

# School of Education

CASAA REPORT

2016

1. **What are the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your unit?**

Candidates (students) completing a degree in the School of Education must be able to demonstrate the five strands of the Conceptual Framework (the underlying structure in the School of Education that gives conceptual meaning to the unit's operations through an articulated rationale and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, faculty scholarship and service, and unit accountability) which includes Knowledge, Diversity, Pedagogy, Professionalism, and Technology.

The successful undergraduate candidate (student) must be able to model the following outcomes:

**Knowledge**

- Teacher candidates (students) in initial programs of study will develop an extensive content knowledge base in order to reach and teach all learners in a diverse society.

**Pedagogy**

- Teacher candidates (students) in initial programs of study will develop pedagogical skills that result in improved learning and achievement for a diverse population of learners.

**Diversity**

- Teacher candidates (students) in initial programs of study will express an understanding of diversity and its impact on learners, other constituencies, and the greater society they serve to improve teaching and learning.

**Professionalism**

- Teacher candidates (students) in initial programs of study will model professionalism as they interact with students, parents, colleagues, and others.

**Technology**

- Teacher candidates (students) in initial programs of study will select and utilize multiple classroom technology resources and tools to improve teaching and learning.

The successful graduate candidate (student) must be able to model the following outcomes:

**Knowledge**

- Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs of study will develop in-depth content knowledge and will be recognized as experts in the content they teach.

**Pedagogy**

- Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs of study will express expertise in pedagogical knowledge through leadership and mentoring.

**Diversity**

- Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs of study serve as role models by actively promoting a school climate and culture that values differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race,



socio-economic status, age, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographic areas.

### **Professionalism**

- Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs will be role models for fairness and integrity in working with their colleagues, students, families, and the community at-large.

### **Technology**

- Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs will be aggressive advocates of the benefits of instructional technology and will make available the necessary resources to acquire the latest technology tools.

Unit goals can be found by visiting:

<http://uam-web2.uamont.edu/PDFs/Education/UnitGoals.pdf>

<http://uam-web2.uamont.edu/PDFs/Education/ConceptualFramework.pdf>

### **Accreditation**

The School of Education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). School of Education has been NCATE accredited since 1968 and is seeking **continuing accreditation** in the fall semester of 2015. The School of Education must seek reaccreditation every seven years. The NCATE Reaccreditation Letter can be found by visiting <http://uam-web2.uamont.edu/pdfs/Education/NCATE%20Letter.pdf>.

#### **1a. How do you inform the public and other stakeholders (students, potential students, the community) about your SLOs?**

The School of Education informs the public and other stakeholders about the student learning outcomes by placing the outcome results on the [School of Education website](#), in stakeholders' reports, in syllabi, on recruitment materials, in the School of Education [Conceptual Framework](#).

#### **2. Describe how your unit's Student Learning Outcomes fit into the mission of the University.**

The University of Arkansas at Monticello shares with all universities the commitment to search for truth and understanding through scholastic endeavor. The University seeks to enhance and share knowledge, to preserve and promote the intellectual content of society, and to educate people for critical thought. The University provides learning experiences which enable students to synthesize knowledge, communicate effectively, use knowledge and technology with intelligence and responsibility, and act creatively within their own and other cultures.

The University strives for excellence in all its endeavors. Educational opportunities encompass the liberal arts, basic and applied sciences, selected professions, and vocational and technical preparation. These opportunities are founded in a strong program of general education and are fulfilled through contemporary disciplinary curricula, certification programs, and vocational/technical education or workforce training. The University assures

opportunities in higher education for both traditional and non-traditional students and strives to provide an environment which fosters individual achievement and personal development. The School of Education seeks to fulfill the university mission through the stated student learning outcomes. The outcomes are aligned to state and national standards and are a direct reflection of the UAM mission.

The student learning outcomes one and three, for both the undergraduate and graduate programs, are a direct reflection of the School of Education's expectations that candidates (students) meet the UAM mission to enhance and share knowledge, to preserve and promote the intellectual content of society, and to education people for critical thought. The student learning outcome one ensures that candidates (students) develop an extensive knowledge base to reach and teach all learners in a diverse society.

Through student learning outcomes two, five, and six, for both the undergraduate and graduate programs, the School of Education ensures that candidates (students) have opportunities develop skills through a contemporary disciplinary curricula.

Student learning outcomes three and five, for both the undergraduate and graduate programs, reflect the School of Education's efforts to enable students to synthesize knowledge, communicate effectively, use knowledge and technology with intelligence and responsibility, and act creatively within their own and other cultures.

