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I. INTRODUCTION

1. Provide a brief overview of the institution and the unit.

The University of Arkansas at Monticello (UAM) is an open-admission, state-supported university established as the Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College in 1909. After becoming a junior college and then a senior college emphasizing agriculture, home economics, and teacher education, it evolved into a comprehensive university that has become part of the University of Arkansas system. It became the University of Arkansas at Monticello in 1971 and expanded its mission to include technical education by merging with two technical institutes in 2003. UAM is governed by the University of Arkansas Board of Trustees but operates autonomously and has its own chancellor, faculty, curricula, budget, and catalogs.

UAM is organized into one college (General Studies), six schools (Business, Arts and Humanities, Education, Forest Resources, Mathematical and Natural Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences), and five divisions (Agriculture, Computer Information Systems, Music, Nursing, and ROTC). It offers associate, baccalaureate, and masters degrees, as well as workforce training and a number of vocational/technical certificates.

The university is located in Monticello, the county seat of Drew County in the rural southeastern corner of Arkansas. According to 2006 Census Bureau estimates, the population of the city is 9,327. The racial makeup of the city is estimated at 64.96 percent White, 32.62 percent Black or African American, 0.15 percent Native American, 0.70 percent Asian, 0.01 percent Pacific Islander, 0.58 percent from other races, and 0.98 percent from two or more races. 1.29 percent of the population is Hispanic or Latino of any race. The majority of UAM students come from Arkansas, with a gradually increasing number of international students and students from other states.
A total of 3,302 undergraduate and graduate students are enrolled at UAM for the 2008-09 academic year. Approximately 2,281 (69%) identify themselves as White; the remainder represent minorities. Sixty percent of the student population is female.

For the 2008-09 academic year, UAM has a total of 274 full-time faculty, 230 (84%) of whom identify themselves as White; the remainder represent minorities. Fifty-two percent of the faculty is female.

The School of Education is the professional education unit; the dean serves as unit head. It offers undergraduate degrees in P-4 early childhood education, (including a 2+2 community college program), middle childhood education, and physical education. Graduate programs include a Masters of Arts in Teaching (MAT), a Masters of Education (M.Ed.), a Masters of Educational Leadership, and licensure programs for P-4 and 4-12 specialists in special education.

The unit includes 14 full-time faculty, 11 full-time in the university/part-time in the unit, and 17 adjuncts. One (7%) of the 14 full-time education faculty teaching in initial programs is a minority; two (15%) of the 13 full-time education faculty teaching in advanced programs are minorities. The unit does not have graduate assistants. Fall 2008 unit enrollment includes 95 initial and 38 advanced candidates. Eighty-seven percent and 79 percent of these candidates identify themselves as White, respectively; the remainder represent minorities.

Since its last NCATE visit, the unit has experienced a number of significant changes affecting its teacher education programs. It revised its P-4 early childhood/special education program to prepare candidates for P-4 early childhood licensure only; revised the middle childhood, MAT, and educational leadership programs; developed two advanced programs for P-4 and 4-12 specialists in special education; and created three emphasis areas for its M.Ed. program – pedagogy, content area, and special education. Revisions were also made to the conceptual framework, courses, programs, and assessment system to better reflect diversity, technology, and professional standards alignment.

2. Describe the type of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This continuing accreditation visit followed the NCATE/Arkansas protocol, which calls for a single NCATE team to conduct the visit with resource support from a consultant from the Arkansas State Department of Education. Arkansas requires teacher education programs to submit NCATE program review documents as appropriate, unless a program is new or being restructured to meet new state endorsement requirements. Program review reports and state program approval documents were available to the team during the visit. Arkansas considers all professional education units that are accredited by NCATE and also meet all other state requirements as approved by the state to offer teacher education programs.

3. Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

UAM has a 2+2 partnership agreement with two community colleges to deliver the P-4 early childhood program and with one community college to deliver the middle childhood program via distance-learning technologies. Program major courses are taught via Compressed Interactive Video (CIV) or as hybrids (both face-to-face and online). Approximately 50 percent of the courses in the 2+2 program and in the M.A.T. are taught by online instruction. All courses are taught by UAM school of Education faculty. The unit does not offer any programs on sites other than the main campus; there are no branch
Candidates, faculty, and supervisors involved in distance learning settings were interviewed in on-campus meetings. All findings in this report reflect both on-campus programs and distance-learning courses unless otherwise indicated.

4. Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

No unusual circumstances affected the visit.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit’s efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P–12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

1. Provide a brief overview of the unit’s conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The University of Arkansas at Monticello “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 that 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 unit’s vision states that it “aspires to prepare multi-faceted, highly qualified professional educators who are caring individuals and are committed to addressing the challenges of educating a diverse population of P-12 students in an evolving technological world.” It regards its mission as preparing “candidates to live and work in a rapidly changing, diverse world.” This vision and mission support the unit’s conceptual framework philosophy, Multifaceted Educators, which considers candidates as “diamonds in the rough” who have talents, skills, and dreams; it regards the faculty’s role as molding “future educators into multi-faceted gemstones that reflect the content knowledge, pedagogical skills, understanding of diversity, technological skills, and professionalism required of them to also transform their students into multi-faceted brilliant diamonds.”

The conceptual framework has five strands: Knowledge, Pedagogy, Diversity, Professionalism, and Technology. The research and literature supporting each of the five strands is current, detailed, and comprehensive. Each of the five strands contains a set of belief statements for candidates in both initial and advanced programs, which then guide the development of unit goals. For example, the Knowledge strand states:

We believe multi-faceted initial teacher candidates:
• attain knowledge of learners and how learning occurs, and
• understand school-community relationships.

We believe multi-faceted advanced candidates and other school personnel:
• have in-depth content knowledge, and
• are recognized experts in the content they teach.

The unit has carefully aligned the five strands of the conceptual framework to state and national standards and the Pathwise teaching model for all initial and advanced programs to provide validity for its own program. All signature assessments have also been aligned with these standards, and the unit has taken steps to ensure that they are fair, consistent, accurate, and free from bias. The assessment system itself is designed to evaluate how well the unit and the initial and advanced programs integrate the strands of the conceptual framework and with its signature assessments, disposition rubrics, Praxis scores, diversity rubrics, Teacher Candidate Rating Instrument (initial licensure programs), and capstone research experience (advanced programs) to yield the data that evaluates candidate performance, as well as program and unit effectiveness.

The unit has also identified specific candidate expectations related to diversity and technology. Course syllabi and “signature assessments” are aligned with these proficiencies. The accompanying rubrics describe levels of candidate competency in each of the standards during coursework, field experiences, and the capstone experiences and provide evidence of candidate progress.

Since the last accreditation visit, the unit has made significant changes to its conceptual framework to better reflect the unit’s shared vision and mission, to better address diversity, and to add in a technology-related strand. The bibliography was updated, and documents were aligned with the latest versions of state and national standards.

III. STANDARDS

In its responses to each standard, the team should indicate when differences exist among the main campus, distance learning programs, and off-campus programs.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
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. Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes
No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.
Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Teacher candidates at the University of Arkansas Monticello demonstrate their content knowledge through Praxis II exams and signature assessments appropriate to their specialized professional association (SPA). The P-4 early childhood program and the middle childhood program are nationally recognized, and the health and physical education P-12 and Master of Arts in Teaching programs are state-approved. The music education program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music.

Satisfactory scores on the Praxis II content licensure tests are used to determine candidates’ readiness for entry to clinical practice in the initial program at the undergraduate level or for admission to the Master of Arts in Teaching program at the graduate level. All initial programs show a 100 percent pass rate on Praxis II content licensure tests. In addition to the Praxis II, content knowledge test, health and physical education candidates are required to take the Praxis II, Movement Forms and Analysis Test. For this test, they design a fitness and movement lesson designed for appropriate developmental levels of children. These data were not available because the program recently underwent a major program redesign and candidates have not yet sat for the test.

