



NCATE

The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS,
FAYETTEVILLE

324 Graduate Education Building

Fayetteville, AR 72701

October 28-30, 2012

Type of Visit:

Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation

Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

Institutional Report for Visits (Continuous Improvement Option) in Fall 2012 and Beyond

I. Overview and Conceptual Framework

This section sets the context for the visit. It should state the institution's characteristics and mission, along with a description of the professional education unit. The basic tenets of the conceptual framework should also be discussed.

I.1 What are the institution's historical context and unique characteristics (e.g., HBCU or religious)?

The University of Arkansas was founded in 1871 in Fayetteville in the NW region of the State. It is the state's largest and most distinguished institution of higher learning and is the flagship school of the UA System. This system extends to five universities, five community colleges, a college of medicine, two schools of law, a presidential school, a math and science high school, and divisions of agriculture, archeology and criminal justice.

The University of Arkansas, originally called Arkansas Industrial University, opened its doors to students on January 22, 1872, created under the Morrill Land-Grant College Act of 1862. Its location was determined by the result of a statewide competition sparked by the General Assembly's Organic Act of 1871.

For the past 139 years, the University of Arkansas has been at the center of higher education in the state of Arkansas, and recently has moved to the center of higher education in the nation. The recently completed "Campaign for the 21st Century," raised more than \$1 billion for the school, used in part to create a new Honors College and significantly increase the university's endowment. Among these gifts was the largest gift given to a public university in America (\$300 million), given by the Walton Family Charitable Support Foundation.

The 2011 Preliminary Enrollment Report shows a record student enrollment of 23,199. The latest report (2010) on instructional faculty shows 1,026 faculty members. Students come from Arkansas, other states, and some 120 countries. The university has over 214 academic programs at the baccalaureate, master's and doctoral levels. The Carnegie Foundation categorizes the University of Arkansas as having "high research activity" placing it among the top ten percent of universities nationwide. The U. S. News and World Report ranked the University of Arkansas as 127 in its 2011 ratings. In the 2012 rankings, the University moved up to a rank 106.

I.2 What is the institution's mission?

The University of Arkansas seeks to integrate student engagement, scholarship and research, and innovation that collectively transforms lives and inspires leadership for a global society. In addition, as the flagship campus of the University of Arkansas System, the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville serves as the state's major center of liberal and professional education and as Arkansas' main source of theoretical and applied research.

I.3 What is the professional education unit at your institution, what is its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators, and what are

the significant changes since the last NCATE review?

The professional education unit at the University of Arkansas is primarily found in the Curriculum and Instruction Department (CIED) of the College of Education and Health Professions (COEHP). which prepares candidates for childhood education (CHED), secondary education (SEED), career and technology education (CATE), and educational leadership (EDLE) in the role of a building or district administrator. CATE and EDLE were moved to the Curriculum Department since the last NCATE visit to have most of the teacher preparation programs in the college located in one department. Another program found in the COEHP is the health and physical education teacher preparation program which is housed in the Health, Human Performance and Recreation Department (HHPR). This program was kept in the HHPR department due to the need for equipment and facilities found in that department. The departments' heads meet together monthly which facilitates communication between these programs. Music education and art education are part of the Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences. Both program chairs sit on our University Teacher Education Board (UTEB) committee as does a representative from the agriculture education program. Agriculture education is housed in the Dale Bumpers College of Agriculture, Food and Life Sciences. The field experiences director works with all teacher education programs to plan appropriate and diverse field placements. The assistant dean for assessment and accreditation in COEHP works with all program for assessment issues. In preparing SPA reports, programs from across the university gathered to share expertise and support each other in completion of the individual reports. All programs use the Pathwise formative observation tool during candidate internship. Mentor teachers are surveyed annually from all programs. Educational Benchmark exit and alumni surveys are also used cross programs. The teacher licensure officer collects data and submits applications for licensure from all teacher licensure programs at the university. Our relationship among programs is collegial and supportive.

I.4 Summarize basic tenets of the conceptual framework, institutional standards and candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions as well as significant changes made to the conceptual framework since the last NCATE review?

Conceptual Framework

The Conceptual Framework for the Professional Education Unit (PEU) is derived from the mission of the University and College and from professional literature and represents the views of numerous constituencies, including PEU faculty, public school teachers, administrators, and candidates. University of Arkansas graduates are prepared to become knowledgeable, skillful, caring, and inquiring scholar-practitioners in diverse educational settings who can balance the needs and aspirations of each learner with the expectations of an increasingly complex and technological society. Scholar-practitioners are teachers, administrators, counselors, and other school professionals who value theory and research, understand that theory and practice are complementary and mutually reinforcing, and are committed to the enhancement of teaching, learning, and professional practice.

The Conceptual Framework for the Professional Education Unit of the University of Arkansas serves to establish a "shared vision for ... efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools." In so doing, it "provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service and unit accountability" (Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions, NCATE, 2008, p. 14).

The goal of the PEU, preparing professional educators to be scholar-practitioners, is fully congruent with broader state and institutional mission and goals. The Scholar-Practitioner Model forms the basis for preparing teachers, administrators, and other school professionals. This preparation occurs at the basic and advanced levels and ties directly into the COEHP mission of enhancing the quality of life of citizens of Arkansas and the nation. Teachers, administrators, counselors, and other school professionals

play a significant role in the quality of life for all of our citizens.

The underlying philosophy of the University of Arkansas PEU espouses public education as the basis for our liberty, form of government, and economic viability. Moreover, the quality of public education and its ability to support our liberty, form of government, and economic viability rests directly on the quality of professional educators in schools.

Scholar-practitioners, whether classroom teachers, school administrators, or other school personnel, must be knowledgeable, skillful, caring, and inquiring. They must possess the seven tenets that represent scholar-practitioners. These educational professionals are among the most critical professionals in our society. Without an educated populace, democracy cannot survive. This was an understanding of our nation's founders and continues to be evident in our society.

The overarching goal of the PEU is to offer effective, academically-rigorous preparatory programs for future educators as scholar-practitioners who advocate for the learning of all children. Professional educators are prepared for teaching, administration, counseling, and other school professions. The scholar-practitioner reflects a professional who is knowledgeable about subject matter and pedagogy; skillful in teaching and managing classrooms and schools; caring about students, families, school staff and the community; and constantly inquiring to better the profession and increase the success of students, schools and the community. The Scholar-Practitioner is defined by the following tenets:

1. One who accesses, uses, and/or generates knowledge
2. One who plans, implements, and models best practices
3. One who understands, respects, and values diversity
4. One who is a developing professional and a lifelong learner
5. One who communicates, cooperates, and collaborates with others
6. One who makes decisions based upon ethical standards and professional criteria
7. One who is knowledgeable about teachers and teaching, learners and learning, and schools and schooling

Knowledgeable. Professional educators must possess general knowledge, content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and professional knowledge to be effective. The scholar-practitioner tenets that accompany knowledgeable are: 1) One who accesses, uses, or generates knowledge, 3) One who understands, respects, and values diversity, and 7) One who is knowledgeable about teachers and teaching, learners and learning, and schools and schooling.

Skillful. This includes the pedagogy required to be an effective teacher, administrator, or other school professional. Tenets associated with skillful include: 2) One who plans, implements, and models best practices including best technology practices and 5) One who communicates, cooperates, and collaborates with others.

Caring. Caring about students, fellow educators, parents, and the community is also important. The caring component includes dispositions. In the context of this definition, the PEU has identified those dispositions that we seek to inculcate in our professional education candidates. Tenets associated with caring include: 3) One who understands, respects and values diversity and 6) One who makes decisions based upon ethical standards and professional criteria.

Inquiring As scholars, candidates are expected to continue to inquire and seek to improve their practice. This involves staying current with educational research and working with appropriate professional organizations to better the professions. The tenet associated with inquiring is 4) One who is a developing professional and a lifelong learner.

Graduates from the University of Arkansas are expected to be scholar-practitioners who advocate for the learning of all children in diverse settings. 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.

I.5 Exhibits

I.5.a	Links to unit catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies
I.5.b	Syllabi for professional education courses
I.5.c	Conceptual framework(s)
I.5.d	Findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, APA, CACREP)
I.5.e	Updated institutional, program, and faculty information under institutional work space in AIMS

DIRECTIONS FOR ACCESSING EXHIBITS.docx

See **Attachments** panel below.

1. Standard 1. Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 What do candidate assessment data tell the unit about candidates' meeting professional, state, and institutional standards and their impact on P-12 student learning? For programs not nationally/state reviewed, summarize data from key assessments and discuss these results.

Initial Program candidates increase their content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge through program courses in curriculum, instruction, research methods, special education, and child and adolescent development. Assessment data in both initial and advanced programs include grade point averages, Praxis assessment scores, key artifacts posted and assessed on the Chalk and Wire portfolio system, course grades on selected courses, interviews, letters of recommendation, Pathwise® assessment scores, dispositional assessments, sample lesson plans, pre-internship interviews, self-assessments, and a cumulative portfolio. Candidates in childhood education (P-4), secondary education (English, social studies, foreign language, science, mathematics), special education (includes gifted), career and technical education (business, family and consumer science, technology education) also conduct and present action research during their M.A.T./M.E.D. internship. However, for the purpose of standard 1, candidate performance in Praxis III, Pathwise assessment data, and Educational Benchmarking (EBI) results best describe what candidate assessment data tells the unit about candidates' meeting professional, state, and institutional standards and their impact on P-12 student learning.

