31 NA

Percent of completers with growth data 26.21 30.1 NA

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

2018-19 2019-20 2020-21

VAS N VAS N VAS N

ELA 79.93 11 No data No data

MATH 79.15 6 No data No data

SCIENCE 78.83 5 No data No data

2018-19 2019-20 2020-21

Number of completers with growth data 18 NA NA

Percent of completers with growth data 25.71 NA NA

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

Overall, the students in the completers' classrooms are meeting expected growth. Our benchmark data from AY 15-16 looks very similar to the data presented here. UAFS graduates are consistently at the 80 mark showing expected growth or within a percentage point of that score. The 2018-19 cohort started out lower than the other cohorts, however, higher numbers make the data more reliable and the reporting numbers for the beginning of this cohort are low. UAFS shares data campus wide with university faculty who are involved in teacher licensure programs. We also share data with K12 school partners, community college partners, and students through the Teacher Education Council which meets every other month on the campus. Data is shared through presentations, think-tank sessions, handouts, and through a web presence which is available to the public.

3. (4.3) This data is in the form of surveys to graduates' employers, is provided to EPPs annually, and can be found on the assessment web page. UAFS had a 67% survey response rate. Based on the four TESS (Framework for Teaching) domains, the ADE survey identifies supervisor perceptions of their novice teachers' educator preparation experience. The UAFS mean consistently exceeds the state scores in all categories, indicating that employers feel that the graduates are Adequately – Well Prepared for teaching in the first year. All scores except one are above a 3.05 Our lowest reported score was Designing student formative assessment and use of these assessments for planning (2.95 on a 4pt scale) This score was still higher than the state score of 2.83 for this indicator. One change the program plans to make as a result is requiring students to provide pre-test data within course work and then to provide the formative assessments developed as a result of that data. Employment milestones (NBCT, graduate degrees, administrative promotions, etc.) are currently self-reported, which has been problematic.

4. (4.4) As with the above employer data, the ADE institutional report also provides survey data from UAFS SOE graduates after their first year of teaching. The survey is designed to collect information on how well they feel their EPP prepared them to teach. The survey was revised in 2015-2016, to reflect the TESS (Framework for Teaching) domains. The UAFS graduates have consistently scored their EPP as having "Adequately – Well" prepared them for teaching, with an average mean that has exceeded the state average in all components. Our lowest score is 3.16 on a 4 point scale in the area of managing student behavior. The state average for this score is 3.05. Students in the education program at UAFS are required to take a classroom management course early in the program. We have recently determined that additional time needs to be spent on classroom management during the internship semester.

5. Graduation Rates:

Year Cohort Semester/N 2 years 3 years

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

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

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

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

2016 Fall/45 26 - 57.8 42 - 93.3%

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

2017 Fall/52 32 - 61.5%

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

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

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

- 2016-2017 61%

- 2017-2018 65%

- 2018-2019 53%

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Supporting Data:

Category 16/17 17/18 18/19

Math 16 13 21

Science 14 7 21

Language Arts 18 24 17

Foreign Language 0 1 1

Music 6 4 7

Minority Graduates 7 3 6

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

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

Standard 1: Content Knowledge (specifically Science of Reading- INTASC standard 4): implementation of strategies for ensuring proficiency in the Science of Reading across grade levels: The University of Arkansas Fort Smith has worked to develop candidate knowledge in the area of the Science of Reading. Course work has been redesigned to include current and relevant research in the key components of the Science of Reading. A workshop to assist students in passing required Science of Reading exams has been implemented in each semester. Reading faculty at UAFS lead a Higher Education Literacy Council each semester to work with other literacy faculty across the state to ensure assignments are deepening knowledge. Resource Allocation: Finances to host the Higher Education Literacy Council are allocated. Providing training for Literacy Faculty to upskill knowledge around the Science of Reading has been provided. Communication: Our plans for deepening content knowledge are communicated to future candidates through marketing and at recruiting events throughout the year. We communicate our plans and outcomes to our current students, staff, faculty, and school partners through regularly scheduled meetings throughout the academic year. Supporting Data: Program Year Pass Rate for UAFS # of Test Takers Pass Rate for State # of test takers 2017-Program YTD 91% 82 79% 1,392

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards

1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships

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

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2020 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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

Acknowledge

2021 EPP Annual Report

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

Section 1. EPP Profile

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

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

<https://education.uafs.edu/>

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2019-2020 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹ 61

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)² 0

Total number of program completers 61

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2019-2020 academic year?