Efforts to ensure opportunities in higher education for both traditional and non-traditional students and strives to provide an environment which fosters individual achievement and personal development are met through student learning outcome four, in both the undergraduate and graduate programs.

Early and often throughout the undergraduate and graduate programs candidates (students) are assessed to determine they are meeting the student learning outcomes and the mission of the university.

**3. Provide an analysis of the student learning data from your unit. How is this data used as evidence of learning?**

Candidates in the initial and advanced programs are prepared through a comprehensive curriculum that prepares them to teach and work as professionals in schools with diverse student populations. All initial and advanced programs were submitted for review by Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) and/or the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE). One hundred percent of initial and advanced licensure programs submitted for SPA review received National Recognition.

In order to achieve national recognition the School of Education carefully aligns the five strand of the conceptual framework to state and national standards, as well as, the Danielson Frameworks for Teaching model for all initial and advanced programs to provide validity for its own programs. Specific assessment identified as signature

assessments have also been aligned with these standards to provide the School of Education with the data necessary to determine if candidates (students) are meeting the unit goals. There are twenty major assessments that are considered undergraduate unit assessments for the School of Education.

Fall 2013 Summative Evaluation	P-4 Early Childhood		Middle Childhood		Physical Education		Music Education		Total	
	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean
Clinical Internship I Cooperating Teacher Summative Evaluation	20	2.67	3	2.66	3	2.30	4	2.60	30	2.55
Clinical Internship I University Supervisor Summative Evaluation	20	2.44	3	2.36	3	2.47	4	2.09	30	2.34
Clinical Internship II Cooperating Teacher Summative Evaluation	3	2.74	4	3.00	4	2.75	2	2.32	13	2.70
Clinical Internship II University Supervisor Summative Evaluation	3	2.79	4	2.76	4	2.68	2	2.82	13	2.76
Spring 2014 Summative Evaluation	P-4 Early Childhood		Middle Childhood		Physical Education		Music Education		Total	
	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean
Clinical Internship I Cooperating Teacher Summative Evaluation	4	2.26	2	2.77	3	2.47	2	2.66	11	2.54
Clinical Internship I University Supervisor Summative Evaluation	4	2.07	2	1.77	3	2.22	2	2.14	11	2.05
Clinical Internship II Cooperating Teacher Summative Evaluation	20	2.87	3	2.88	3	2.80	4	2.82	30	2.84
Clinical Internship II University Supervisor Summative Evaluation	20	2.81	3	2.95	3	2.80	4	2.52	30	2.77
Fall 2014 Summative Evaluation	P-4 Early Childhood		Middle Childhood		Physical Education		Music Education		Total	
	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean
Clinical Internship I Cooperating Teacher Summative Evaluation	19	2.54	2	2.55	3	2.50	1	2.50	25	2.53
Clinical Internship I University Supervisor Summative Evaluation	19	2.35	2	1.95	3	2.50	1	2.09	25	2.33
Clinical Internship II Cooperating Teacher Summative Evaluation	4	2.89	2	2.98	3	3.00	2	3.00	11	2.95
Clinical Internship II University Supervisor Summative Evaluation	4	2.80	2	3.00	3	2.79	2	2.95	11	2.85
Spring 2015 Summative Evaluation	P-4 Early Childhood		Middle Childhood		Physical Education		Music Education		Total	
	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean
Clinical Internship I Cooperating Teacher Summative Evaluation	8	2.64	1	2.68	0	0	1	2.41	10	2.62
Clinical Internship I University Supervisor Summative Evaluation	8	2.51	1	2.59	0	0	1	1.91	10	2.45
Clinical Internship II Cooperating Teacher Summative Evaluation	19	2.90	2	2.93	3	3.00	1	2.73	25	2.91
Clinical Internship II University Supervisor Summative Evaluation	19	2.88	2	3.00	3	2.79	1	2.68	25	2.89

Fall 2015 Summative Evaluation	P-4 Early Childhood		Middle Childhood		Physical Education		Music Education		Total	
	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean
Clinical Internship I Cooperating Teacher Summative Evaluation	10	2.77	1	2.86	0	0	0	0	11	2.78
Clinical Internship I University Supervisor Summative Evaluation	10	2.66	1	2.52	0	0	0	0	11	2.64
Clinical Internship II Cooperating Teacher Summative Evaluation	8	2.94	1	3.00	0	0	1	2.95	10	2.95
Clinical Internship II University Supervisor Summative Evaluation	8	2.88	1	2.91	0	0	1	2.95	10	2.89
Spring 2016 Summative Evaluation	P-4 Early Childhood		Middle Childhood		Physical Education		Music Education		Total	
	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean
Clinical Internship I Cooperating Teacher Summative Evaluation	2	2.91	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.91
Clinical Internship I University Supervisor Summative Evaluation	2	2.48	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.48
Clinical Internship II Cooperating Teacher Summative Evaluation	10	2.97	1	3.00	0	0	0	0	11	2.97
Clinical Internship II University Supervisor Summative Evaluation	10	2.91	1	2.86	0	0	0	0	11	2.91

