INSTITUTIONAL REPORT
ADDENDUM – SEPTEMBER 2012

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
FAYETTEVILLE, AR   72701
October 28-30, 2012

Type of Visit:
Continuing visit – Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit – Advanced Preparation

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.1 Statement about the evidence
- The unit did not make it clear how these data showed candidates were approaching mastery.

Response: Mastery of Pathwise shows mastery of Standard One. This can be seen in the Pathwise Correlation to Standard One on the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279172&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

The link below lists Pathwise Scores for 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11showing that candidates are approaching mastery on all domains in Pathwise
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279276&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

No data for internal key assessments were provided.
Response: Internal Assessments in program reports: Use of grade point averages, Praxis assessment scores, key artifacts for program assessment including Pathwise observation scores can be found in each program report. Instructions for the artifact, rubrics for assessing the artifact and data obtained from the assessment are also part of the program report. SPA program reports can be found under AIMS All Programs. In order to see assessment attachments, follow these directions, "Please open the PDF file in adobe reader. Click on View, Show/Hide, Navigation Pane, Attachments (or View, Navigation Panel, Attachments - depending on your version)." State program reports can be found under the IR Addendum Standard 1listed as "State Program Reports and Reviews" at the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279273&PageId=174138&u=guest&cus=164

Pathwise Observational Instrument and the Pathwise Scoring Guide may be found on the below page link.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279276&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

Pathwise is one method utilized to assess candidate's impact on student learning. Domain C of Pathwise focuses on "Teaching for Student Learning. Candidates assess student learning in C4: "Monitoring students' understanding of content…." Data on Pathwise both overall and by domain is disaggregated by U of A program in each program report and also the assessment report. Overall Pathwise scores and by program for 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 are found on the page linked below.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279276&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

(3) Internal assessments.   Internal assessments need to be clearly identifiable, linked to dialogue in the IR and disaggregated by program area.
Response: Pathwise internal assessments for the last 3 years disaggregated by program can be found on the following page:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279117&PageId=173114&u=guest&cus=164
The narrative in the IR regarding Pathwise is on pages 4, 5, and 6 and can also be found linked to this page .
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279103&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

1.1a   How were unit programs reviewed by the BOE?   What trends emerged?   What do these trends reveal about the unit's programs?

Documentation of program reviews and recognition by the state was provided for the following:

Bachelor of .Science in Education (Kinesiology-Health and Physical Education)
Bachelor of .Science in Education (Agriculture Sciences and Technology)
Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art Education
Bachelor of Science in Education in Career and Education (Business Technology Education)
Bachelor of Science in Education in Career and Education (Family and Consumer Sciences Education)
Master of Education (Career and Technical Education)

Documentation of program reviews and recognition at the national level was provided for the following:
Secondary Science Education (MAT)

Secondary Social Studies

AFI Number & Text	Apply to ITP	AFI Rationale
1. Candidates have limited experience in assessing their effectiveness in terms of student learning.		Evidence was provided demonstrating candidates have opportunities to assess their effectiveness with regard to student learning. However, additional details regarding ways in which this occurs in both a formative process prior to graduation and how it occurs through the Praxis III assessment would be helpful for the BOE.

Response: Since the off-site review the following programs have been nationally recognized:
Educational Leadership Building Level, advanced level, Master's SPA: ELCC
Foreign Language Education, initial level, Masters' SPA: ACTFL
Response to Conditions are in process for the following programs:
Educational Leadership District Level, advanced level, Ed.S. SPA: ELCC
Childhood Education ELEL, initial level, Baccalaureate, SPA: NAEYC
Childhood Education MAT, initial level, Master's, SPA: NAEYC
Secondary English Education, initial level Master's SPA NCTM
Secondary Math Education, initial level, Masters, SPA NCTM
Special Education , advanced level, Master's, SPA: CEC

Programs that are in the process of responding to conditions have initiated new assessments since the first program report and are awaiting collection of data on the new assessments prior to resubmission.

AFIs continued from last visit:

Response: As a formative process prior to graduation, candidates impact on student learning is evaluated by Pathwise and by teacher work samples. Candidates assess their effectiveness with regard to student learning prior to graduation through the Pathwise Formative Observation Domain C: Teaching for Student Learning p. 2 on form. Scoring criteria for Pathwise are also available at this link.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279112&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

University faculty and P-12 mentor teachers meet with candidates in pre and post conferences regarding the observation. On Pathwise domain C: Teaching for Student Learning 2008-09 candidates in programs range from an average of 2.5 in the physical education program to 2.9 in the business education program. Overall, the average on Domain C is 2.7 which is approaching mastery, a high level for a candidate doing internship. Analyzing total scores for Domain C instead of means, totals on Domain C range from 12.3 in physical education to 14.6 in business education.