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: <https://education.uafs.edu/education/accreditation-information>

Description of data accessible via link: Assessment data

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

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

1 & 2 (4.1 and 4.2) Impact on P-12 learning and Indicators of teaching effectiveness: The Arkansas Department of education assists universities in the state track data in this area. A simple value added model is used to assess student growth relative to the students' individual score history and the student's expectation of growth (predicted scores). Teacher and Education Preparation Provider Value Added Scores (VAS) are the mean of student growth in each subject. An 80 transformed score means that on average, the students of completers at a given university are meeting expect growth.

UAFS 2017-18 Completer Cohort (year 1) ELA N=20 VAS =81.07; MATH N=15 VAS = 81.01; Science N=6 VAS =82.09; UAFS 2018-19 Completer Cohort (year 2) ELA N=21 VAS = 81.11; MATH N=19 VAS = 81.13; Science N=8 VAS =79.95; UAFS 2019-20 Completer Cohort (year 3) No data available. Due to COVID, the State of Arkansas did not administer the ACT aspire from which this data is taken. All of our VAS scores meet the 80 that indicates students of completers at our university are meeting expected growth except for Science during the second cohort. That VAS was 79.95 which, while not at 80 is very close. UAFS shares data campus wide with university faculty who are involved in teacher licensure programs. We also share data with k12 school partners, community college partners, and students through the Teacher Education Council which meets every other month on the campus. Data is shared through presentations, think-tank sessions, handouts, and through a web presence which is available to the public.

3. (4.3) This data is collected in the form of a survey to graduates' employers, is provided to EPPs annually, and can be found on the assessment web page. Based on the four TESS (Framework for Teaching Domains), the ADE survey identifies supervisor