The data above are based on an unacceptable (1), acceptable (2), or target (3) scale. Target level is more difficult to achieve and is primarily reached after extensive experience. The data above are color coded to indicate the same group of candidates that were in internship I and in internship II. Based on a two tailed t-test with a 95% confidence interval and a P value of .0099, there is a statistically significant difference from internship I scores and internship II scores. This is a strong indication of growth in the candidates (students) from one internship to another. It is through the alignment of the conceptual framework to the state and national standards that the School of Education can state with confidence that candidates (students) that score at the target or acceptable level on state and national standards have also met the unit goals for student learning outcomes. The School of Education is confident that candidates (students) in all programs are performing at a level that indicates they are meeting the units learning outcome goals.

The data below were collected from the teacher work sample portfolio. All undergraduate candidates (students) must complete a teacher work sample portfolio during internship II.

Fall 2013 Teacher Work Sample Portfolio	N	Range	Mean
Portfolio Task 1: Context for Learning	13	4.0	4.0
Portfolio Task 2: Planning Instruction and Assessment	13	3.0-4.0	3.87
Portfolio Task 3: Instructing Students and Supporting Learning	13	3.0-4.0	3.77
Portfolio Task 4: Assessing Student Learning	13	3.0-4.0	3.63
Portfolio Task 5: Reflecting on Teaching and Learning	13	3.0-4.0	3.93

Spring 2014 Teacher Work Sample Portfolio	N	Range	Mean
Portfolio Task 1: Context for Learning	30	3.0-4.0	3.89
Portfolio Task 2: Planning Instruction and Assessment	30	3.0-4.0	3.85
Portfolio Task 3: Instructing Students and Supporting Learning	30	3.0-4.0	3.83
Portfolio Task 4: Assessing Student Learning	30	3.0-4.0	3.52
Portfolio Task 5: Reflecting on Teaching and Learning	30	3.0-4.0	3.65
Fall 2014 Teacher Work Sample Portfolio	N	Range	Mean
Portfolio Task 1: Context for Learning	11	3.0-4.0	3.90
Portfolio Task 2: Planning Instruction and Assessment	11	3.0-4.0	3.93
Portfolio Task 3: Instructing Students and Supporting Learning	11	3.0-4.0	3.95
Portfolio Task 4: Assessing Student Learning	11	3.0-4.0	3.40
Portfolio Task 5: Reflecting on Teaching and Learning	11	4.0	4.00
Fall 2015 Teacher Work Sample Portfolio	N	Range	Mean
Portfolio Task 1: Context for Learning	9	4.0	4.0
Portfolio Task 2: Planning Instruction and Assessment	9	3.0-4.0	3.96
Portfolio Task 3: Instructing Students and Supporting Learning	9	4.0	4.0
Portfolio Task 4: Assessing Student Learning	9	3.0-4.0	3.78
Portfolio Task 5: Reflecting on Teaching and Learning	9	3.0-4.0	3.89
Spring 2016 Teacher Work Sample Portfolio	N	Range	Mean
Portfolio Task 1: Context for Learning	11	4.0	4.0
Portfolio Task 2: Planning Instruction and Assessment	11	4.0	4.0
Portfolio Task 3: Instructing Students and Supporting Learning	11	3.0-4.0	3.86
Portfolio Task 4: Assessing Student Learning	11	3.0-4.0	3.94
Portfolio Task 5: Reflecting on Teaching and Learning	11	4.0	4.0

The data above are based on an unacceptable (1), needs improvement (2), acceptable (3), or target (4) scale. Based on a One-way ANOVA  $F=2.22$  and  $F_{\text{Crit}}=3.24$  the determination was made that there were no statistically significant differences between the different programs. This would indicate that the candidates in all programs are performing at similar levels. With a scoring range from 3-4 statistically all candidates are acceptable or target on the assessment. It is through the alignment of the conceptual framework to the state and national standards that the School of Education can state with confidence that candidates (students) that score at the target or acceptable level on state and national standards have also met the unit goals for student learning outcomes. The School of Education is confident that candidates (students) in all programs are performing at a level that indicates they are meeting the units learning outcome goals.