The Pathwise Formative Observation instrument is used as one of several assessment tools in all licensure programs and is a useful in gauging the overall effectiveness of candidates in teaching P-12

students. Successful performance across all four domains of Pathwise is also a requirement for the successful completion of the internship requirement and graduation in the unit. One hundred percent of unit graduates of teacher licensure programs passed the Pathwise assessment.

Pathwise is an observation-based assessment system that measures candidate effectiveness in teaching P-12 students. The unit uses this instrument across all educational programs. Pathwise is grounded in 19 essential teaching criteria that are divided into four domains of teaching where data is gathered: 1) Domain A: Organizing content knowledge for student learning, 2) Domain B: Creating an environment for student learning, 3) Domain C: Teaching for student learning, and 4) Domain D: Teacher professionalism. Pathwise utilizes a system of conferencing, observation, reflection, and feedback. Unit candidates have been assessed at least twice during their internship. The system calls for candidates to submit a lesson plan and pre-observation interview form prior to the Pathwise assessment. Following the assessment, the observing faculty member reviews the assessment with the candidate. Candidates are provided with a score from a low score of 1 to a high score of 3 on each of 19 criteria in the four domains, as well as written and oral feedback. The unit uses the Pathwise assessment throughout clinical experiences, internships, and student teaching experiences. Exhibit 1.3c Pathwise provides data concerning the performance of initial licensure candidates on the Pathwise Assessment System for 2008-2011. The table includes the results of assessments across 15 licensure content areas in the unit. Over 1,000 candidates were assessed using this system from 2008-2011. Each of these candidates was assessed at least twice during their internship.

In Domain A, Organizing knowledge for student learning, candidates maintained an average composite score of 12.53 out of a possible score of 15. Domain A includes criteria that address student background knowledge and experiences, the articulation of clear goals, and the use of appropriate content, methodology, and assessment techniques. Candidates receive a score in each of these criterion areas and a composite score for the domain. Criterion scores can fall into the following categories: a) 1.0 little or no evidence, b) 1.5 beginning, c) 2 demonstrates the criteria, d) 2.5 approaching mastery; and e) 3 mastery. A composite score of 12.53 indicates an average score of 2.55 across all five criteria in the domain. In Domain B, Creating an environment for student learning, candidates maintained an average composite score of 13.15 out of a possible score of 15 and a mean score of 2.68 across all five criteria in the domain. Domain B includes five criteria that address items of fairness, maintaining rapport, challenging learning expectations, maintaining consistent standards, and maintaining a safe learning environment. The composite scores across Domain B are very high and suggest that candidates are being very successful in creating an appropriate learning environment for students. Domain C, Teaching for student learning, includes five criteria related to learning goals, instructional procedures, curriculum delivery, extending student thinking, adjusting learning methodologies, and using instructional time effectively. Candidates maintained an average composite score of 13.09 out of a possible 15 across all criteria in Domain C, indicating that candidates are providing high quality instructional experiences, extending student thinking, continuously monitoring student understanding, and are using instructional time effectively. Domain D, Teacher professionalism, includes criteria related to teacher reflection, teacher efficacy, professional relationships, and communicating with parents/guardians. Candidates maintained an average composite score of 10.23 out of 12 possible points across this domain--indicating an average score of 2.56 on all four criteria. An average score of 2.56 suggests that candidates are approaching mastery on the criteria.

The Pathwise Assessment System provides the unit with a valuable measure of candidate's impact on student learning in the 15 licensure content areas during the internship experiences. In particular, the assessment system allows the unit to gage candidate growth and mastery in the content areas, the learning environment, the development of instruction that leads to student learning, and in the development of professional teacher dispositions.

Another important measure of candidate's impact on P-12 student learning is the Praxis III performance assessment. The Office of Teacher Quality at the Arkansas Department of Education utilizes the Praxis III performance assessment as a tool for converting an Initial Teaching License to a Standard Teaching License. New teachers with an Initial Teaching License complete Praxis III during their first or second year of teaching in Arkansas. Praxis III uses structured interviews before and after a classroom observation, requires written descriptions of the novice teacher's class and subject matter, and involves direct observation of the teacher's classroom practices by a trained, state-certified teacher performance assessor. In the 2010-11 Praxis III assessment, graduates from the unit met the statewide mean of 51, with a range from a score of 45.5 to a high score of 56.5. These 138 employed teachers represented all initial licensure areas at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

The Educational Benchmarking (EBI) metric is used to gather follow-up data from graduating candidates, alumni, and their employers. The EBI follow-up survey is administered to graduates and principals during the first three years of candidate employment after graduation. The most recent administration of this instrument (2011) resulted in responses from 230 exiting candidates, and 78 graduates and employing principals. The instrument consists of 14 factors and multiple questions under each factor. Factor 4, Aspects of Student Development, most accurately addresses the degree to which graduates from the unit are impacting P-12 student development. Factor 4 consists of 13 questions ranging from the degree to which the unit enhanced the graduate's ability to foster classroom collaboration to the degree that education course work enhanced the graduate's ability to engage students in the learning process. EBI uses a 7 point scale, ranging from (1) not at all to (7) extremely. Additionally, EBI compares the responses of graduates from our unit with graduates from other institutions in the same Carnegie class (i.e., University of Alabama, Auburn University, Vanderbilt University, etc.). Data generated from the responses placed the unit well above the comparison units on Factor 4, aspects of student development. These categories include: Effectively developing lessons, engaging students in the learning process, fostering intellectual development of students, encouraging positive social interaction among students, developing curricula, encouraging self motivation in students, fostering social development of students, and fostering holistic learning. Overall, the results of the EBI suggest that the unit is having a positive impact on P-12 student learning. The content/subject matter knowledge of our candidates is also perceived by them to be above the ratings of comparison institutions. Finally the overall program effectiveness is rated higher than other peer units are rated.

Advanced programs in Special Education submit Specialized Professional Association reports (SPA) to Council of Exceptional Children (CEC) and the Educational Leadership program submits to the Educational Leadership /Constituent Council (ELCC). Both of these programs are recognized by their national SPA. The advanced program in Career and Technology Education is approved by the state. Students in both of these programs must pass a Praxis 2 exam(s). Results are listed in the assessment report (Standard 2).

Candidates in the CIED M. Ed. programs must meet requirements established by the program. These requirements now include an action research project as evidence of impact on P-12 student learning. The comprehensive exam/teacher action research pass rates in are 100 percent.

1.2 Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

- **Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.**
- **Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that**

have led to target level performance.

- **Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in unit Standard 1.**

1.2.b Continuous Improvement

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 1.**

At the end of each spring semester, the unit accreditation office issues an assessment report. This report includes the results of Praxis subject tests, summative evaluation data, mentor teacher assessment data, the results of exit focus groups, EBI assessment data, admission portfolio data, and candidate interview data for all programs (e.g., childhood education, secondary education, health/kinesiology, etc.). Program faculty members draw conclusions and issue recommendations after meeting to review this assessment report. Several substantial programmatic and unit changes have occurred as a result of this assessment report review. Some of these resulting changes are outlined in the following paragraphs.

- A review of assessment data and the need to better coordinate progression through the initial teacher licensure program resulted in the 2007 implementation of the Chalk and Wire portfolio system. Mentor teacher assessment data and summative assessment data illustrated that candidate growth through the program was not documented adequately. This same data identified a potentially missed learning opportunity for candidates. With many candidates completing their first philosophy of teaching assignment or their first lesson plan in an undergraduate class and subsequent related assignments later in graduate school, the potential for faculty and the candidate to examine growth through the program was latent. After implementing the Chalk and Wire portfolio system and the subsequent development of rubrics for lesson plans, classroom management plans, philosophy and other assignments, faculty and candidates are able to see growth through the program.
- In 2008, secondary education exit focus group assessment data revealed that although candidates were far exceeding the state requirement for student teaching internships, they were largely completing these internships in four large school districts in Northwest Arkansas. In many ways, these four school districts in Northwest Arkansas do not represent the norm common to the majority of the State of Arkansas. In general terms, these four districts are larger, wealthier, more diverse, and include larger disciplinary departments than do the majority of schools in a very rural state. Many candidates indicated that, while the program prepared them well for large suburban schools districts, it did not adequately prepare them to teach in a small district where they might be the only foreign language teacher, or the only advanced mathematics teacher. The secondary education faculty worked with administrators and faculty from 28 rural school districts and faculty from Fulbright College of Arts and Science to initiate the very successful Rural Schools Initiative. The initiative led to the development of the mechanisms that now result in all secondary education candidates being placed in at least one rotation (at least nine weeks) in a rural school during the 1 year internship.