perceptions of their novice teachers' educator preparation experience. The UAFS mean generally exceeds or meets the state average. However, for the 2020 reporting period we had several areas that were a little lower than the state average. Our lowest reported score was a 2.8 on a 4 point scale. The state average was 3.0. This component is related to Using Assessment in Instruction. We are unclear as to why this score dipped this semester. We will need to watch the data for the upcoming year to begin to understand if this will be trend. This is the first time since the survey started being administered that we have been below the state average on a score. We did move the assessment class to online. Perhaps we need to rethink that decision. 4. (4.4) As with the above employer data, the ADE institutional report also provides survey data from UAFS School of Education graduates after their first year of teaching. The survey is designed to collect information on how well our graduates feel their EPP prepared them to teach. The survey was revised in 2015-2016 to reflect the TESS (Framework for Teaching) domains. The UAFS graduates have consistently scored their EPP as having "Adequately -Well" prepared them for teaching, with an average mean that has exceeded the state average in all components. Our lowest score was 3.2 on a 4 point scale. Three out of the 22 areas reflect the score of 3.2. These indicators are: Managing Student Behavior, Maintaining Accurate Records, and Communicating with Families. It is not unusual for new teachers to feel inadequate as it relates to managing student behavior. The faculty at UAFS are planning to increase time spent in the classroom prior to internship to potential help with this concern. For maintaining accurate records we plan to work with mentors to allow candidates the opportunity to work with maintaining records during internship so that they will be more prepared for this area. We have implemented the CAEP recommended parent teacher interaction module to assist our candidates with communicating with families. 5. Graduation Rates 2016 Spring N=39; 2 year grad rate 59%; 3 year; 87.2%. 2016 fall N= 45; 2 year 57.8%; 3 year 93.3%. Spring 2017 N= 60; 2 year 53%; 3 year 90.9%. 2017 fall N= 53 2 year 60.4%. 3 year 88.7%. Spring 2018 N=37 2 year 59.5%, 3 year not yet available. Secondary and K12 candidates are admitted to the program and still have a semester or year of content courses to complete prior to graduation. This explains the higher 3rd year graduation rate. 6. According to the Title 2 our pass rate on licensure exams was 95%. At UAFS, candidates have been required to pass all licensure exams prior to internship and then complete all other ADE through assignments in the required seminar course. This reporting year, ADE began allowing candidates who scored within two standard errors of measure below the pass score to receive a provisional license. Due to this change, we allowed all candidates who met the -2 SEM requirement for the provisional license to intern since they could be licensed however the students did not meet the cut score. This information is shared with the SOE faculty/staff, school partners and on the UAFS website. 7. According to the Title 2 our pass rate on licensure exams was 95%. At UAFS, candidates have been required to pass all licensure exams prior to internship and then complete all other ADE through assignments in the required seminar course. This reporting year, ADE began allowing candidates who scored within two standard errors of measure below the pass score to receive a provisional license. ADE number from the past three years show that UAFS first-year teachers are in AR schools at the following rates: 2017-2018 61%; 2018-2019 53%; 2019-2020 86%. The numbers are reflective of the SOE's role of serving two states, as Fort Smith is literally on the state line between Arkansas and Oklahoma. 8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information: After consulting with the UAFS Associate Vice Chancellor of Strategic Analytics and Institutional Research, it has been confirmed that the report that comes in from the U.S. Department of Education does not disaggregate student loan default rates by program. Therefore, there are no numbers specific to SOE teacher graduate.. The most recent number are from 2017, and indicate that the overall UAFS student loan default rates are: FY 2015 15.2%; FY 2016 16.5, FY 2017 16%. All students are currently required to take a one-hour Personal Finance Applications (FIN 1521 class to encourage fiscal responsibility. Also, supplemental funding measures have been put into place to assist students in need, to decrease the need for student loans.

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

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

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

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

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

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

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

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

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

Standard 3 Recruitment and meeting employer needs) Strategies: We have programs in the following shortage areas for Arkansas-English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Music, and Spanish. Unfortunately, due to low enrollment, the Spanish program is slated to be sunset. We are no longer accepting candidates into the program but are committed to graduating those who have started the program. Special Education is also identified as a shortage area, but we currently have only a resource room endorsement area. Strategy 1-Begin a Masters of Special Education; Strategy 2- Work with area school districts to get a cohort of students interested in Special Education. Evidence of resource allocation: The University has faculty in each degree program who have teaching license in the area in which they teach. The secondary teacher licensure programs are housed in a different college than the School of Education but the teacher licensure faculty work closely with School of Education Faculty to ensure competent graduates. The English Language Arts program has a committee specifically to develop strategies for recruitment and retention in their area. The university hired a new faculty member with expertise in Special Education. His responsibilities include growing our Special Education Resource room program and developing a masters degree in Special Education. Goals: (a) Propose a Masters in Special Education (b) Apply for the Special Education Academy 101, (c) Award scholarship dollars to those seeking licensure in content areas where there is a shortage. Communication: Our plans for recruitment and retention are communicated to future candidates through marketing and at recruiting events throughout the year. We communicate our plans and outcomes to our current students, staff, faculty, and school partners through regularly scheduled meetings throughout the academic year. Further, our website provides information about our program. Supporting Data: Unfortunately, we had fewer graduates in all shortage areas where we offer a degree. As mentioned earlier, Foreign Language will be sunset by 2023. Music has remained relatively steady, but Math, Science, and Language Arts are all significantly decreased. As stated, we will continue to recruit for these areas.