Each year the faculty review the data to determine the areas that need to be addressed. Through this review the faculty determined that candidates (students) demonstrate a thorough understanding of the relationship of content and content-specific pedagogy delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards through various SPA and ADE approved key assessments. The data indicate 100% of all program completers scored acceptable to target on all key assessments used to measure student learning outcomes. The data confirm candidates (students) have an in-depth understanding of the content that they plan to teach and can differentiate instruction so that all students learn. Additionally,

the data verify candidates demonstrate the ability to present content to the students in challenging, clear, and compelling ways for appropriately using technology. The School of Education faculty will continue to meet and review the data to determine areas that need to be addressed. During those meetings curriculum alignment and review will continue.

**4. Other than course level/grades, describe/analyze other data and other sources of data whose results assist your unit to improve student learning.**

The School of Education uses multiple strategies and assessments to measure the effectiveness of the unit program quality. These include the analysis of demographic data to ensure that signature assessments are fair, consistent, accurate, and free from bias, the quality of faculty lectures and presentations; the quality and availability of advisors; the quality of assessments; and the variety, quality, and supervision of field and internship experiences. They are assessed using disaggregated data from items included in candidate (student) internship surveys, graduate surveys, and employer surveys. Additionally, all candidates (students) are scored using the School of Education disposition rubric that reflects their ability to work with students, families, colleagues, and communities. The disposition rubric is designed around the five strands of the Conceptual Framework, which are directly correlated with the student learning outcomes. Candidates are required to score acceptable or above on all parts of the disposition rubric by the end of Internship II.

Disposition Data							
2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016	
Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean
2.94-4.90	4.03	2.88-5.00	4.12	2.76-4.77	4.14	2.9-4.85	4.09

The Arkansas Department of Education has implemented a process for guaranteeing a 100% rate of return on completer (graduate) surveys. The department now has individuals complete the survey as a part of their mentoring process in the public schools. The date reported by the School of Education from this point forward on completer (graduate) surveys will be generated by the department; however, the analysis of the data will be conducted by the School of Education.

The data below indicate that candidates (students) that complete the UAM education program believe they are on average well prepared for the position for which they were trained. Compared to state averages UAM candidates (students) are as prepared as other candidates (students) in other universities in the state. The School of Education has noted a few areas of concern that will need to be monitored to determine if changes need to be made to the curriculum. Even though UAM did not performing poorly in these areas the School of Education is determined to not have scores below the state in any area in the future.

<b>Novice Teacher Survey Spring 2015</b>			
<b>TESS Domain</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>UAM (n=23)</b>	<b>State (n=1512)</b>
1a.	Knowledge of content and pedagogy	4.04	4.17
1b.	Knowledge of students	4.13	4.21
1c.	Instructional outcomes	4.30	4.05
1d.	Knowledge of resources	4.17	4.06
1e.	Coherent instruction	4.17	4.07
1f.	Student assessments	4.22	3.94
2a.	Environment of respect and rapport	4.22	4.24
2b.	Culture for learning	4.09	4.18
2c.	Managing classroom procedures	4.09	4.03
2d.	Managing student behavior	4.04	3.98
2e.	Organizing physical space	4.17	4.14
3a.	Communicating with students	4.09	4.17
3b.	Questioning and discussion techniques	4.09	3.96
3c.	Engaging students in learning	4.09	4.08
3d.	Using assessment in instruction	3.87	3.94
3e.	Flexibility and responsiveness	4.04	4.11
4a.	Reflecting on teaching	4.13	4.20
4b.	Maintaining accurate records	3.74	3.96
4c.	Communicating with families	4.09	3.97
4d.	Participating in professional community	4.22	4.11
4e.	Growing and developing professionally	4.13	4.16
4f.	Showing Professionalism	4.17	4.30
Overall Average		4.10	4.09

The School of Education utilizes Praxis exam pass rates to determine areas in which candidates excel and areas in which they require assistance. The School of Education is aware that candidates do not perform as well on the Middle School Praxis exams. Based on the data reviewed the faculty made modifications to the curriculum to include a focus on specific content throughout the coursework.