The overall unit mean of program totals was 13.47. In 2009-10 Domain C total scores ranged from 11.2 in science to 14 in Business Education, a high level for interns. 2010-11 total scores in Domain C ranged from 11.5 in English to 14.6 in business education. A score of 12 is mastery level. Therefore, it can be shown our candidates are reaching mastery. All Pathwise scores for 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 can be found at this link: https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279112&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

In addition to Pathwise, each program has a "Teacher work sample" where candidates pre-test, then teach lessons on the concept and post test to determine student learning. For example, assessment #5 starting on page 22 in the Agriculture Education State Report is the "Unit Plan with Pre/Post Assessment." All state program reports with student learning assessments and data can be found on the following link https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279111&PageId=174138&u=guest&cus=164

SPA reports with assessments regarding student learning can be found under AIMS under All Programs. To open assessments follow directions below:
"Please open the PDF file in adobe reader. Click on View, Show/Hide, Navigation Pane, Attachments (or View, Navigation Panel, Attachments - depending on your version)."

Praxis III is an observational tool with the same domain and scoring guide as Pathwise. However, instead of being a formative evaluation, it is a summative evaluation conducted by external evaluators who undergo rigorous training. Passing scores on Praxis III moves the graduate from an initial license to a standard license. Looking at how the candidates in the 2008-09 cohort did on the Praxis III in 2009-10 as first year teachers, we find that in Domain C, Teaching for Student Learning, our graduates had a total of 13.66, slightly higher than in the formative Pathwise observations done the previous year. This was in line with the state average of 13.6 on Domain C. Detailed scores on Praxis III for the 2009-10 year can be found at the following link: https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279113&PageId=173114&u=guest&cus=164

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

(1) Conceptual framework and external standards alignment. The evidence presented provides some of the information needed to support the unit's assertion in the conceptual framework (CF) stating, "proficiencies reflect the knowledge, skills, and dispositions identified by specialized professional associations (SPAs) and NCATE, and criteria found in Pathwise mentoring standards supported by Arkansas Department of Education. Proficiencies reflect the knowledge, skills, and dispositions identified by specialized professional associations (SPAs) and NCATE, and criteria found in Pathwise mentoring standards supported by Arkansas Department of Education."

Rationale: Additional evidence (a matrix showing alignments) is needed to show the relationship between the CF and state and national standards.   For example, ELCC review of the education leadership programs is noted in other parts for the IR, but no supporting information is provided,

and the ELCC report is not included in the exhibits.   In addition, it is not clear if there is a state licensure evaluation other than Praxis III for graduates.

Response:
See alignment matrix under IR Addendum Standard 1 Exhibits—link below
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279103&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

ELCC Report is on NCATE AIMS Website under All Programs. In order to view the assessment attachments follow the directions provided by NCATE tech support.

"Please open the PDF file in adobe reader. Click on View, Show/Hide, Navigation Pane, Attachments (or View, Navigation Panel, Attachments - depending on your version)."

Both Program Reports submitted by the program and the program review reports "Final Report" are available on this matrix. The current ELCC reports are listed under Educational Leadership.

There is no other state licensure evaluation after a candidate receives his/her initial licensure than the Praxis III. The Praxis III was utilized through 2010-11 and then discontinued.

(1) Standards alignment.   Evidence is needed that the CF is aligned with external standards, especially for advanced programs for teachers that don't require licensure or undergo state review.
Response: See matrix under IR Addendum Standard 1 Exhibits—link below. The last program M. Ed. In CIED does not require licensure or undergo state review.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279103&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

(2) Relationship of evidence to IR narrative. The unit should make clear their intent regarding the evidence and exhibits provided.   A clear reference in the IR to the evidence provided is needed.
Response: The unit has a total of sixteen teacher preparation programs that result in licensure The list of programs, both SPA reviewed and state reviewed can be found under IR Addendum Standard 1 listed as "U of Arkansas Programs for Review" at top of page at the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279165&PageId=174138&u=guest&cus=164

From fall 2010 to the present, the Unit submitted seven initial SPA program reports and four advanced SPA program reports. The reports and reviews of the reports are available under AIMS All Programs. Of the seven initial program reports submitted three: science, social studies, and foreign language, have been nationally recognized. Reports for four programs: childhood education MAT (five year initial licensure program), childhood education ELEL (4 year licensure program), secondary English and secondary math, are recognized with conditions. Both childhood education programs have resubmitted September 15, 2012 in response to their conditions. English and math will resubmit in spring 2012 when they have two administrations of new assessments to report. Three advanced programs submitted reports. Special education submitted to CEC and was recognized with conditions. Educational leadership submitted both a building level licensure and a district level licensure to the ELCC SPA. The building level is recognized with conditions. The

district level is nationally recognized. The Ed Leadership building level has been resubmitted. The special education program is collecting data to resubmit in the spring.