- Similar to the Rural School Initiative, the secondary education faculty initiated a new initiative in the spring of 2011 to place candidates in urban schools and high minority schools in downstate Arkansas. This initiative resulted from focused interviews with graduates from the program--several of whom now teach in larger city schools. Given the geography and population of the State of Arkansas, placing interns in large inner city schools has been difficult. The largest city in the state, Little Rock, has a population of less than 200,000 and no city in Arkansas has an international airport. However, with the potential assistance of a local benefactor, the secondary education faculty has developed a plan that would allow the first group of interns to complete one internship rotation in an urban school district during the spring semester of 2012.
- The fall of 2010, all undergraduate academic advisors were relocated to the academic departments from their previous home in the Boyer Center in the Graduate Education Building. For several years, focused interviews of graduating candidates had revealed a communication problem between the professional academic advisors (candidate advisors for the first 44 hours) and faculty advisors in the academic departments. Candidates complained that they were receiving differing and often contrary academic advice from the professional advisors than they were from the program faculty. After an administrative review of the situation, it was determined that the physical location of the two entities was exacerbating the problem. Follow-up conversations with candidates during the spring of 2011 focused interviews revealed that the relocation had greatly reduced the communication problem between the faculty advisors and the professional academic advisors. In fact, not one candidate complaint was issued on this matter during the spring of 2011.
- Each year, the unit hosts meetings and discussion groups with local school partners. In 2007 these discussions led to the implementation of two content concentrations and a new mathematics methods course for childhood education candidates. Given the rapidly expanding population of non-English speaking students in Arkansas (the majority in Northwest Arkansas) and the need to more adequately prepare candidates who held special education credentials, leaders from partner schools and faculty from the childhood education launched two new concentrations in the childhood education program. Following implementation in the fall of 2008, childhood education candidates have to select one of two concentrations: English as a second language or special education. This results in childhood education majors graduating with a concentration in one of those two areas. After reviewing the results of the annual assessment report during the summer of 2011, particularly the results of the focused interviews with childhood education candidates, the childhood education faculty are currently initiating plans to implement two additional concentrations. Beginning in the fall of 2012, childhood education candidates will be required to select from one of four concentrations. In addition to the previous two concentrations in ESL and special education, candidates will select from a concentration in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) or middle level endorsement as well. By having these four concentrations, childhood education candidates will be in a position to specialize and become more marketable to particular school districts in the state.
- During the spring and summer of 2008 interviews with school administrators during partner meetings and specially called informational meetings revealed the need to move more advanced programs to on-line delivery platforms. The rural geography and difficult mountain roads made it very difficult for full-time teachers and administrators to participate in advanced programs in the unit. Faculty in various programs worked with public school partners and the Global Campus to launch two new on-line programs. The educational leadership M.E.D. program (principal licensure) and the secondary education M.E.D. in career and technical education were transitioned to fully on-line programs. Both programs have witnessed substantial enrollment growth since these programs were launched in the fall of 2009. For example, the secondary M.E.D. in career and technical education has grown from no enrolled students to an enrollment of 35 candidates in three years.

Plans for Sustaining and Enhancing

Substantial organizational changes and improvements have occurred in the unit during the past two years. Notably, a new position of Assistant Dean for Accreditation and Assessment was launched in the fall of 2009. This assistant dean created the new Boyer Center for accreditation, assessment, and licensure. With this new office, several key positions were created that have substantially improved the organization of the unit, the gathering and use of unit data, and unit responsiveness to candidates and faculty. Some of the new positions include: The director of field placement, the assessment assistant, and the portfolio help desk assistant. Additionally, the unit licensure officer was relocated to the Boyer Center. These organizational changes and additions have substantially improved the operation of the unit and have led to noticeable increases in the use of data within academic programs. Moreover, these changes have led to a more cohesive unit that acts as one rather than 15 different units. This new organizational structure will allow the unit to:

- Strengthen ties with external school partners by presenting the unit to the school leaders as an organized unit that acts as one entity;
- Respond more quickly as a unit to data generated by external school partners, candidates, follow-up studies, and assessment data;
- Launch new and revised programs in a timely fashion. For example the new STEM and 5-6 endorsement concentrations for the childhood education program was just mined from the assessment data during the summer of 2011 and the new program modification will be submitted in the fall of 2011. This will position this change to be implemented during the fall of 2012. Implementing a major curriculum modification only one year after it was initiated is remarkable in post secondary education.

1.3 Exhibits

1.3.a	State program review documents and state findings (Some of these documents may be available in AIMS.)
1.3.b	Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years
1.3.c	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing candidate learning against standards and proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Some of this information may be accessible for nationally recognized programs in AIMS. Cross reference as appropriate.)
1.3.d	Data and summaries of results on key assessments, including proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Data should be disaggregated by program, and for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs.)
1.3.e	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing professional dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn
1.3.f	Data and summaries of results on key assessments of candidates' professional dispositions (Data should be disaggregated by program, and for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs.)
1.3.g	Examples of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning
1.3.h	Samples of candidates' work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels) from programs across the unit
1.3.i	Follow-up studies of graduates and summaries of the results
1.3.j	Employer feedback on graduates and summaries of the results
1.3.k	Data collected by state and/or national agencies on performance of educator preparation programs and the effectiveness of their graduates in classrooms and schools, including student achievement data, when available

See **Attachments** panel below.

2. Standard 2. 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 How does the unit use its assessment system to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations?

The Unit Assessment System at the University of Arkansas (Exhibit 2.3.d) was created in response to a professional responsibility to ensure graduates of our programs are of the highest quality. The annual assessment report documents candidate, program, and unit strengths and areas for improvement. Both quantitative and qualitative data are included in the assessment report. Quantitative sources utilized in this assessment include Praxis test scores and Pathwise observation evaluations, exit surveys, and alumni surveys. Praxis test scores include the Praxis II, which candidates must pass before completing the program, and Praxis III, taken during the first year teaching as part of the permanent licensure process. During candidates' internship or student teaching year, a Pathwise observation evaluation which parallels Praxis III is scored according to Arkansas standards and recorded for each intern. A mentor teacher survey is also conducted annually to obtain feedback from our public school partners. Focus groups of students provide qualitative feedback to the department head as do meetings of the Northwest Arkansas Steering Committee which is comprised of public school partner principals and mentor teachers.

All data and findings are compiled into an assessment report and disseminated to the program chairs in the Professional Education Unit. The Assessment Committee and program members analyze the data relative to their programmatic offerings, looking for strengths and weaknesses and ways to improve the program. They submit their recommendations for improvement based on the data provided. The program recommendations are then incorporated into the assessment report and implemented the following year.

An example of how this process was utilized successfully in the Educational Leadership advanced program is as follows:

One area of interest was candidate performance on Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standard 2.2. The curriculum project measures standard 2.2 twice (in part 1 and again in part 2). When students were asked to apply principles of effective instruction that improve practice they all performed at the "outstanding" level but when part of the assignment asked students to "Demonstrate the ability to use and promote technology and information systems to enrich curriculum and instruction, and to monitor instructional practices" only 58% of students met the "outstanding" criteria and 30% scored a 3 out of 5 (emergent). We identified two issues that may play a role in these relatively low scores. First, it is not clear that the criteria in the rubric are closely aligned with the assignment. To avoid confusion we are adjusting the instructions to candidates in the assignment to use similar language to the criteria in the rubric. Second, we will emphasize presenting candidates with models of using technology to monitor and enrich curriculum and instruction prior to administering this assessment.

2.2 Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

- **Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.**
- **Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.**
- **Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in unit Standard 2.**

2.2.b Continuous Improvement

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 2.**

Centralized, continuous data collection, program level analysis and recommendation for improvement have been ongoing since the 2006-07 school year. Chalk and Wire electronic portfolio system has been adopted for collection and evaluation of student key assessments. A CIED faculty member was given half release time to take on the duties of assessment coordinator. The faculty member was trained as a Board of Examiner (BOE) and participated in BOE team visits to become more familiar with what is required for accreditation. Annual dates were established to collect appropriate data pieces such as the Pathwise formative observation, mentor teacher surveys, and candidate exit surveys. In fall 2009 the assessment coordinator position was folded into the Assistant Dean for Assessment and Accreditation in the Dean's Office for Academic Affairs. Gate checks such as Praxis I completion prior to entry into program were centralized with the teacher licensure officer and assistant dean for accreditation. In the fall of 2010 a field services coordinator position was established and the assistant dean and the teacher licensure officer were all moved to one location, the Boyer Center for Student Services. This allows centralized record keeping and monitoring of data collection.

The first comprehensive assessment report was completed in December 2006 for the spring 2007 focus visit. Since that time the report has been ongoing each year and the data collected has been separated into program groups for analysis. The data has also been refined in the case of the Praxis 2 to more closely reflect the student population in our program and not just students who had taken courses at the University of Arkansas at one time. Educational Benchmark Reports on candidate exit surveys and alumni surveys have also been added to the report.

In fall 2010, the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) distributed a novice teacher survey to all first year teachers in Arkansas and linked the responses with the institution where the teacher received training. This is an important additional piece of data.

Within the advanced programs, the additional requirement of a teacher action research project for our M. Ed. students in elementary and secondary education has led our advanced candidates to measure how research based strategies affect student achievement.