<b>Licensure Test Pass Rates</b>						
<b>Test Name</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b># Pass</b>	<b>% Pass</b>	<b>State Pass Rate (%)</b>
Early Childhood: Content Knowledge	14	177.64	169-190	14	100	99.87
Health and Physical Education: Content	7	160.14	155-171	7	100	86.44
Middle School English Language Arts	8	153.75	130-171	4	50	47.59
Middle School Mathematics	9	154.67	130-189	2	22	54.21
Middle School Science	5	142.60	133-156	1	20	53.03
Middle School Social Studies	6	140.50	115-158	3	50	74.17
PLT: Grades Early Childhood	26	167.54	156-183	25	96	92.13
PLT: Grades 5-9	14	173.50	157-183	13	93	92.43
PLT: Grades 7-12	35	167.40	149-191	31	89	94.45

The data below indicate the number of program completers and the percentage that were employed by Arkansas public schools. This data do not include individuals that moved out of state or took positions teaching in a private school. The data demonstrate that candidates from the UAM School of Education are employed at a higher percentage rate than the state.

<b>Program Completers Employed in Arkansas Public Schools</b>		
	<b>UAM</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>
2012-2013 Completers	65	2036
2012-2012 Completers Employed in Arkansas Public Schools in 2013-2014	52	1143
Percentage Employed in Arkansas Public Schools in 2013-2014	80%	56%
	<b>UAM</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>
2013-2014 Completers	79	2324
2013-2014 Completers Employed in Arkansas Public Schools in 2014-2015	60	1394
Percentage Employed in Arkansas Public Schools in 2014-2015	76%	60%
	<b>UAM</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>
2014-2015 Completers	78	2176
2014-2015 Completers Employed in Arkansas Public Schools in 2015-2016	57	1220
Percentage Employed in Arkansas Public Schools in 2015-2016	73%	56%

**5. As a result of the review of your student learning data in previous questions, explain what efforts your unit has made to improve student learning. Be specific indicating when, how often, how much, and by whom these improvements took place.**

The School of Education unit assessment system is designed for the collection, analysis, summarization and use of data for unit, initial and advanced program improvements. The electronic system is supported by Chalk and Wire, which is an ePortfolio, assessment, and data analysis tool. The system is comprehensive and houses data from all unit programs, unit assessments and surveys which are aligned with national, state and professional standards. The assessment system was developed through collaborative efforts of teacher education faculty, candidates (students), public school educators, and other stakeholders.

The assessment system of the professional education program is focused on candidate outcomes rather than program inputs. This focus resulted in the development of a greater emphasis on performance assessments to evaluate candidate performance as they matriculate through the transition points in the initial and advanced programs. Data on candidate performance from both internal and external assessment sources are used to evaluate and improve unit and program effectiveness, as well as the programs' graduates. The assessment process involves the collection, aggregation, and analysis of data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates (students), the unit, and its programs. The assessment system is cyclical, in nature, starting and ending with the Conceptual

Framework. The assessment system evaluates how well the unit and the initial and advanced programs integrate the strands of the Conceptual Framework into the curriculum and aligns the candidate proficiencies with unit and program standards. Signature assessments, disposition rubrics, Praxis scores, and the Teacher Candidate Rating Instrument (TCRI) yield data to evaluate candidate performance as well as program and unit effectiveness. Program and unit data are aggregated, analyzed, and reviewed by the Curriculum and Assessment Committee, program faculty, Teacher Education Committee, and other stakeholders to make program and unit decisions. The continuous review of program and unit data enables the School of Education to ensure the alignment of programs to the Conceptual Framework, to state and national standards and to identify possible unit and program improvement needs. The data also provide multiple evidences at various transition points to monitor candidate performance and to ensure candidates (students) are prepared to positively impact student learning.

The reliability and validity of data are critically important in the planning and assessment of unit and program outcomes. The assessment system was developed to ensure the data are fair, consistent, accurate, and void of bias through triangulation and cross-analysis of data for each candidate and program. Multiple and varied assessments are administered throughout all programs to minimize bias for diverse populations. In addition, programs at the initial and advanced levels use standardized, commercially produced examinations such as Praxis exams and the School Leadership Licensure Assessment as part of its assessment measures. Program faculty members assist in the development of program signature assessments, and scoring rubrics which are reviewed periodically by faculty committees to ensure understanding, fairness, validity, and reliability. All assessment tools are developed in alignment with national standards. The unit also utilizes multiple measures which are administered at various points throughout the programs of study. The measures include standardized tests, course-imbedded assessments, field-experience measures, and surveys and rubrics that are completed by faculty, initial and advanced candidates (students), university supervisors, graduates, cooperating teachers and public school administrators. Gathering data from multiple evaluators and cross-referencing the data from one assessment to another allows for triangulation to ensure validity.