Beginning in fall 2010 we also had seven initial programs submit state reports instead of SPA reports as directed by the Arkansas State Department of Education. All seven programs were initial licensure programs and all except Career and Technology Education were at the master's level:1)agriculture education, 2)art education 3)business technology education, 4) career and technology education master's 5) family consumer science education, 6) industrial technology education,7) physical education, wellness and leisure. Six of the programs were approved by the state. The industrial technology program did not have enough students within the last five years to be approved and is continuing to collect data on completers as they graduate to resubmit in 2014. State program reports and state review reports can be found under the IR addendum Standard 1listed as
"U of Arkansas Programs for Review" at the following link:

https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279165&PageId=174138&u=guest&cus=164

Internal Assessments in program reports: Use of grade point averages, Praxis assessment scores, key artifacts for program assessment including Pathwise observation scores can be found in each program report. Instructions for the artifact, rubrics for assessing the artifact and data obtained from the assessment are also part of the program report whether it is a SPA report under AIMS All Programs or a state program report found under the IR Addendum Standard 1 listed as "State Program Reports and Reviews" at the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279277&PageId=174138&u=guest&cus=164

Pathwise Observational Instrument and the Pathwise Scoring Guide may also be found on the above page link. Pathwise is one method utilized to assess candidate's impact on student learning. Domain C of Pathwise focuses on "Teaching for Student Learning. Candidates assess student learning in C4: "Monitoring students' understanding of content…." Data on Pathwise both overall and by domain for the unit and by program is found at the link below for 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279278&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

Pathwise is also disaggregated by U of A program in each program report and also the assessment report. Assessment reports are found on the page linked below.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279171&PageId=175061&u=guest&cus=164

Candidates also monitor student learning through a teacher work sample found in each state and SPA program report. An example for the business education state report and the science SPA report may be found at the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279275&PageId=174255&u=guest&cus=164

Other SPA reports with assessments on candidates' impact on student learning may be found in AIMS All Programs. To see the assessment attachments follow the directions for NCATE tech support:

"Please open the PDF file in adobe reader. Click on View, Show/Hide, Navigation Pane, Attachments (or View, Navigation Panel, Attachments - depending on your version)."

Other state program reports with assessments on candidates' impact on student learning may be found at
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279111&PageId=174138&u=guest&cus=164

(3) Internal assessments. Internal assessments need to be clearly identifiable, linked to dialogue in the IR and disaggregated by program area.
Response: Pathwise internal assessments for the last 3 years disaggregated by program can be found on the following page:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279117&PageId=173114&u=guest&cus=164
The narrative in the IR regarding Pathwise is on pages 4, 5, and 6 and can also be found linked to this page.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279103&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

(4) Initial vs. advanced programs. The unit needs to identify all the programs that are subject to NCATE review and clearly classify them as initial or advanced using NCATE classifications.
Response: The list of programs, both SPA reviewed and state reviewed can be found under IR Addendum Standard 1 listed as "U of Arkansas Programs for Review" at the top of the page on the following link: Programs are designated by level ITP for initial programs and ADV for advanced.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279170&PageId=174138&u=guest&cus=164

(5) All state and SPA recognition reports need to be provided in the evidence, including responses to conditions if available and trends that emerged from the data.
Response: All state program reports, including responses to conditions are available at the following link.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279170&PageId=174138&u=guest&cus=164

SPA Program Reports including responses to conditions are available on AIMS under All Programs.
Trends that emerged from the initial report conditions in PEWL, Art Ed., and Agri Ed., was a lack of sufficient candidate data on Praxis II. Another area where a trend emerged in the above three programs and Educational Leadership was a lack of sufficient data on the teacher candidate work samples involving pre and post tests to determine impact on student work. These data were

gathered and included in the responses and subsequently approved without conditions.

In secondary English and math SPA conditions, new assessment instruments were created in response to conditions, and resubmissions are waiting on data collection from these new assessments.