Table 2 Unit Assessment System (UAS) Advanced Programs

Program M.Ed. M.Ed. Ed.S. Ed.D. ESL M.Ed. M.Ed. M.Ed. M.Ed.
 ELED EDAD EDAD EDAD Endorse SEED SPED WDED ETEC
 Key Assessments/Measures:

Entry

GPA √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

GRE/MAT √ √

Recommendations √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Interviews √ √ √

Current Teaching license √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Essay √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Continuation

Pathwise

Standards Rubrics √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Observations √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Annual Progress Review √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Course Evaluations √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Action Research Projects √ √ √

Formative Portfolios √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Internships/Practicum √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Exit

Comprehensive exams √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Summative Portfolios √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Praxis II √ √

Follow-up

Survey-Alumni, mentors, employers √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

EBI Survey √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Praxis I, II, III results √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Analyses

Faculty review data √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Data entered into database √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Annual Assessment Report √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Changes

Changes in textbooks √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Changes in Course syllalbi √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

Changes in field experiences √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √

2.3 Exhibits

2.3.a	Description of the unit's assessment system in detail including the requirements and key assessments used at transition points
2.3.b	Admission criteria and data from key assessments used for entry to programs
2.3.c	Policies, procedures and practices for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and evaluations of program quality and unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias

2.3.d	Policies, procedures and practices for ensuring that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used for continuous improvement
2.3.e	Data and summaries of results on key assessments disaggregated by program, alternate route, off-campus, and distance learning programs (Cross reference with Exhibits 1.3.d and 1.3.f as appropriate)
2.3.f	Policies, procedures and practices for managing candidate complaints
2.3.g	File of candidate complaints and the unit's responses and resolutions (This information should be available during the onsite visit)
2.3.h	Examples of significant changes made to courses, programs, and the unit in response to data gathered from the assessment system

DIRECTIONS FOR ACCESSING EXHIBITS.docx

See **Attachments** panel below.

3. Standard 3. The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 How does the unit work with the school partners to deliver field experiences and clinical practice to enable candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn?

The unit works with school partners to deliver field experiences and clinical practice that allow candidates to deliver the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions needed to become true "scholar/practitioners" who help all students learn. The unit places students in 15 local school districts for observations and internships through the newly created Office of Field Placement (OFP). Communication is on-going between the OFP and local school administrators to ensure the needs of candidates and host schools are addressed.

Initial Teacher Licensure Programs

Field experiences range from a one-hour observation to year-long clinical experience labeled as teaching internship. In Health and Physical Education, Career and Technology Education, Agriculture Education, Art Education and Music Education candidates clinical experience is a semester long. Candidates beginning pre-professional work enroll in an introduction practicum during their freshman or sophomore year which places them in three different schools over the semester. Candidates in this course observe classes at one elementary school, one middle school or junior high school, and one high school. Candidates also take Classroom Learning Theory which requires 12 hours of in-class observation in the same classroom over the semester. All candidates also enroll in Survey of Exceptionalities which includes a 10 hour field experience component at local agencies that serve people with disabilities. The culminating field experience is a student teaching internship which lasts one semester or an entire school year, depending on the program. Other observation and teaching requirements vary by program. (See Exhibit 3.3.b)

Candidates are placed in local schools through collaboration among the Director of Field Placement, unit faculty members, school district administrators, and school faculty. The OFP identifies sites,

informs candidates about the process for criminal background checks, establishes formal agreements with schools, and maintains communication between the unit and schools. College faculty and school personnel typically place students within the arranged schools. The unit works with school districts to offer training to mentor teachers each August to prepare them to host candidates. At these trainings, mentor teachers are taught different supervision techniques, given information about expectations of the mentors and candidates, and have the opportunity to speak with other mentors and unit faculty members about the internship year. Training in the Pathwise© formative observation instrument is offered at the regional co-op numerous times in the summer and mentor teachers are required to attend training prior to serving as a mentor.

Efforts are made to ensure candidates have diverse field placements. Secondary candidates are placed at both rural and urban schools during their education. Data on percentage of English Language Learners, racial minorities, and socioeconomic status are collected on all partner schools. This data is used to inform field placements in order to secure diverse experiences for candidates. As part of preparing candidates to teach all students, they take a Survey of Exceptionalities course where they must do a case study of a child with exceptionalities. In this course, candidates also serve at least 10 hours in a community agency that works with people with disabilities.

In the area of content knowledge, secondary candidates are prepared prior to field experiences. Childhood education, agriculture education, physical & health education, art education and music education candidates receive content knowledge alongside field experiences. Candidates in secondary education must have a major in the content area they wish to teach or a required number of content courses with a grade point average on the last 60 hours of 3.0 or higher. Other candidates receive some content knowledge prior to field experience and some alongside their field experience. Knowledge of the diverse student population within the United States is also obtained through curriculum prior to field experiences (see exhibit 4.3.b). Pedagogical knowledge is taught by university faculty who have experience in P-12 schools and clinical adjunct faculty who may still be teaching in P-12 schools.

Pedagogical skills are observed and feedback is given during field experiences in our partner P-12 schools. Our candidates are expected to "plan, implement and model best practices" and also to "communicate, cooperate and collaborate with others." Weekly checklists are completed on childhood education candidates. Teacher work samples (linked to SPA and State Program standards) are collected by all programs from candidates. Evaluation of student learning is typically documented through pre and post assessments. The ETS© Pathwise© formative evaluation is used with all programs. Four primary domains are assessed with Pathwise: A.) Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning, B.) Creating an Environment for Student Learning, C.) Teaching for Student Learning, and D.) Teacher Professionalism. Interns learn about Pathwise in their methods courses to prepare them for evaluation.

Dispositions are taught through ethics (ADE Powerpoint) and our candidates are taught to make decisions based on professional standards and ethical criteria. Pathwise domain A requires candidates to become familiar with relevant aspects of students' background knowledge and experiences. As our candidates become more familiar with student's backgrounds and the challenges the students and their families have overcome, our candidates develop a caring relationship (Pathwise B2 "Establish and maintain rapport") with their students. Fairness is also part of our candidates' ethics. The candidates treat students fairly as measured by Pathwise criteria B1: "creating a climate that promotes fairness." Mentor teachers and university liaisons alike observe candidates to insure they are caring scholar practitioners.

Advanced Programs

Field experiences are also a requirement of advanced programs that lead to careers in schools. The unit has four advanced programs that offer master's degrees to candidates who plan to pursue teaching, counseling, or leadership positions in schools. Field experiences for these programs differ but typically

include in-depth interactions with students and/or administrators.

Counseling education candidates are required to have two years of classroom teaching experience before they can be certified as a counselor. In the counseling education program, candidates conduct at least 600 clock hours interning with a licensed school counselor over two semesters. A minimum of 120 hours each semester are direct contact hours. Direct contact hours may include individual or group counseling sessions or classroom presentations. Candidates are evaluated by the school counselor and course instructor throughout the internship. Candidates submit three videotaped counseling sessions, detailed case studies, and a daily log of internship activities as part of their portfolio.

The special education advanced program is offered on-line and serves candidates throughout the state and region who may not have local access to higher education. Special education candidates are already licensed teachers who want to add a special education credential. They enroll in a practicum as the culminating experience of their program. In practicum, candidates develop and teach a unit plan in a special education classroom in a public school. Typically, candidates teach in the school where they are currently employed. They are observed by a special education supervisor at the school using evaluation techniques and forms developed by the unit. The supervisors are licensed by the state of Arkansas to serve as special education supervisors or are special education teachers if a supervisor cannot be found locally. Candidates develop a portfolio to reflect on their practicum experience. The portfolio includes products that provide evidence of competency in relation to different Council of Exceptional Children standards. Reflective essays are also included with each product to explain how the products correlate with each standard.

Candidates planning to pursue leadership at the building level enroll in the unit's advanced program in educational leadership. The internship portion of this program requires at least 216 hours shadowing building administrators. Most candidates perform the bulk of the internship in the building where they are already employed. However, they must complete at least a portion of their internship in a different school district. Candidates are also required to plan their internship to include experiences with special needs students and students from different ethnic groups. At the completion of the internship, candidates create a portfolio to summarize their experience. The portfolio includes a log of activities and reflections on the experience in addition to other specific assignments.

The curriculum and instruction advanced programs offer further education to teachers who are already licensed. Through the M.Ed. in Elementary or Secondary Education, teachers can add an area of licensure or take courses to expand their professional competence. Candidates complete a teacher action research project during this program which serves as their field experience component.

3.2 Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

- **Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.**
- **Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.**
- **Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in unit Standard 3.**

Recently, the unit created the Office of Field Placement (OFP) to coordinate all placements for candidates. A Director of Field Placement was hired to be the primary contact for district superintendents and principals. The OFP works closely with local schools to determine specific placements for candidates. Placement processes have been standardized across programs to create continuity for schools, unit faculty, and candidates. Moving forward, the OFP has created a website to ensure easy access to information for mentor teachers, unit faculty, and candidates. The OFP has acquired a database for tracking placements from introduction course observations through student teaching internships. This process will aid in ensuring that candidates have diverse field experiences.

Initial Teacher Licensure Programs

Both the unit and school partners are involved in designing, implementing, and evaluating field experience components. Mentor teachers for the MAT program are asked to contribute to this process through evaluations, both formal and informal, each year. Mentor teachers and school administrators are also involved in molding the internship program in a variety of ways. All mentor teachers are electronically surveyed at the end of the school year and the data collected is included in the assessment report. Mentor teachers also meet informally with unit faculty throughout the year when faculty members visit schools to supervise interns. The unit then considers the input of the mentor teachers when making changes. For example, secondary interns have taught in the schools Tuesday-Fridays and attended class on campus on Mondays for the past several years. In the last school year, mentor teachers suggested that interns be in the schools on Mondays and in class on campus on Fridays. One of our largest school district partners holds professional development activities after school on Mondays. Interns were missing those opportunities because they were on campus for class on that day. Because the mentor teachers provided this feedback, the unit changed the schedule so interns will be in the schools on Mondays and able to participate in the professional development activities in this district. Collaboration between unit faculty and mentor teachers is an integral part of the internship program.