Program faculty continuously review the curriculum to ensure candidates (students) are provided opportunities to learn, practice, and demonstrate their knowledge in each of the five strands of the Conceptual Framework and that the curriculum is aligned with standards and assessments. Faculty constructed state approved curriculum/standards matrices, as part of state program review. The matrices indicate where in the curriculum candidates (students) have opportunities to learn and practice what is specified in the standards. In addition, candidates (students) are provided information on how the rubrics are used to score the assessments and how the rubrics and assessments are used to measure candidate performance.

The unit utilizes multiple strategies and various assessments to measure the effectiveness of the unit operations and quality of the programs. Specific questions are embedded in the Pre/Post Internship Surveys that allow candidates (students) to rate faculty and the courses in the teacher education program. Candidates (students) are given the opportunity to

provide feedback on field and internship experiences by answering questions on the Pre/Post Internship Surveys. Candidates (students) complete evaluations of the faculty using the university student evaluation each semester. Candidates (students) can also provide both positive and negative feedback through the grievance procedure described in the syllabi, handbooks, and on the SOE Website. The cooperating teachers are asked to complete an evaluation of the clinical internship each semester. The evaluation allows cooperating teachers to rate the unit on the effectiveness and organization of the internship process.

The unit strategic plan and university annual report are utilized as self-studies and provide an opportunity for the faculty to evaluate the operations of the unit. The strategic plan is reviewed by the faculty each year to determine goals that have been met and goals for the future. The annual report for the university provides a concise overview of various aspects of the unit operations including workloads, internship placements, the number of graduates from the program, and the number of minorities graduating each year. The system clearly specifies the data to be collected, the frequency of data collection, who is responsible for collecting the data, and who is responsible for analyzing and evaluating data and monitoring its use to support candidate learning and effective program and unit operations and quality.

Various data are housed in the university registrar's office and in the SOE Chalk and Wire system. General data such as grades are maintained by the registrar. Unit and program data are housed in the Chalk and Wire system. The collection and analysis of unit and program data is the responsibility of the unit Assessment Coordinator. Data reports are reviewed by the Teacher Education Committee, the Assessment and Curriculum Committee, comprised of arts/sciences representatives, the unit/program faculty, public school partners, teacher candidates (students), and with participants at the stakeholders' meetings. Data are generated as candidate grades are entered into the Weevilnet system. Data, such as admission dates, completion dates, licensure applications, are entered into the university and unit databases by university and unit staff. Test data, such as ETS reported Praxis I and II scores are accessed and analyzed using the ETS Data Manager. Data on intern performance are reported by university supervisors and cooperating teachers using the TCRI scoring rubric and placed in Chalk and Wire. Each initial and advanced program has six to eight program-specific key performance-based assessments that yield data specific to candidate performance as it relates to program and unit standards. The School of Education Candidate Grievance Procedure is made to candidates (students) in the Teacher Education Handbook, on the School of Education website and is referenced in the syllabi. The procedure states that a candidate should first discuss course concerns and complaints with the faculty member responsible for the course in which the complaint lies. If a complaint is not satisfactorily resolved, the candidate may present the matter in writing to the Dean of the School of Education. If the issue remains unresolved, the candidate may appeal to the Teacher Education Committee.

The Curriculum and Assessment Committee and the Teacher Education Committee regularly review data results to determine strengths and areas for improvement in the unit, initial and advanced programs, and initial and advanced candidate performance. Results of

key assessments are shared with candidates (students) throughout the program. In addition to feedback from faculty, candidates (students) compare their scores to the indicators on the scoring guide or rubric to evaluate how they might improve based upon the indicator criteria. Faculty advisors, individual faculty, program coordinators, university supervisors, and the partnership coordinator share performance data with candidates (students) to identify areas for improvement and to identify strengths. Results of disposition and diversity rubrics are also shared with candidates (students) and recommendations for improvement are made, if needed. Data are shared in faculty meetings to identify possible areas of concern or inconsistencies in scoring of key assessments as well as diversity and disposition rubrics. Faculty evaluations include a self-evaluation, peer evaluations, classroom observations and the dean's analysis of how well faculty perform in the five strands of the unit conceptual framework. Faculty are encouraged to use the data to identify instructional strengths and areas for improvement in their teaching as well as areas for professional development needs. Faculty are provided with a rich array of professional development activities that are linked to indicators of effective practice including the five strands of the unit conceptual framework.

**6. What new tactics to improve student learning will your unit consider, experiment with, research, review or put into practice over the next year?**

The School of Education developed and implemented a new 100% online non-licensure undergraduate degree program designed for paraprofessionals working in public schools. The development of this degree made way for a memorandum of understanding with the Arkansas Department of Education for an alternative route to licensure through a teacher residency program.