Our special education advanced program is in the process of resubmitting with input from new faculty and with additional data. Currently special education is an additional licensure program working primarily with inservice teachers. The state is in the process of changing special education to an initial licensure program.

(6) Pathways assessment. The unit used Pathways assessment data to show candidate mastery. Additional information is needed showing how this assessment relates to this standard.

Response: Correlation between Pathwise and Standard One can be found on this page https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279103&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

(7) Online instruction. Online instruction within unit programs is not clear.   The manner in which online instruction is used by programs needs to be clarified.   Are any programs or program components totally online?

Response: Classes occurring on campus are supported by Blackboard Learn, web based classroom management system, where students post assignments and receive grades on web based Blackboard.

The educational leadership and special education programs are totally online. Answers to the Responses to NCATE online questions can be found at the following link: https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279167&PageId=175028&u=guest&cus=164

(8) Program quality. Clarify how the increased enrollment in the unit has improved the quality of programs.

Response: We would retract the generalized statement that increased enrollment has improved the quality of programs, however the following anecdotal evidence leads us to believe that with increased enrollment, improvement has occurred:

With increased enrollment, certain functions have been centralized such as the Director of Field Placement. Prior to 2010-11, each program placed their own interns. Communication was not always consistent with both the P-12 district offices and the principals at the schools. In 2010-11 enrollment growth allowed for money from internship fees to pay for a Director of Field Placement (DFP). The director makes all placements with input from the programs. This makes communication consistent. The DFP has also implemented a process where the students must pass a criminal background check prior to student teaching. This is the same background check they must pass in order to be licensed in the state of Arkansas. Previously, a student could complete all degree requirements and be ineligible for licensure due to the background check. Now, with the background check taking place prior to student teaching, candidates not eligible for licensure due to background checks can choose a different career path prior to completing their degree.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Statement about the evidence

The unit indicated recommendations are implemented the following year; however, limited data were presented to support this practice.

Response: <mark>Updated assessment reports with conclusions and recommendations for all programs plus the unit level are available on the following page:</mark>
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279169&PageId=175061&u=guest&cus=164

No information was provided showing the alignment of the assessment system with state and professional standards.

Response: <mark>See alignment matrix under IR Addendum Standard 1 Exhibits—link below.</mark>
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279103&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

The unit indicated it has an assessment system for each of its advanced programs [Curriculum and Instruction (CIED) Elementary M. Ed., Secondary, M.Ed., Educational Leadership (EDLE) M. Ed. Ed. S., and Special Education (SPED) M. Ed.]. Data are collected and analyzed on the applicant's More information about these assessment systems is needed.

Response: <mark>Special Education and Educational Leadership assessments can be found in program reports under AIMS, All Programs, The M. Ed. In CIED assessments can be found at the following link:</mark>
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279179&PageId=147157&u=guest&cus=164

The unit did not provide any data to support the alignment of the assessment system with state and professional standards.

Response: <mark>See matrix under IR Addendum Standard 1 Exhibits—link below. The last program M. Ed. In CIED does not require licensure or undergo state review.</mark>
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279103&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs continued from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. The unit assessment system does not include systematic use of graduate follow-up data.	ITP	The unit provided evidence showing the assessment system systematically collects graduate follow-up data. More evidence is needed to show the use of that data to improve program, candidate, and unit performance.
2. Locally developed assessment procedures have not been examined to eliminate potential sources of bias or to ensure accuracy, consistency, and fairness in administration.	ITP	More evidence is needed to show bias has been eliminated from locally developed assessments. Specifically, assessments and their scoring guidelines need to be included in the evidence.
3. The unit makes limited use of its assessment system to improve programs.	ITP	The unit presented evidence that data are being used to drive program improvement. However, no information was provided to show that the unit assessment system drives candidate or unit improvement.

Response to AFI 1. The unit assessment system does not include systematic use of graduate follow-up data. The assessment reports for 2008-09,2009-10, and 2010-11 include unit assessment with conclusions and recommendations based upon graduate follow-up data. Use of Praxis II alumni data, Novice Teacher Survey Alumni Data, and Educational Benchmark Alumni Data can be found on the following linked page**:**
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279118&PageId=174312&u=guest&cus=164

Response to AFI 2. SPA Program Reports are available at AIMS All Programs. To see assessments and scoring guides please open the PDF file in adobe reader. Click on View, Show/Hide, Navigation Pane, Attachments (or View, Navigation Panel, Attachments - depending on your version).
State Program Reports can be found at the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279103&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164
Pathwise and Educational Benchmarking Institute Surveys (EBI) rubrics and scoring guides can be found at
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279176&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164
Reliability among faculty on internal assessments is achieved through a group training on rubrics and practice grading portfolios e.g., together prior to actual grading that affects student entrance to program, etc.