School partners are actively involved in placing students for student teaching internships for the secondary MAT program. Each spring, principals are asked to submit nominations for mentor teachers. During this time, candidates are asked to fill out a form detailing any specific requests for placements. Once all information is received, unit faculty members make initial placement suggestions under the guidance of the program chair. The placements are then given to the school partners for input. School administrators have the opportunity to approve or change all placements. For observation placements in local schools, the OFP, unit faculty and school administrators jointly determine the classrooms to be used. The process of placing candidates for secondary MAT internships and undergraduate observations is collaborative between the unit and school partners.

One of the great strengths of the MAT program is its length. Candidates complete a year-long internship which allows them to experience the different phases of each school year. Secondary education candidates intern at three different school levels, middle school (grades 6-7), junior high (grades 8-9) and high school (grades 9/10-12) to see different environments and work with diverse students. Childhood education candidates intern in different classrooms at the same school for the year. Because of this, childhood education interns become an integrated part of the school faculty. The length of the program encourages students to see and treat the interns as co-teachers. After observing for at least two weeks, candidates slowly assume duties for the classroom until they shoulder the majority of teaching responsibilities. Candidates are included in district and school professional development activities as well as parent-teacher conferences and other school and community events.

Mentor teachers, school administrators, and unit faculty work together to supervise and evaluate candidates throughout the MAT internship. Unit faculty travel to partner schools regularly to observe

and evaluate candidates. Mentor teachers submit summative and formative evaluations each rotation. Additionally, mentor teachers are encouraged to provide regular feedback to candidates. Throughout the internship, candidates work on an action research project to link classroom theory with their experiences in partner schools.

Throughout unit programs, faculty members attend professional development meetings alongside mentor teachers and school administrators. Childhood and elementary education faculty attend weekly faculty meetings in partner schools with interns. Unit faculty also attend professional development meetings at the local educational co-op alongside mentor teachers. Additionally, workshops are offered on campus that unit faculty, mentor teachers, and interns attend. Past topics have included literacy, (an annual offering), autism, and middle level education.

To further move toward target level, the OFP plans to implement a web survey of all principals and superintendents at the conclusion of each year. This will supplement the mentor teacher survey that is currently web based. The administrative survey will ask for feedback on the process of placing students and suggestions for overall improvement in the area of field placement. The OFP maintains open communication with partner schools throughout the year by visiting district administrators during the summer and attending district principal meetings every spring. The unit has held a meeting of the Northwest Arkansas Partnership Steering Committee each February which includes district administrators, mentor teachers, unit administrators, and unit faculty members. In 2011 a fall meeting was also added. At these meetings, school partners provide detailed feedback about internship and observation placements. After the fall 2011 meeting, a survey component was added to elicit feedback on the success of the meeting and suggestions for the future of the committee. The head of the unit also attends monthly meetings of partner school superintendents to discuss on-going partnerships and new initiatives.

Since the last NCATE visit, other changes have been made to move toward the target level for field experiences. Previously, secondary education MAT interns were placed largely in the four major school districts in our area. In an effort to increase diversity of experiences for candidates, the program began the rural school initiative to place more candidates in rural schools during the 2009-2010 school year. The expansion of the secondary education internship program into rural schools has been positive for all parties. Secondary education MAT interns are now placed in 15 local school districts and each intern has at least one rural school placement during their internship. Rural schools eagerly welcomed candidates and have been great partners in this new endeavor.

In order to further expand field experience opportunities for students, the unit is pursuing partnerships with schools across the state, region, and world. A pilot program to place secondary MAT interns in Central Arkansas will begin in February 2012. The interns who participate will complete one-third of their rotation in Central Arkansas. Placing candidates in central Arkansas will give them a more diverse experience as the region is largely urban and the population is more racially diverse. Partnerships with community colleges in the state are being formed to offer more teacher licensure opportunities across the state. The unit began offering a 2+2 BSE program for childhood education (grades P-4) leading to teacher licensure with a nearby community college in fall 2004 after the previous NCATE visit. This program has grown from an initial enrollment of 20 candidates to 45 candidates in 2010-11. This growth has led the unit to offer the four year licensure program for CHED on campus as well as in a 2+2 model giving CHED candidates the option of a four year BSE licensure program or the five year MAT program. Both programs offer a full year internship. In addition, the success of the 2+2 BSE licensure program has resulted in the unit offering partnerships with other community colleges across the state. A new faculty position has been created to build these partnerships. Through these, partnerships our candidates will have the opportunity to take part in even more diverse field experiences. The unit is

pursuing partnerships with community colleges in areas of the state that are traditionally underserved for additional 2+2 BSE programs. The OFP is also exploring overseas partnerships for the student teaching internship as an option for secondary MAT interns. The OFP has identified a partner school in the United Kingdom and plans to begin placing students overseas in Spring 2013..

Advanced Programs

There are many professional development activities jointly attended by unit and school based faculty. The largest population of English Language Learners in the state is in Northwest Arkansas. The two districts with the most ELLs in number and percentage partner with the U of A. This demographic has emerged rapidly within the last 15 years, growing from 8% of the students in 1995 to over 50% of the students in 2010 in one partner district. The need for professional development on teaching strategies for ELLs for our initial candidates and also advanced program candidates is critical. In response, the university and a partner school together wrote a grant to provide professional development for 90 partner school advanced candidates which would lead to English Second Language additional licensure. This grant paid for tuition and books for the candidates and provided crucial knowledge, skills and pedagogy for these candidates. The disposition of respecting diversity grew in these candidates as they learned more about their diverse students. The district also supplied district wide professional development for all teachers on scaffolding support for the ELL students in the district which U of A faculty involved in the grant attended. Additionally, the district with support from U of A faculty has begun an English Language Institute (ELI) for training advanced candidates in the district who were not able to participate in the earlier grant program. Forty-five candidates have completed the institute and are now ESL endorsed and another 40 candidates are enrolled for the 2011-12 school year. The curriculum for ELI was planned jointly by the partner school district and the university. The university has also supported the institute through discounted tuition and fees for candidates. A third form of joint professional development has been an annual ESL symposium sponsored by the unit and partner districts. We are preparing for our fourth symposium in February 2012 with an emphasis on ESL and special education which is in response to requests from advanced candidates who attended previous symposiums.

As part of the overall move toward target level for field experiences, advanced programs have started to partner with the OFP for placing candidates. The faculty and program chairs in the advanced programs have longstanding relationships with local school teachers and administrators who have helped them place candidates in the past. They will continue to place candidates in local schools with the help of the OFP to allow for better tracking and improved communication with schools.

For all advanced programs, the unit and school partners are involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences. Mentors or supervisors at each site are involved in the day-to-day evaluation of candidates. The mentors or supervisors relay information regarding the candidates back to the unit via formal evaluations provided by the unit. The unit works with school partners informally to redesign the programs as needed. The advanced programs have solid relationships with school partners, in part because teachers and administrators at local schools are the majority of the candidates who enroll in these programs.

In the Master of Education in Educational Leadership program, candidates participate in a synthesized internship program. This internship component encourages reflection on what was learned through course work and how it applies at their internship school. For example, candidates research school testing data to offer specific instructional recommendations. They also lead at least one faculty meeting on best practice teaching strategies that they have researched. Another assignment requires candidates to plan an event to celebrate diversity and/or multiculturalism. At the conclusion of each assignment, candidates reflect on the experience by documenting it in their portfolio. The internship component in

the educational leadership program spurs candidates to consider what they learned in the classroom and how it relates to the real students in real schools.

Candidates in the Master of Science in Counseling program also benefit from an extensive internship program. During the counseling internship, candidates shadow a licensed counselor and assume some of their duties. Candidates perform individual and group counseling sessions, class presentations, and may meet with parents during their time at the partner school. A portfolio with a paper detailing the candidate's personal counseling approach is written at the beginning of the program and changed throughout the program. The paper should reflect the changes in the candidate's counseling approach as he/she learns about practically applying counseling theory in schools.

In the 2009-2010 school year, the M.Ed. in Elementary and Secondary Education programs added a new component: a teacher action research project. Until this point, the programs did not require any field experience, although most participants were already teaching while pursuing their degrees. Candidates now complete the action research project in the school where they are employed or, if not currently teaching, work with the program coordinator for placement. The action research projects allow candidates to conduct research in the classroom that can improve their teaching and/or the classroom environment. This program is currently proposing a new degree plan that would include a core curriculum along with an area of specialization.