Category (secondary and middle level candidates) 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20

Math 16 13 21 7

Science 14 7 21 6

Language Arts 18 24 17 8

Foreign Language 0 1 1 0

Music 6 4 7 6

Activities: We offer a concurrent course in two area high schools and will include a third high school effective this fall that will give us access to secondary students showing an interest in teaching. Two faculty members are part of a Public School Minority Recruitment Committee with strategies to retain and recruit students. This committee is made of university faculty, community leaders within the minority population, and public school leaders and teachers. Resources: The University has committed a faculty member to work with high school teachers throughout the concurrent semester. Further, the university has monies for travel to recruitment events and meetings. Budgets include money to bring potential students to campus as part of recruitment. Goals: We hope to increase our minority population by 2. Data: As noted in the chart we increased our minority graduates by 3 from the 18/19 school year to the 19/20 school year. We will continue to recruit and create opportunities for minority candidates to visit campus. Communication Plan: Our plans for recruitment and retention are communicated to future candidates through marketing and at recruiting events throughout the year. We communicate our plans and outcomes to our current students, staff, faculty, and school partners through regularly scheduled meetings throughout the academic year. Our website also contains information related to our programs.

Category 16/17 17/18 18/19 19/20

Minority Graduates 7 3 6 9

Standard 2 Partnerships Strategies: The School of Education has a Teacher Education Council that consists of school district leadership with whom we partner. This group agrees on entry, preparation, and exit requirements. We work with our professional development schools throughout the program to determine assignments that will benefit our students, and which also benefit the schools in which we serve. Teacher candidates are assisting teachers with administering formative assessments. Our candidates work alongside the classroom teacher creating a synergy for student learning. Partnership meetings provide opportunity for brainstorming how to meet the needs of the school district and the university. An established teacher apprenticeship program is supporting both the school district and high performing teacher candidates. Resource allocation for partnerships: The SOE has designated resources for travel to and from partnership schools. Faculty time is allocated to plan and discuss mutually beneficial assignments with principals, assistant principals, teacher leaders and classroom teachers. The Teacher Licensure and Field Experience Coordinator position is a resource dedicated to developing partnerships. Goals: Our goal is to increase involvement in the Teacher Apprenticeship both with number of apprentices and number of school districts involved. Beginning with the fall 2021 school year, we are planning to embed all of our elementary and middle level courses in partnership school districts. This will increase the time our candidates are able to spend in the classroom prior to teacher internship. We have worked with our four closest partners to create a pathway for all of our teacher candidates to become substitutes which will support the needs of the

districts we serve.

Type of Meeting Date

School Partnership Meeting 9/9/19; 10/7/19; 11/14/19; 1/8/20; 2/27/20; 3/20/20; 5/21/20

Teacher Education Council 11/6/19; 2/5/20

Teacher Apprenticeship 8/23/19; 8/29/19; 9/12/19; 10/2/19; 10/16/19; 10/24/19; 1/29/20; 2/26/20

Professional Development School 9/5/19; 9/12/19; 9/19/19; 9/26/19; 10/3/19; 10/10/19; 10/17/19; 10/24/19; 10/31/19; 11/7/19; 11/21/19; 1/20/20; 2/4/20; 2/6/20; 2/11/20; 2/13/20; 2/18/20; 2/20/20; 2/25/20; 2/27/20; 3/3/20; 3/5/20; 3/10/20; 3/11/20-
COVID (no more meetings with PDS schools for the 19/20 AY)

Standard 1 Content Knowledge (specifically Science of Reading-InTASC 4) Implementation of strategies for ensuring proficiency in the Science of Reading across grade levels: The University of Arkansas Fort Smith has worked to develop candidate knowledge in the area of the Science of Reading. Course work has been redesigned to include current and relevant research in the key components of the Science of Reading. A workshop to assist students in passing required Science of Reading exams has been implemented in each semester. Reading faculty at UAFS lead a Higher Education Literacy Council each semester to work with other literacy faculty across the state to ensure assignments are deepening knowledge. Resource Allocation: Finances to host the Higher Education Literacy Council are allocated. Providing training for Literacy Faculty to upskill knowledge around the Science of Reading has been provided. Communication: Our plans for deepening content knowledge are communicated to future candidates through marketing and at recruiting events throughout the year. We communicate our plans and outcomes to our current students, staff, faculty, and school partners through regularly scheduled meetings throughout the academic year. Supporting Data: Our university has a 92% pass rate on the Foundations of Reading Exam.