2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

(1) The unit did not show how data drive efforts to improve candidate performance or unit operations at the unit level, not just at the program level.

Rationale: This Standard (2b) requires the unit provide evidence "Candidate assessment data are regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations."

Response All data on graduate performance was utilized to improve candidate performance at the unit level.

https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279118&PageId=174312&u=guest&cus=164

Additionally, unit wide Pathwise formative observation data was analyzed, conclusions drawn and recommendations made

https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279119&PageId=174313&u=guest&cus=164

2.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Inclusion of Evidence. Evidence for Standard 2 lacked clarity regarding how exhibits were related to the standard. For example, GPA means were placed in the exhibits without any contextual information to guide the BOE and enlighten our understanding of why the unit was presenting these data for our review.

Response: Exhibits were included for standard 2 as listed in the Institutional Report: Continuous Improvement Option 2.3 p. 4. GPA means for two years were utilized by programs in determining entry into the program. More coherence on use of GPA for program entry can be found on the SPA Program Reports available at AIMS All Programs. To see assessments please open the PDF file in adobe reader. Click on View, Show/Hide, Navigation Pane, Attachments (or View, Navigation Panel, Attachments - depending on your version).

State Program Reports can be found at the following link:

https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279170&PageId=174138&u=guest&cus=164

(2) Program Improvement. Evidence that annual reports for all programs included examples of using data for program improvement. The annual reports for 2009- 2010 were available for review, but only the Agriculture Education program included conclusions and recommendations.

Response: Annual assessment reports with recommendations for improvement can be found at the following page:

https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279175&PageId=175061&u=guest&cus=164

(3) Assessments and Rubrics. All related assessments and their scoring guidelines need to be included in the evidence.

Response: SPA Program Reports are available at AIMS All Programs. To see assessments and scoring guides please open the PDF file in adobe reader. Click on View, Show/Hide, Navigation Pane, Attachments (or View, Navigation Panel, Attachments - depending on your version).

State Program Reports can be found at the following link:

https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279170&PageId=174138&u=guest&cus=164

<mark>Pathwise and Educational Benchmarking Institute Surveys (EBI) rubrics and scoring guides can be found at</mark>
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279176&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

(4) Unit Improvement.   The manner in which the assessment system is used to inform unit improvement was not presented in the IR and exhibits.
Response: <mark>Unit wide improvement sections can be found in all three assessments reports in the IR addendum Standard 2. In addition, the following page has the unit wide assessment sections from all three reports.</mark>
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279177&PageId=174313&u=guest&cus=164

(5) Advanced programs assessment system. More information about the advanced system or systems is needed.
Response: <mark>The advanced programs assessment system for Special Education and Educational Leadership can be found in the SPA reports under All Programs. To see the assessments for each program, please open the PDF file in adobe reader. Click on View, Show/Hide, Navigation Pane, Attachments (or View, Navigation Panel, Attachments - depending on your version).</mark>
<mark>Major assessments for advanced programs and specific information about the M. Ed. in CIED major assessment can be found at the link below.</mark>
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279179&PageId=147157&u=guest&cus=164

(6) Assessment system.   It is unclear what the unit assessment system actually is. Reference is made to an assessment system for each initial program and each advanced program.   Where/how are data collected regularly and systematically, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations?   What is the difference between the unit assessment system and the data management system?
Response: <mark>Talking point in intro to unit</mark>.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
3.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard

<mark>**Response to AFI below**: Training and qualifications for mentor teachers in the educational leadership program can be found at the following link:</mark>
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279182&PageId=175087&u=guest&cus=164

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
	ADV	
2. The unit lacks adequate provisions for selecting and orientating site-based supervisors for the educational administration program.		Although a description is given for mentor teachers/supervisors, it is not clear if it also applies to supervisors for the educational administration program.