In addition to the teacher residency memorandum of understanding the School of Education developed a memorandum of understanding with the Arkansas Department of Education that allows schools to hire intern II candidates as long term substitutes to fill the needs of the district when a licensed teacher cannot be hired.

Based on data collected from the completer (graduate) survey the School of Education has placed more emphasis on instructors modeling best practices with the use of technology. The faculty have been encouraged to integrate more hands-on technology into their instruction.

The School of Education partnered with the STEM Center and the ERZ specialist to support classroom instruction through team-teaching and special classroom demonstrations of instructional strategies.

**7. How do you ensure shared responsibility for student learning and assessment among students, faculty and other stakeholders?**

The School of Education hosts an annual stakeholders meeting that includes members of the community, principals, superintendents, teachers, faculty from other university units, School of Education faculty, and candidates (students). During this meeting, stakeholders

are presented with information regarding new School of Education programs, new rules and regulations governing teacher preparation, CAEP updates, and curriculum changes within School of Education programs. Stakeholders have an opportunity to participate in round table discussions and voice concerns about past and future events.

Candidates (students) serve as members of the Teacher Education Committee and serve on the UAM Graduate Council as voting members. Both of these allow candidates (students) to have input on a number of matters dealing with program decisions as well as candidate (student) matters.

The School of Education has a candidate (student) comments and concerns form available online for students to communicate directly with the dean any issues or concerns that they may have. The dean responds to all candidate (student) concerns and the response is documented and placed in the CAEP files with the name of the candidate (student) removed for privacy.

A candidate having a complaint in regard to the School of Education programs of study or coursework should discuss the concern with their advisor or the faculty member responsible for the course in which the complaint lies. If a complaint is not satisfactorily resolved, the candidate may present their complaint to the Dean of the School of Education using the form on the School of Education homepage.

Concerns in regard to School of Education programs should first be presented the program coordinator for the major area of concern. Candidates may present unresolved issues in writing to the Dean of the School of Education. If the issue remains unresolved, the candidate may appeal to the School of Education Teacher Education Committee.

Complaints involving the Dean of the School of Education should be directed to the Provost. The candidates may ultimately appeal all concerns about current programs to the Provost and then to the Chancellor after the above steps have been taken.

**Procedure for Academic/Course Concerns:**

1. A candidate should schedule an appointment with the instructor/professor. At this meeting the presentation of the complaint and all discussion will be entirely informal. The instructor/professor will attempt to resolve the complaint. Where his or her complaint is not satisfactorily resolved, a candidate has the right to submit a written formal complaint to the Dean of the School of Education. When a candidate presents a complaint in writing, the Dean of the School of Education will conduct an investigation and issue a written decision.
2. The candidate or the person(s) involved in the complaint may appeal the decision issued by the Dean of the School of Education by forwarding his or her complaint in writing to the School of Education Teacher Education Committee. Upon receipt of a complaint, the School of Education Teacher Education Committee will, at its regularly scheduled meeting, investigate the matter and issue a decision. The decision of the School of Education Teacher Education Committee will be made to the candidate and the person(s) involved in the grievance. If the decision of the School of Education

Teacher Education. Committee is not satisfactory to the candidate, he/she may appeal the decision to the Provost and then to the Chancellor.

**Procedure for Program Concerns:**

1. A candidate should schedule an appointment with the Program Coordinator with supervisory responsibility for the area where the complaint lies. At this meeting the presentation of the complaint and all discussion will be entirely informal. The Program Coordinator will attempt to resolve the complaint. Where his or her complaint is not satisfactorily resolved, the candidate has the right to submit a written complaint to the Dean of the School of Education. The Dean of the School of Education will conduct an investigation and issue a written decision.
  
2. The candidate or the person(s) involved in the complaint may appeal the decision issued by the Dean of the School of Education by forwarding his or her complaint in writing to the School of Education Teacher Education Committee. Upon receipt of a complaint, the School of Education Teacher Education Committee will, at its regularly scheduled meeting, investigate the matter and issue a decision. The decision of the School of Education Teacher Education Committee will be made to the candidate and the person(s) involved in the grievance. If the decision of the School of Education Teacher Education Committee is not satisfactory to the candidate, he/she may appeal the decision to the Provost and then to the Chancellor.

**8. Describe and provide evidence of efforts your unit is making to recruit/retain/graduate students in your unit/at the University. (A generalized statement such as “we take a personal interest in our students” is not evidence.)**

The School of Education continued for the sixth year the Pinning Ceremony for candidates (students) admitted to teacher education.