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

2017-Program YTD 92% 110 81% 1,798

Standard 4 Program Impact: The University of Arkansas Fort Smith is partnering with an Educational Cooperative in our area which works with novice teachers in years 1-3. We are in the process of creating a partnership by which data related to completer effectiveness and completer impact on student growth and learning as well as employer satisfaction and completer satisfaction will be more readily accessible for us to report and analyze.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2021 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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

Acknowledge

2022 Annual Accreditation Report

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

Section 1. EPP Profile Updates in AIMS

Please review the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS and update the following information for: Contact Persons, EPP Characteristics, Program Listings. [See the Annual Report Technical Guide for additional guidance.]

1.1 Update Contact Information in AIMS:

1.1.1 I confirm that the EPP has listed and updated the contact information for the individual(s) designated as "EPP Head."

[The individual(s) identified as the EPP head should have authority over the EPP. This contact may receive time-sensitive communications related to the accreditation of the EPP.]

Agree Disagree

1.1.2 I confirm that the EPP has listed and updated the contact information for the individual(s) designated as "CAEP Coordinator".

[The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in coordinating accreditation activities. This contact may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.]

Agree Disagree

1.1.3 I confirm that the EPP has provided updated contact information for two distinct people for these roles.

[CAEP requires that EPPs provide information for two distinct contact persons to ensure that automatic communications sent from AIMS are received by the EPP in the event of personal turnover.]

Agree Disagree

1.2 Update EPP Information in AIMS:

1.2.1 *Basic Information* - I confirm that the EPP's basic information (including mailing address and EPP name) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS.

[The individual(s) identified as the EPP head should have authority over the EPP. This contact may receive time-sensitive communications related to the accreditation of the EPP.]

Agree Disagree

1.2.2 *EPP Characteristics and Affiliations* - I confirm that the EPP characteristics and affiliations (including Carnegie classification, EPP type, religious affiliation, language of instruction, institutional accreditation, and branch campuses/sites) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS

[The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in coordinating accreditation activities. This contact may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.]

Agree Disagree

1.2.3 *Program Options* - I confirm that EPP's program listings (including program name, program

review level, certificate level, program category, and program review option) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS for all EPP programs that fall within CAEP's scope of accreditation; (programs outside of CAEP's scope of accreditation should be archived and not listed in AIMS).

Agree Disagree

Section 2. EPP's Program Completers [Academic Year 2020-2021]

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in P-12 settings during Academic Year 2020-2021?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹

61

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

0

Total number of program completers 61

¹ For a description of the scope for Initial and Advanced programs, see Policy II in the [CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures](#)

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Please report on any substantive changes that have occurred at the EPP/Institution or Organization, as well as the EPP's current regional accreditation status.

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2020-2021 academic year?

3.1 Has there been any change in the EPP's legal status, form of control, or ownership?

Change No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 Has the EPP entered a contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach out agreements?

Change No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 Since the last reporting cycle, has the EPP seen a change in state program approval?

Change No Change / Not Applicable

3.4. What is the EPP's current regional accreditation status?

Accreditation Agency:

HLC

Status:

Accredited

Does this represent a change in status from the prior year?

Change No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 Since the last reporting cycle, does the EPP have any other substantive changes to report to CAEP per CAEP's Accreditation Policy?

Change No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. CAEP Accreditation Details on EPP's Website

Please update the EPP's public facing website to include: 1) the EPP's current CAEP accreditation status with an accurate listing of the EPP's CAEP (NCATE, or TEAC) reviewed programs, and 2) the EPP's data display of the CAEP Accountability Measures for Academic Year 2020-2021.