3.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Field Experience and Clinical Practice Placements.   Data on candidate placements in field experiences and clinical practice is needed to verify that candidates are getting diverse placements. (The IR indicated that this is in process but was not available at the time of the report.)
Response: The field experience data base will be demonstrated during the onsite visit. A screen shot of the data base can be viewed at the link below.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279180&PageId=173115&u=guest&cus=164

(2) P-12 Collaboration.   Examples across programs that collaborative activities between unit and P-12 schools are taking place. (Activities are noted in the IR, but no evidence is presented except one P-12 school agreement template.)
Response: The Northwest Arkansas Partnership Steering Committee is our formal vehicle for collaboration between the PEU and the P-12 schools. Membership list, agendas, minutes, attendance records and a survey of members can be found at the following URL:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279181&PageId=175078&u=guest&cus=164

(3) Mentor Teacher Qualifications.   Does this apply to both initial and advanced licensure programs?
Response: Mentor teacher qualifications apply across all initial programs. The advanced licensure candidates are primarily inservice teachers. The two advanced licensure programs are special education and educational leadership. Qualifications for mentor teachers in these programs can be found at the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279182&PageId=175087&u=guest&cus=164
The M. Ed. In CIED does **not** result in a license. However, they do conduct action research in the field as part of their degree and are supervised as follows:

Supervision of M.Ed. Action Research Project Advanced Program
Action research projects conducted as a part of the CIED M.Ed. program are supervised by a faculty advisor who holds graduate faculty status level ? (which ever level is required to chair an M.Ed. committee). All research must be signed by the faculty advisor before being approved by the Institutional Review Board prior to implementation of the human subject protocol. The faculty advisor provides support and supervises each step of the process, from identification of a topic for investigation through the proposing, implementing, as well as collecting, analyzing and reporting of data.

(4) Advanced Candidate Evaluation.   Need evaluation instruments for advanced programs.
Response: Advanced Candidate evaluations for licensure can be found in the Special Education and Educational Leadership SPA reports under AIMS All Programs. Please open the PDF file in adobe reader. Click on View, Show/Hide, Navigation Pane, Attachments (or View, Navigation Panel, Attachments - depending on your version). Major assessments for advanced candidates in the M. Ed. CIED program which is not a licensure program, can be found at this link below:

https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279179&PageId=147157&u=guest&cus=164

(5) Partnerships.   Need partnership agreement with community colleges and enrollment information.
(6) Partnerships.   Need partnership agreement with the UK partner school.
Response to 5 & 6: Partnership agreement with the Department of Defense schools which includes the UK and the memo of understanding with Northwest Arkansas Community College is at the link below:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279281&PageId=173943&u=guest&cus=164

(7) Candidate assessment. Clarify the multiple measures used to evaluate candidate performance in initial programs (refer to tables provided).
Response: All candidates in initial programs have formative observations utilizing Pathwise during their internship/student teaching Pathwise observation instrument, scoring guide and scores are available at the following link: .
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279203&PageId=173113&u=guest&cus=164

Candidates also have internal assessments as listed in the SPA report for their program. These reports can be accessed under "All Programs" Please open the PDF file in adobe reader. Click on View, Show/Hide, Navigation Pane, Attachments (or View, Navigation Panel, Attachments - depending on your version). Candidates in programs with state reports also have internal program assessments as listed in each program report. Program reports are available on the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279170&PageId=174138&u=guest&cus=164

Other internal assessments can be viewed at the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279205&PageId=141055&u=guest&cus=164
Finally, candidates' performance as graduates is evaluated by an external state evaluator using Praxis III. Praxis III scores can be found at the link below.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279206&PageId=174312&u=guest&cus=164

Standard 4: Diversity
4.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Diverse Placements.   Data on candidate placements in field experiences and clinical practice. The IR indicated that this is in process but was not available at the time of the report.   (This is also needed for Standard 3).

Response: The field experience data base will be demonstrated during the onsite visit. A screen shot of the data base can be viewed at the link below.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279180&PageId=173115&u=guest&cus=164

(2) Program agenda or some other documentation of activities with University of Arkansas Pine Bluff.
Response: Documentation of University of Arkansas Pine Bluff and activities with school in Harlem can be found at the link below.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279207&PageId=173116&u=guest&cus=164

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
5.1 Statement about the evidence
However, there was not additional evidence outside of the table provided in the exhibits.
Response: Faculty vita can be found at the two following links.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279211&PageId=173118&u=guest&cus=164

https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279212&PageId=173619&u=guest&cus=164

A review of course syllabi reveals an inconsistency in the presence of the conceptual framework throughout various courses in various programs.
Response: Updated syllabi with reference to conceptual framework can be found at the following links. *Initial Programs*
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279241&PageId=175247&u=guest&cus=164

Advanced Programs
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279242&PageId=175249&u=guest&cus=164

(1) Faculty modeling of best practices in teaching is not clear.
Rationale: There is no evidence in syllabi that professional education faculty use a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of different learning styles. There is little evidence that faculty integrate diversity and technology throughout their teaching.
Response: A table showing integration of diversity in coursework by faculty can be found at the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279213&PageId=175186&u=guest&cus=164
Response: Tables of evidence for technology integration can be found on the link below.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279213&PageId=175186&u=guest&cus=164
(2) Faculty does not appear to be assessing their own effectiveness as teachers.
Rationale: Although there are candidate evaluations, focus group interviews, peer evaluations,

and department head evaluations, nothing is mentioned as to what faculty do with this information. The only requirement seen for the faculty member is a self-reporting of activities. There is no concrete evidence that faculty are assessing their own effectiveness, especially in terms of student learning.