The School of Education hosted the fifth annual hotdog picnic to help keep candidates (students) actively engaged in campus events. Welcome Back flyers were given to every candidate (student) taking an education course and candidates (students) were contacted by their advisor personally welcoming them back in the spring. The School of Education believes that events such as these keep candidates (students) in regular contact with faculty outside of regular advising.

Specific activities are listed below.

<u>Date:</u>	<u>Activity:</u>	<u>Number &amp; Medium</u>
7/7/15	Visited w/3# Upward Bound Students for EDUC	face/to/face
7/8/15	Called/emailed Students about Eff. Instructional Man.Course	16 students
7/8/15	Called/emailed about Effective Strategies course	20 students
7/20/15	Kirsten Holiman, ASU & Mid-South Comm. College,	emailed, phone,
her	future student planning on visiting SOE	several times
8/27/15	SOE’s Faculty /Student Mixer	approx. 109 present

10/27/15	Scholarship Award Letters	29 letters mailed
10/27/15	Scholarship Award Letters	20 letters mailed
11/10/15	"Becoming an AR Teacher" Recruitment Fair, 3:00-7:00 p.m., Benton Event Center	
12/15/15	"Becoming an Arkansas Teacher, Nov. 10, 2015	BentonEvent Center, 18 emails
12/15/15	Scholarship Award Letters	5 letters mailed
12/15/15	College Fair Attendees	20 emails, 6 letters
12/15/15	College Fair Attendees	15 emails, 6 letters
12/16/ 15	College Fair Attendees	21 emails, 3 letters
12/16/15	College Fair Attendees	33 emails, 2 letters
12/16/15	College Fair Attendees	13 emails, 6 letters
12/18/15	Parent/Family Appreciation Day	12 emails, 3 letters
12/18/15	Whiting's, 1 <sup>st</sup> long list of potential Students' Interests	19 emails
12/21/15	Whiting's 1 <sup>st</sup> long list (cont.& finished)	38 emails
12/23/15	UAM Scholarship Award Winners	3 letters(1music&2ed)
2/9/16	UAM Scholarship Award Letters	25 letters
2/11/16	Letter Recommendation for Scholarship	1 letter
2/12/16	Weevil Welcome Students Scholarship Letters	32 emails
2/29/16	Emailed back a student who had emailed Dr. Doss	1 email
4/16/16	ADE Recruitment of Future Teachers, Heifer, Pavilion, LR	7 emails
5/5/16	Three Teacher Edu. Prog. Inductees' letters to be in KDPI	3 letters
5/5/16	Four Teacher Edu. Prog. Inductees letters to be in KDPI	4 letters
5/10/16	SOE Hamburger & Hot Dog Picnic, H.S. Students Letters.	23 emails
5/10/16	SOE Hamburger & Hot Dog Picnic, H.S. Students Letters.	21 emails
5/10/16	Pre-Freshman Recruiting Letter	1 letter
5/11/16	Ten (10) Emails to Future Graduate Students, received 4/19/16	10 emails
5/12/16	Two Responses from Grad. Students & I responded to them	2 emails
5/12/16	Emails to MAT's, SPED, MED LDR, TCH_LR for recruitment	27 emails
5/12/16	Received back emails from yesterday's & today's above....	
5/13/16	Emails to General Study's people	39 emails
5/16/16	Emails to Future MAT's	22 emails
5/16/16	Emails to Future Masters of Education Students	4 mails
5/16/16	Emails to Masters of Teaching & Learning	6 emails
5/16/16	Emails to Sp. Ed. Endorsements	5 emails
5/16/16	Emails sent to future, Masters in PE & Coaching candidates	6 emails
5/19/16	Emails Sent for K-6 <sup>th</sup> , MLED, TCH&LP, H& PE applicants	41 emails
5/19/16	Emails Sent of ADMIT students in HPE & K-6th	4 emails
5/20/16	Emails Sent to APPL students in GEN Studies, AA MAJ	20 emails
5/23/16	Emails sent to Gen Studies-AA, AASGT,BAS, BGS	21 emails
5/24/16	Emails sent to Graduate Applicants in PE, MAT, SPED412, MA TCH <MAPEC	15 emails
5/24/16	Working w/ K- 6 <sup>th</sup> Teacher candidate to pass the PRAXIS CORE in reading and writing.	2 hours
6/6/16	ArkADE Student Scholarship Letter Written	1 hour

6/7/16	Responded via email to future student who has chosen UAM and had a question.	1 email
6/10/16	Emails to Future, Registered Freshmen, attending June Reg.	19 emails
6/23/16	Answered email back from future student	1 email