3.2.b Continuous Improvement

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 3.**

3.3 Exhibits

3.3.a	Examples across programs of collaborative activities between unit and P-12 schools to support the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, including memoranda of understanding
3.3.b	Policies, practices, and data on candidate placement in field experiences and clinical practice
3.3.c	Criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, which includes both higher education and P-12 school faculty
3.3.d	Examples of support and evaluation of clinical faculty across programs
3.3.e	Guidelines/handbooks on field experiences and clinical practice for candidates, and clinical faculty, including support provided by the unit and opportunities for feedback and reflection
3.3.f	Assessment instruments and scoring guides used for and data collected from field experiences and clinical practice for all programs, including use of technology for teaching and learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
	Performance data on candidates entering and exiting from clinical practice for all programs (These

3.3.g assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)

DIRECTIONS FOR ACCESSING EXHIBITS.docx

See **Attachments** panel below.

4. Standard 4. The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

4.1 How does the unit prepare candidates to work effectively with all students, including individuals of different ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and/or geographical area?

The unit's conceptual framework focuses on preparing candidates to become knowledgeable, skillful, caring, and inquiring scholar-practitioners in diverse educational settings. Tenet number three in the conceptual framework focuses on candidates who understand, respect, and value diversity. This tenet is embedded in each professional preparation program, thus emphasizing proficiencies related to diversity. Specific proficiencies addressing diversity include:

1. Recognizes the nature of diversity of candidates, professionals, and family members
2. Creates an appropriate learning environment for diverse populations
3. Incorporates teaching strategies appropriate for diverse populations
4. Understands assessment procedures and interpretation for candidates from diverse backgrounds.
5. Analyzes experiences that affect perception of others

Candidates are sensitized to cultural and ethnic diversity throughout their teacher education program. Through specialized pre-service courses and graduate course in M.A.T. and Advanced Programs, candidates observe, critique, and participate in activities that promote and incorporate diversity in teaching and learning. Field/ internship components serve to link core courses as well as advanced courses to practice. Exhibit 4.3.b presents a table outlining the proficiencies addressed in the courses across programs.

Area Addressed: Curriculum Components

There are numerous required courses that enable candidates to develop awareness of diversity. The unit articulates the proficiencies that candidates are expected to develop in many courses such as CIED 1002/1001 Introduction to Education, CATE 4003 Introduction to Professionalism, and PHED 3903 PE for Special Populations. In the Special Education Program (SPED), faculty require candidates to prepare a portfolio comprised of graded assignments addressing diversity in terms of exceptionality, (Teaching Persons with Severe Disabilities, CIED 5763) and moderate disabilities (Teaching Persons with Mild Disabilities, CIED 5723). This portfolio serves to prepare candidates for their semester-long field experience in classrooms comprising students with a range of exceptionalities, as well as cultural, linguistic, and ethnic diversity. The Educational Leadership program (EDLE) prepares candidates to reflect upon the impact of socio-economic diversity (Analytical Decision Making EDLE 5083) along with cultural diversity in contemporary schools. Candidates prepare a questionnaire designed to assess

the availability of technology in home settings as a measure of socio-economic capital, thereby elevating candidates' interpretations of the role of socio-economics. In CIED 5052 Multicultural Issues, a required M.A.T. course, all candidates participate in a case study and group project. Candidates are provided opportunities to discuss the relationship of culture identity and learning and the role of multicultural education and its implications for teachers, schools, and families. In addition, the M.Ed. in CATE offers WDED 5523 Diversity Issues & Globalization as a core course. Exhibit 4.3b outlines the diversity components in the courses.

Candidates also have a variety of field-based experiences designed to prepare them to work effectively with diverse students, such as English Language Learners in PHED 4263 Professional Issues in Physical Education. Other programs include an internship that requires candidates to acquire experiences working with students who represent exceptionality, linguistic diversity and varying levels of socio-economic status (EDLE Program Internship [EDLE 574V and 674V], The CATE Practicum and Teaching Strategies courses (CATE 4013 and 5013) require candidates to observe and reflect on diverse classroom settings. The SPED practicum requires candidates to teach students with disabilities in an array of settings. In order to further expand candidates' experiences, SPED also requires candidates to volunteer in agencies that provide services to individuals with disabilities (SPED 5733 Inclusive Practices, SPED 3023 Survey of Exceptionalities). In the Childhood & Elementary Education Programs, the practicum in CIED 1011 Introduction to Education, and CIED 3011 Early Childhood Education Practicum provide opportunities for candidates to observe and implement accommodation and adaptation techniques in response to exceptionalities and cultural diversity. Candidates also complete internships that give them the opportunity to observe and teach in ESL and Gifted classrooms. In addition to these field experiences, our Childhood M.A.T. candidates can choose to complete an endorsement in ESL (12 hours) or an additional license in SPED (21 hours). The Elementary B.S.E. candidates enroll in CIED 4123 (Teaching a Second Language) in the spring semester of their senior year. This course provides further opportunities for candidates to learn about diversity.

Area: Assessment

Candidates are assessed on diversity proficiencies in a number of ways in various courses through a systemized unit assessment process. In courses, faculty collect an array of data to assess the degree to which the candidates are developing the necessary proficiencies to teach diverse students. For example, candidates' proficiencies are examined in reflective journals, papers, case studies (PHED 3903 PE for Special Populations, PHED 3074 Secondary Physical Education, CIED 5763 Teaching Students with Severe Disabilities), curriculum plan units (CIED 5723 Teaching Persons with Mild Disabilities), and lab design projects (Lab Management CATE 4041). Candidates also receive feedback from peers and supervisors through the use of group work, seminars, and the mentor teacher model. For candidates in advanced field placements, feedback is ongoing and a part of a substantive unit evaluation.

Documentation comprises of reflective papers and journals chronicling their experiences, and serves as a basis for classroom discussions and advanced instructional planning. These candidates scored from 12.5 to 14.6 (out of 15) with an average of 13.41 on Pathwise B, Creating an environment for candidate learning.

On the EBI Exit Survey, relative strengths were noted in teaching children from diverse ethnic and academic backgrounds. On the EBI Alumni Follow-Up Survey, alumni scored stronger on classroom equity and diversity than the benchmark comparison groups. Further, candidates are provided feedback from a variety of assessment techniques at various gateways rooted in the programs. Forms of assessment include Praxis examinations, interviews, presentations, action research, and comprehensive examinations, which have proven effective in improving candidates' acquisition of knowledge, skills and dispositions. The use of predetermined gateways and a variety of assessment tools are part of a continued effort to re-evaluate courses and programs and to stimulate necessary changes.

Area: Candidates' Experiences with Individuals Representing Diverse Groups

Most of the schools used by the university as field placement sites enroll students who represent an array of diverse characteristics. Mentor teachers in field sites have first-hand knowledge and experience in working with diverse students. To ensure that candidates have opportunities to intern and observe in diverse school-based settings, a database has been developed (See Exhibit 4.3f) that includes all of the field experience sites used by programs. These sites have been coded as either (1) schools with a high percentage of low income candidates based; (2) schools with high percentage of minority candidates; or (3) meeting both criteria 1 and 2. The field placements of candidates are coded using the 1, 2, or 3 coding system. As candidates move from one placement to the next, the database is checked by the field placement director to ensure that the candidate has diverse placements. Seven rural school districts were added to the three-rotation system in 2008 for the Secondary M.A.T (SEED). SEED candidates' opportunities for a richer diverse experience have increased since this partnership was established.

Most of the candidates in the Educational Leadership (EDLE) Program are fully employed in school districts, many outside Northwest Arkansas. Therefore, the EDLE program uses a different means for ensuring diverse field experiences. The faculty member who supervises EDLE candidates reviews both SES and diversity levels prior to placing candidates for field experiences. If the primary site does not have at least 30 percent low income and 30 percent diversity, the candidate is automatically assigned experiences with a second school and/or district. There are 17 required activities for the intern to complete and five of those activities require specific analysis based on diversity of candidate population.

Candidates in the advanced teacher preparation programs also complete a field experience. Because most of these candidates are employed, similar to candidates in the Educational Leadership Program, they complete their field experiences at their own schools. Activities related to diversity are required of these candidates to ensure that they have opportunities to interact with diverse candidates.

Candidates engaged in advanced clinical practice plan implement lessons using strategies that promote successful instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students. Candidates learn to use student interest and developmental levels to modify instruction to meet the needs of the students assigned to their classes. Candidates in PHED 3903 Physical Education for Special Populations engage in field experiences and complete a journal. Candidates in CATE are required to interview a teacher in a diverse setting. In SEED, candidates complete journal activities (Special Methods of English Instruction) regarding student diversity

4.2 Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

- **Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.**
- **Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.**
- **Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in unit Standard 4.**

4.2.b Continuous Improvement

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 4.**

Working with Diverse Faculty

Our faculty is approximately 90 percent white, yet they have expertise and involvement in professional development activities that foster their sensitivity to diversity. For example, faculty participation in international conferences, leadership roles in professional organizations, outreach to local communities, and workshops accentuate and broaden faculty members' knowledge of diverse cultures, which, in turn, lead faculty to incorporate these experiences into course development. For example, Dr. Sam Totten recently travelled to Africa. Dr. Mounir Farrar travelled to Middle East. Other faculty (C. Johnson, M. Collier, F. Bowles, E. Casey) under the guidance of Dr. Diana Worthen, are collaborating on founding a chapter of the National Association of Multicultural Education (N.A.M.E.) in Northwest Arkansas. Dr. C. Goering, collaborating with Dr. Jolliffe and colleagues, has developed the Arkansas Delta Oral History Project that is designed to provide support and outreach in the rural Arkansas Delta. Dr. Goering also developed a series of writing workshops to assist first-generation African American college students. The Secondary Education Program (SEED) hosted a visiting scholar, Dr. Huang Wei, from the People's Republic of China (2010-2011). Moreover, Dr. F. Bowles serves as the faculty advisor for the Native American Students Association and participates in the Bridge Scholars Mentoring program for under-represented students. In addition, she facilitates a distance learning class in Choctaw language and serves on the Native American Studies Minor committee for the university as well as on the Native American Symposium committee.