Response: Faculty teaching is evaluated by candidates using the Purdue Survey. Faculty must include the Purdue survey results as part of their annual evaluation. As part of the annual evaluation, faculty must include a paragraph of self-reflection/critique on their teaching effectiveness, In addition, faculty conference with the department head and reflection on teaching effectiveness is part of that conference.

5.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Faculty qualifications. Faculty vitae or other evidence to further show the qualifications of faculty.
Response: Faculty vita can be found at the **two** following links.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279211&PageId=173118&u=guest&cus=164

https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279212&PageId=173619&u=guest&cus=164

 (2) Cooperating teacher qualifications. Verification that all teachers serving as mentor teachers in P-12 schools meet minimum NCATE &state expectations, such as Pathwise training.
Response: Mentor Teacher Qualifications can be found at the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279220&PageId=175215&u=guest&cus=164

(3) Faculty instruction. Confirmation via interviews, syllabi, or evaluations that faculty model a variety of teaching strategies during instruction.
Response: Evidence of faculty modeling a variety of teaching strategies can be found in the chart at the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279213&PageId=175186&u=guest&cus=164

(4) Integration of technology. Evidence of the integration of technology in the teaching and learning process.
Response: Tables of evidence for technology integration can be found on the link below.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279213&PageId=175186&u=guest&cus=164

(5) Faculty research. Documentation of outcomes of research mini-grants awarded for summer research work.
Response: The College's summer research mini-grant program was initiated in the Summer 2011 term, and one faculty team award was made to faculty from the PEU.   Their proposal (see link below) was begun, but they filed an extension due to their inability complete the project due to

building construction disruption.   In 2012, funding for the mini-grant program was increased to $25,000, and one award was made to a faculty team from the Health Professions (Nursing – not part of the PEU).

https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279250&PageId=175278&u=guest&cus=164

(6) Faculty evaluation. Evidence of self-assessment and reflection as part of the evaluation process.

Response: Faculty teaching is evaluated by candidates using the Purdue Survey. Faculty must include the Purdue survey results as part of their annual evaluation. As part of the annual evaluation, faculty must include a paragraph of self-reflection/critique on their teaching effectiveness. All faculty are evaluated annually by a committee of three peers. In addition, faculty conference with the department head and reflection on teaching effectiveness is part of that conference.

(7) Personnel. Updated 1995 College of Education and Health Professions Personnel Document.
(8) Personnel. Drafts and copies of other personnel documents from other colleges where education candidates are enrolled (link provided was not active).
Response: Draft of the new College of Ed & Health Professions Personnel Document and Fulbright Arts & Sciences Personnel Document, and Bumpers Agriculture College personnel document may be found on the link below.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279223&PageId=175217&u=guest&cus=164

(9) Faculty professional development. Documentation of professional development offered from the College of Education and Health Professions.
Response: Documentation of professional development offered by COEHP is on the page linked below
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279226&PageId=175240&u=guest&cus=164

In addition to professional development offered by COEHP, the university offers professional development through the Wally Cordes Teaching and Faculty Support Center. The center provides new faculty support meetings monthly, and not-so-new faculty discussions twice yearly. Teaching Camp is offered each summer through the center. The link to the Teaching and Faculty Support Center is at
http://tfsc.uark.edu/345.php

(10) Faculty professional development. Specific information on funding for professional development, as this varies from department to department, and sometimes is dependent upon a competitive process

Response: Each faculty member in the curriculum department which is 80% of the PEU receives an annual amount for professional development for 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12--$2,200 for tenure track faculty and $800 for clinical. This amount was increased to $3,000 for tenure track and $1,500 for clinical faculty in 2012-13.