4.1. EPP's current CAEP (NCATE/TEAC) Accreditation Status & Reviewed Programs

4.1 Provider shares a direct link to the EPP's website where information relevant to the EPP's current accreditation status is provided along with an accurate list of programs included during the most recent CAEP (NCATE or TEAC) accreditation review.

<https://uafs.edu/academics/colleges-and-schools/chehs/school-of-ed/index.php>

4.2. CAEP Accountability Measures (for CHEA Requirements) [2020-2021 Academic Year]

Provider shares a direct link to its website where the EPP's display of data for the CAEP Accountability Measures, as gathered during the 2020-2021 academic year, are clearly tagged, explained, and available to the public.

CAEP Accountability Measures (for CHEA Requirements) [2020-2021 Academic Year]

- **Measure 1 (Initial): Completer effectiveness. (R4.1)** Data must address: (a) completer impact in contributing to P-12 student-learning growth **AND** (b) completer effectiveness in applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
- **Measure 2 (Initial and Advanced): Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement. (R4.2|R5.3| RA4.1)**
Data provided should be collected on employers' satisfaction with program completers.
- **Measure 3 (Initial and Advanced): Candidate competency at completion. (R3.3)**
Data provided should relate to measures the EPP is using to determine if candidates are meeting program expectations and ready to be recommended for licensure. (E.g.: EPP's Title II report, data that reflect the ability of EPP candidates to meet licensing and state requirements or other measures the EPP uses to determine candidate competency at completion.)
- **Measure 4 (Initial and Advanced): Ability of completers to be hired** (in positions for which they have prepared.)

CAEP Accountability Measures (Initial) [LINK] <https://uafs.edu/academics/colleges-and-schools/chehs/school-of-ed/accreditation/assessment.php>

CAEP Accountability Measures (Advanced) [LINK] [No Link Provided](#)

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

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report. The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.

Section 6. EPP's Continuous Improvement & Progress on (advanced level) Phase-in Plans and (initial-level) Transition Plans

Please share any continuous improvement initiatives at the EPP, AND (if applicable) provide CAEP with an update on the EPP's progress on its advanced level phase-in plans and/or initial level transition plans.

6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year.

This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to two major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

Results from supervisor and novice teacher survey satisfaction survey, indicates that employers and completers were less satisfied (n=26; 2.92/4 for employer survey; n=91, 3.02/4 for completer survey) with training in the area of assessment than in other areas of the survey. As a result, the SOE adjusted vocabulary in all courses to be consistent with the statewide PLC model. Assessment courses develop common formative and summative assessments for lesson planning and discuss the value of these types of assessments. Further, faculty in all classes began a collaborative process for embedding coursework in area schools. The faculty also began the process of collaboratively creating assignments that were authentic representations of the classroom and were created cross curricular. Further indication of needed growth in this area came from the results of an outside review of our program. As a result of this review, the School of Education is participating in professional development related to assessment. Faculty are also working directly with mentor teachers to strengthen the experiences of our candidates. Candidates began participating in assessing students and providing RTI. Following RTI opportunities, students provide a post test, and then provide results of the assessment to the classroom teacher. We continue to study the changes of these results and anticipate growth over the next supervisor and novice teacher surveys.

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

Yes No

6.1.3 Optional Comments

R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers
R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

Section 8: Feedback for CAEP & Report Preparer's Authorization

8.1 . [OPTIONAL] Just as CAEP asks EPPs to reflect on their work towards continuous improvement, CAEP endeavors to improve its own practices. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information to identify areas of priority in assisting EPPs.

8.1.1 What semester is your next accreditation visit?

spring 2024

8.1.2 Does the EPP have any questions about CAEP Standards, CAEP sufficiency criteria, or the CAEP accreditation process generally?

no

8.2 Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2022 EPP Annual Report, and that the details provided in this report and linked webpages are up to date and accurate at the time of submission..*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Monica Riley

Position: Executive Director

Phone: 4797887912

E-mail: monica.riley@uafs.edu

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

Acknowledge