Working with Diverse Candidates

As part of the college's continuing effort to increase candidate peer interaction with candidates of other ethnicities, during the spring 2006 term, all teacher candidate interns in childhood education attended a daylong workshop at the University of Arkansas Pine Bluff (UAPB), the state's historically black college. This conference, entitled the Thirteenth Annual Conference on Educational Access, focused on the achievement gap between African-American students and Caucasian students. Students and faculty spent the entire day at the conference. A part of the day was spent with U of A students interacting with students from the UAPB teacher preparation program. Following the conference, students reflected on their experiences on the five-hour bus ride back to Fayetteville and in their classes the following weeks. Partnering with UAPB is an excellent way for our teacher candidates to interact with candidates from a different background. The following year, teacher candidates from UAPB interacted with our candidates as they attended a Literacy Symposium in Fayetteville with Ruby Payne addressing teaching students from poverty. This has continued as an annual exchange during the summer literacy symposium.

Fellowships such as the Benjamin Franklin Lever Tuition Fellowship offered by the university are designed to increase diversity within advanced degree programs by providing financial assistance to graduate students from underrepresented groups. Also a Holmes Doctoral Scholarship is being instituted for culturally diverse doctoral students.

Experiences with Diverse P-12 Students

The new director of field placement is installing a software program to track all field experience placements from pre-admission to the education programs to the internship or student teaching experience. This data base will categorize the schools by type in which the candidate has had field experiences. Schools will meet criteria for high percentage of free-reduced lunch students, high percentage of culturally and linguistically diverse students, rural schools, high percentage of special needs students, etc. This has been done with internships previously without a data base. The new system will help us do a better job of insuring diverse field experiences placements.

4.3 Exhibits

4.3.a	Proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to demonstrate through working with students from diverse groups in classrooms and schools
4.3.b	Curriculum components and experiences that address diversity proficiencies (This might be a matrix that shows diversity components in required courses.)
4.3.c	Assessment instruments, scoring guides, and data related to candidates meeting diversity proficiencies, including impact on student learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
4.3.d	Data table on faculty demographics (See example attached to NCATE's list of exhibits)
4.3.e	Data table on candidates demographics (See example attached to NCATE's list of exhibits)
4.3.f	Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice (See example attached to NCATE's list of exhibits)
4.3.g	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty
4.3.h	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates
4.3.i	Policies, procedures, and practices that support candidates working with P-12 students from diverse groups

DIRECTIONS FOR ACCESSING EXHIBITS.docx

See **Attachments** panel below.

5. Standard 5. Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 How does the unit ensure that its professional education faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators through scholarship, service, teaching, collaboration and assessment of their performance?

Faculty members in the Professional Education Unit (PEU) of the University of Arkansas model best practice in their work. Through role modeling best practice in the classroom to collaborating on action research and professional development, these faculty members are among the leaders in the University, at the State level, and in their professional disciplines. In addition to their initial training, all faculty members work hard to continue to improve their work through participation in a variety of professional development activities. Faculty have received a variety of recognitions in scholarship, teaching, and service.

In the area of scholarship the following accolades have been given:

Sean Connors, assistant professor of English education, was named a runner-up for the 2011 M. Thomas Inge Award for Comics Scholarship for his paper "Reading Images: Deconstructing the Visual Design of Graphic Novels." Marcia Imbeau, associate professor of special education, collaborated with Carol Tomlinson of the University of Virginia to produce a guide for teachers to incorporate differentiated instruction in the management of their classrooms. Kathleen Collins, associate professor of special education, co-edited *Toward a Broader Understanding of Stress and Coping: Mixed Methods Approaches*. During the 2010-11 academic year, the College of Education and Health Professions faculty produced 8 books, 25 book chapters, 86 refereed articles, 108 un-refereed articles, 71 invited lectures and 155 other lectures.

In the area of teaching awards have been given to the following faculty:

Cheryl Murphy, director of distance education and associate professor of educational technology, won a Gold Award for Excellence in Distance Learning Teaching from the United States Distance Learning Association. John Pijanowski, associate professor of educational leadership was the recipient of the university's teaching honor, the Charles and Nadine Baum Faculty Teaching Award for 2010. Samuel Totten, professor of curriculum and instruction, served on the faculty of the International Institute for Genocide and Human Rights Studies affiliated with the University of Toronto for a two-week intensive seminar in August 2010. He taught a session on Darfur, Sudan. He also spoke on "16 Years after the Genocide against Tutsi: Handling its Consequences" at the International Symposium on Genocide in Rwanda April 2010. William McComas, professor of science education was the recipient of the 2010 Four Year University and College Biology Research in Teaching Award from the National Association of Biology Teachers.

Exceptional service by faculty members include the following:

Chris Goering, assistant professor of secondary education, was elected to the Secondary Section Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English in 2010. Cathy Wissehr was elected to the Arkansas Environmental Education Association Board of Directors for the 2011-2012 term. Wissehr is an assistant professor of science education. Linda Eilers, clinical associate professor of childhood education served as president of the Arkansas Reading Association 2010-2011. Freddie Bowles, assistant professor of foreign language education, received a Lucile Cornet Individual Award for Professional Development. Michael Daugherty, professor of technology education, was inducted into the International Technology Education Association Academy of Fellows. Grace Kerr, clinical instructor was named Outstanding Volunteer for Fayetteville Public Schools, 2011.

Faculty members in the PEU earned their doctoral degrees at many of the leading universities in the United States (Columbia, Ohio State, Cornell, Georgia, etc.) and are among the most productive and well respected faculty on the UA campus. Their academic products range from books and journal articles to invited speeches around the world. Additionally, faculty members shared their expertise at the local level to help promote best practice in area schools and agencies.

Faculty members in the PEU hold a range of academic titles, and make use of University guidelines for appointment, tenure, and promotion. Bridging three distinct academic colleges, forms vary slightly, but all reward excellence in the classroom as well as productivity in research, grant writing, advising, and service. Faculty are evaluated on an annual calendar basis, and by University policy, receive feedback from peers as well as departmental administration. Resources are provided for each faculty member's professional development, including the resources to attend state and national meetings, in addition to many opportunities for development being provided on the UA campus.

5.2 Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it

is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

5.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

- **Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.**
- **Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.**
- **Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in unit Standard 5.**

5.2.b Continuous Improvement

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 5.**

In response to needs expressed by faculty to the college council to share information about research initiatives undertaken by college faculty, the college council initiated the College Luncheon Academic Seminar Series (CLASS) in fall 2009. The series nurtures the college's scholarly community, providing a forum where faculty and staff share their work with peers and foster future collaborations. These sessions promote a greater understanding of the diverse ways in which the college's faculty and staff work toward the shared mission of improving education outcomes for Arkansans.

As the personnel document used by the faculty dates from 1995, a committee has been meeting with the associate dean for academic affairs to develop a new personnel document that would reflect the variety among the departments and programs within the college. The format of the document will reflect the format used in the Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences and allow departments to set some departmental criteria while generic overarching guidelines would be set by the college. The dean brought in Raoul Arreola, author of *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System* who has consulted with over 200 colleges and universities in designing and implementing faculty evaluation systems, to discuss with faculty and leadership the foundation of a strong faculty evaluation system.

To encourage scholarship among faculty in the summer, research mini-grants were given to faculty for the summer of 2011. This was in response to faculty request to provide research funding in addition to funding for teaching in the summer. The new vice provost for research funded a trip to Washington D. C. to contact grant sponsors last year and a separate college trip is also being considered.

Beginning in 2010, the dean initiated a college wide mentoring system for new faculty. Each new faculty member is assigned a mentor to introduce them to college resources and expectations for research, teaching, and service. The dean of the college has meetings with new faculty on a regular basis.

5.3.a Data table on faculty qualifications (These data may be compiled from the tables submitted earlier for national program review by clicking on "Import" below, or compiled in Excel, Word, or PDF format and uploaded as an exhibit in following "5.3.b Exhibit Links" section.)

**Table 1
Faculty Qualification Summary**

FacultyInfo_13916_4527_62543.xls
See **Attachments** panel below.

5.3.b Exhibits

5.3.a	Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty (This table can be compiled in the online template from data submitted for national program reviews or compiled in Excel, Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit. See example attached to NCATE's list of exhibits.)
5.3.b	Data table on qualifications of clinical faculty (i.e., P–12 school professionals and professional education faculty responsible for instruction, supervision, and/or assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practice)
5.3.c	Policies and practices to assure clinical faculty meet unit expectations
5.3.d	Policies, expectations, and samples of faculty scholarly activities
5.3.e	Summary of faculty service and collaborative activities in schools (e.g., collaborative project with school faculty, teacher professional development, and addressing the needs of low performing schools) and with the professional community (e.g., grants, evaluations, task force participation, provision of professional development, offering courses, etc.)
5.3.f	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty evaluation (including promotion and tenure) and summaries of the results in areas of teaching, scholarship and service
5.3.g	Policies, procedures, and practices for professional development and summaries of the results

DIRECTIONS FOR ACCESSING EXHIBITS.docx

See **Attachments** panel below.