(11) New faculty support. Information on the new mentoring system guidelines for faculty.
Response: New faculty support/mentoring program can be found on the following link:

https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279221&PageId=175216&u=guest&cus=164

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. The conceptual framework is not the primary vision that guides decisions of the unit.	ITP,ADV	Key assessments have been aligned to conceptual framework. However, there is no evidence that assessment data drives unit decision-making.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard
Response: Examples of data driven unit decision making can be found in each assessment report under Standard 2 in the IR addendum.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279231&PageId=175061&u=guest&cus=164

The unit wide assessment section of the report can be found at the link below.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279232&PageId=175241&u=guest&cus=164

(1) Faculty load
Rationale: Some faculty loads include no credit for scholarship.   It is not clear that unit is implementing the university's faculty load policy.
Response: The COEHP makes use of different classifications of faculty appointments.   The majority of faculty members in the PEU are "tenured" or "tenure-track" meaning that they have a diverse set of responsibilities in the areas of teaching, research, service, and advising (this is clearly spelled out in the personnel documents and the University's Faculty Handbook).   During the past 15 years, many units have also begun to employ "research" faculty and "clinical" faculty.   These appointments are made to address specific needs, such as teaching or working on research funded assignments.   In the instances in the IR that were questioned, these faculty

members with no scholarship assignment are clinical faculty, meaning that they have been hired, full-time, to provide instruction and advising. The Provost has implemented a planning process to address the guidelines for clinical and research appointed faculty members, and although there has yet to be developed a comprehensive addition to the faculty handbook, these faculty members are employed with the clear understanding that they teach four courses per academic term (a 4-4 load).

(2) Allocation of resources across units
Rationale: Exhibits regarding allocation of resources are incomplete.
Response: Please see complete comparison of state budget allocation by college and distribution of off-campus program income from Global campus at the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279233&PageId=175242&u=guest&cus=164
(3) Involvement of faculty and administrators and practitioners in program planning, implementation, and evaluation.
Rationale: There is no documentation of involvement of practitioners and other faculty from other units in evaluation of the unit and its programs.
(1) Professional Community Involvement in Governance. Documentation of University Teacher Education Board representation, involvement of other faculty, etc. in evaluation of the unit and its programs
Response: The Northwest Arkansas (NWA) Partnership Steering Committee includes practitioners and other faculty from outside the College of Education & Health Professions. The NWA Partnership committee provides evaluation feedback of the unit and its programs at their semi-annual meetings. See membership and minutes at the link below:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279234&PageId=175078&u=guest&cus=164
The NCATE Assessment Steering Committee has members from all programs including art education, Angela LaPorte, agriculture education, Don Edgar, and music education, Robert Docker. The most recent meeting, September 11, 2012, reviewed assessment data as it pertains to the unit and made recommendations for unit improvement.

The University Teacher Education Board, UTEB, is composed of faculty from all colleges with teacher preparation programs and practitioners. All course and program changes proposed for teacher education must be approved by UTEB. Proposed changes in courses and programs must have rationale based on data and show promise for program improvement.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279235&PageId=175244&u=guest&cus=164

6.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit
(2) Resources. Additional documentation of equitable allocation of resources for comparable programs across the university.
Response: Please see complete comparison of state budget allocation by college and distribution of off-campus program income from Global campus at the following link:
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279233&PageId=175242&u=guest&cus=164
(3) Faculty Load. More detail regarding faculty loads.

Response: The COEHP makes use of different classifications of faculty appointments.   The majority of faculty members in the PEU are "tenured" or "tenure-track" meaning that they have a diverse set of responsibilities in the areas of teaching, research, service, and advising (this is clearly spelled out in the personnel documents https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279236&PageId=175217&u=guest&cus=164

 and the University's Faculty Handbook). http://provost.uark.edu/72.php

  During the past 15 years, many units have also begun to employ "research" faculty and "clinical" faculty.   These appointments are made to address specific needs, such as teaching or working on research funded assignments.   In the instances in the IR that were questioned, these faculty members with no scholarship assignment are clinical faculty, meaning that they have been hired, full-time, to provide instruction and advising.   The Provost has implemented a planning process to address the guidelines for clinical and research appointed faculty members, and although there has yet to be developed a comprehensive addition to the faculty handbook, these faculty members are employed with the clear understanding that they teach four courses per academic term (e.i. 4-4 load).

(4) Conceptual Framework.   Evidence that the CF guides unit decision-making.

Response: The conceptual framework is aligned with Pathwise and Praxis III which are utilized extensively in unit assessment. See link below for alignment matrices.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279237&PageId=175245&u=guest&cus=164
Unit assessments can be viewed at the link below or in the assessment reports in the IR addendum under standard 2.
https://ep3.chalkandwire.com/ep2_uark/SecureUrlPage.aspx?urlId=55279282&PageId=175241&u=guest&cus=164