6. Standard 6. The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1 How do the unit's governance system and resources contribute to adequately preparing candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards?

The University of Arkansas, Fayetteville professional education unit has the leadership and authority under Dean Tom Smith to plan, deliver and operate coherent programs of study for teacher and other school personnel candidates. The unit effectively manages or coordinates all programs that prepare school personnel. Faculty, students, and P-12 personnel collaborate on the University Teacher Education Board (UTEB) to approve course and program changes affecting teacher preparation. All programs are reviewed and recognized by either Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) or State Program Review. This insures candidates meet national and state standards. Recruiting and admissions practices

are described clearly in catalogs and program handbooks. Academic calendars and catalogs are available on the web and faculty update the information annually. Grading policies are outlined in the syllabi. Advising for the first 45 hours has been moved to the departments so students for the most part are advised in the same building where the professional education classes are offered. P-12 practitioners meet semi-annually with program faculty to collaborate on program changes. University liaisons meet weekly with mentor teachers in the P-12 schools to insure smooth operation of the internship.

Budgetary allocations are proportional to other units on campus with clinical units and supports the clinical work essential for professional educator preparation.

Workload policies (exhibit 6.3.h) are within acceptable guidelines for faculty to engage in teaching, scholarship, and service. Tenure track faculty do not teach more than nine hours per semester and clinical faculty teach no more than 12 hours per semester. Supervision of clinical practice does not generally exceed 9 candidates for each full-time faculty member per semester. The unit provides professional development and resources for faculty through funding of travel to conferences, teaching center workshops on campus, and symposium for ESL, literacy, middle school, and autism.

Campus and school facilities are adequate. The primary building, Peabody, for curriculum and instruction was renovated during the 2010-11 academic year and now has smart technology classrooms. A faculty/student committee worked with the architects in planning the restoration. The graduate education building has wireless available plus smart classrooms. The library offers extensive online services besides the brick and mortar holdings. Due to an increase in student enrollment over the past three years, P-12 facilities are often used for intern meetings with liaisons. An automated scheduling system (R25) has helped the unit maximize use of classroom space.

6.2 Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

6.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

- **Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.**
- **Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.**
- **Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in unit Standard 6.**

6.2.b Continuous Improvement

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 6.**

Unit Leadership and Authority

Since the 2004 visit, a new dean, Dr. Tom Smith, has been appointed to the College of Education and Health Professions (COEHP). Dr. Smith began his leadership with the following three initiatives in collaboration with faculty and staff: Visioning for the Future, Personnel Document Revisions, and an Organizational Committee.

The Vision Committee adopted the Appreciative Inquiry approach and held a summit in May 2011. As a result of the summit, seven strategic action teams have been established to focus on the initiatives identified. These include organizational structure; diversity; technology, campus recreation and fitness initiatives; international programming; clinical and field experiences; and development. The following summarizes activities around each of these strategic action teams.

- **Organizational Structure**

A newly established strategic action team will develop a plan for reorganization of the college structure. Currently the college has a vertical organizational structure. The goal of this team is to develop recommendations to "flatten" the organization to create more, smaller departments with a common academic focus and to give our health and human services programs more visibility within the college. The team has a goal of making recommendations to the dean by the end of the fall 2011 term.

- **Diversity**

The diversity strategic action team has begun to focus on developing an updated college diversity plan. The group has met twice and will meet regularly throughout the year to enhance our diversity efforts.

- **Technology**

The technology strategic action team has begun to meet regularly to develop a long term technology plan for the college. New technology applications in Peabody Hall and the Epley Center for Health Professions, as well as the campus adoption of ECHO 360, are being incorporated into the plan.

- **Campus Recreation and Fitness Initiatives**

The campus recreation and fitness strategic action team has been heavily involved in finalizing the opening of the University Recreation satellite center in the Arkansas Union. They are also in the process of developing ideas for a new campus recreation center.

- **International Programming**

Discussions are on-going by the international planning strategic action team to expand international opportunities for students and faculty in the college. An educational component of the Arkansas Health Teams Abroad Program, which has been present in Sweden for several years, will be added. Additional international opportunities for students and faculty are discussed at the committee's monthly meetings.

- **Clinical and Field Experiences**

This strategic action team has met once to develop ideas related to our clinical and field experiences, including the establishment of a lab school. Dean Smith has visited the University of Chicago Lab School, the University of Chicago Charter school office, and the TCU lab schools to gather ideas for our efforts. Additional lab schools will be visited during this academic year to obtain a better understanding of the various lab school models that currently exist. It is hoped that specific plans for creating a lab school administered by the college will be developed by the end of the academic year. Converting a public school to a university charter school is also a possible initiative that will take less time to implement than a lab school.

- **Development**

The development strategic action team is working to establish college priorities for the upcoming

campus capital campaign. Faculty, staff, and administrators have had opportunities to provide their ideas for future development efforts. This planning will continue throughout the year to finalize the college development priorities.

The Organizational Committee, based on feedback from constituents at the 2011 COEHP Summit, was established to explore the organizational structure of the College's academic programs. The committee was chaired by Dean Tom Smith, and began weekly meetings in August 2011. Through meeting with all academic programs, department heads, and drawing on a variety of data reports from Institutional Research, the committee has offered an initial restructuring plan. The plan calls for the creation of smaller, more academically focused departments. The focus is based on academic subject matter, and is in response to the current structure that has many often divergent programs clustered into administrative departments. As of the spring 2012, the proposal continues to be refined and is scheduled to be presented to the faculty and university for approval and a 2013 implementation.

Personnel

A Personnel Document Committee, as part of the Dean's three-point initiative, was a faculty-led task force that was established to review the College's personnel document. The task force was further charged with bringing the document into alignment with the University's and University System's policies and procedures. The task force met for the entire 2010-2011 academic year and brought forward a draft of the revised document, and had the draft approved by the University's legal counsel. The document, to be consistent with University and University System, requires department-level personnel documents. Early in the 2011-2012 academic year, a template for these personnel documents was written and approved, and once the new organizational structure of the College is in place, each department will then finalize their personnel documents and all documents will then be submitted to the University of Arkansas System for final approval and implementation.

Governance of the teacher education programs is overseen by the University Teacher Education Board (UTEB). The name of the board was changed from University Teacher Education Initial Certification Board (UTEIC) to the current name UTEB, to reflect the fact that the board governs advanced programs as well as initial programs. Representatives from all teacher preparation programs in the unit are on the committee as well as public school partners and students.

In the area of professional development, the College Council under the new dean, has initiated a COEHP Luncheon Academic Seminar Series (CLASS) where faculty members present research and initiatives in their programs. The Education Reform program hosts a lecture series with outside speakers brought in to present research on current issues in education. In the Curriculum Department a Brown Bag Lunch Series has been initiated with graduate students and faculty presenting. All three venues are open to faculty in other units of the institution.

Our advising center has been disbanded since the last visit, and advisors are now assigned to departments and housed there to be nearer to students they serve. This physical move also puts advisors who advise for the first 45 hours closer to the faculty advisors that take over after the first 45 hours.

Budget

Budget will be based on faculty in programs, the new department structure under the new organization, rather than the current large departments. Travel funds that were previously in the dean's account have been moved to departmental accounts.

Unit Facilities

As the primary Curriculum and Instruction Department building, Peabody Hall, was renovated during 2010-11. Faculty and students met with architects to have input into the renovation design.

The renovation has included an elevator, new SMART technology and additional office spaces. Classroom space is at a premium as our enrollment grows, but our new electronic scheduling system helps us make the best use of the space we have.

Unit Resources including Technology

Capture 360 which allows video recording of classrooms has been installed in classes at both buildings (Peabody Hall and Graduate Education) where the majority of the unit classes are held. The global campus building in Rogers is equipped with technology and is utilized for our 2+2 program students who tend to live closer to that facility than the main campus in Fayetteville.

We have a faculty/staff technology committee led by Cheryl Murphy, faculty member in educational technology. The committee is currently putting together a three year plan for the future with strategic initiatives that will include an action plan, timeline for implementation and evaluation. The plan will be submitted in December 2012 and begin implementation in January 2013.

6.3 Exhibits

6.3.a	Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the unit
6.3.b	Organizational chart and/or description of the unit governance structure and its relationship to institutional governance structure
6.3.c	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate services such as counseling and advising
6.3.d	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate recruitment and admission, and accessibility to candidates and the education community
6.3.e	Academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications, grading policies, and unit advertising
6.3.f	Unit budget, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning , and alternative route programs when applicable
6.3.g	Budgets of comparable units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other campuses
6.3.h	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty workload and summary of faculty workload
6.3.i	Candidates' access to physical and/or virtual classrooms, computer labs, curriculum resources, and library resources that support teaching and learning
6.3.j	Candidates' access to distance learning including support services and resources, if applicable

DIRECTION FOR ACCESSING EXHIBITS

See **Attachments** panel below.