Data from the signature assessments provide further evidence that candidates in initial programs possess in-depth content knowledge. All signature assessments are aligned with the conceptual framework, as well as with state and national standards. For the early childhood and 2+2 early childhood programs, 100 percent of the candidates achieved a ranking of target on the curriculum and development project assessment. The MAT program examines GPA as a measure of content knowledge, and, for the 2007-2008 and 2006-2007 academic years, 100 percent of the candidates entered the program with an earned undergraduate GPA of 3.00 or higher. No aggregated data were available for the content knowledge signature assessment for middle level candidates because of low enrollments.

The principal and graduate surveys have specific items designated to assess content knowledge, pedagogy, professionalism, knowledge of technology, and diversity. The number of responses from these surveys was very low. The data from these surveys were not disaggregated by program and were collected on both initial and advanced candidates. With these limitations, spring 2008 data from specified items show that principals believe that candidates possess in-depth content knowledge. Prior to spring 2008, ratings on content knowledge items were somewhat lower. They ranged from 18 percent to 75 percent agreement that candidates possessed sufficient content knowledge; however, the increase in higher ratings of candidates by principals in later years shows the unit’s use of data for program improvement. The graduate survey data reveal that all candidates believed they were well prepared. The graduate surveys had extremely low samples; therefore, the results of these surveys may not have not been useful for determining candidates’ content knowledge or for planning for program improvement. (See discussion under Standard 2, element B.)

Although some programs were lacking data, information was gathered from interviews with candidates, graduates, and administrators to verify the candidate’s acquisition of content knowledge. All groups who were interviewed believed candidates had sufficient content knowledge to be effective teachers in their respective content areas.
Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

The M.Ed. program for teachers is state-approved, and the special education specialist P-4 and 4-12 programs are nationally recognized with conditions.

The M.Ed. program identified Praxis II and GPA as assessments of content knowledge. Because these are required prior to entrance to the program, all candidates achieved these criteria. The special education instructional specialist program identified Praxis II and an exceptional learning needs portfolio as a key assessment to show that candidates demonstrate acquisition of in-depth content knowledge in their field. Data show that 100 percent of candidates achieved the cut score on the Praxis exam and received an acceptable or better rating on the portfolio.

Principal and graduate survey data were not disaggregated by program or program level. Therefore, the data from the instruments are the same as those provided for initial candidates.

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

| Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates in all initial programs acquire the pedagogical content knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching. Each program has a signature assessment specifically designed to assess candidates’ pedagogical knowledge and skills. These include an action research project for the middle level education program; lesson plans and lesson implementation for student learning for the P-4 early childhood, the 2+2 early childhood, and health and physical education programs; and Praxis III for the MAT program. In spring 2008, data for the P-4 early childhood and 2+2 early childhood programs showed that all candidates performed at the acceptable or target level and data for the health and physical education program showed that 80 percent of the candidates scored acceptable or target level. No data were available for other programs - the middle level program has few candidates enrolled, and the MAT program was recently redesigned so no graduates had completed the assessment at the time of the visit. Although data are lacking for those programs, interviews with candidates, graduates, and school stakeholders provided evidence that candidates possessed pedagogical content knowledge and skills.

Initial candidates are required to complete an educational technology course. This course includes assignments that require the development of web pages, use of Smart Boards, use of a document camera, assessment of web sites and software, development of multimedia presentations, and a report on assistive technology. Candidates reported that they are required to include technology in all lessons implemented during their internships.

Spring and fall 2008 data from the technology survey completed by cooperating teachers during internships indicate that the majority of candidates are performing satisfactorily. These data are not disaggregated by program. Results of the technology survey administered to candidates during their internship indicate that in 2007, 100 percent of the initial and advanced candidates rated the program as strong or outstanding in three areas. These areas include the preparation for using technology to enhance student learning, as a resource to enhance student learning, and for personal and teacher productivity. In
2007 and 2008, at least 84 percent of the principals rated candidates’ technology skills on the same items as satisfactory, strong or outstanding. These data were not disaggregated by program or program level.

Follow-up surveys are not disaggregated by program or program level; therefore, the results apply to both initial and advanced programs. The data for the graduate and principal surveys are included in the section for advanced candidates below.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:**

The M.Ed. program includes two signature assessments that assess pedagogical knowledge and skills. The individual diversity study requires candidates to interview students whom they have taught and older adolescents or adults whom they are not presently teaching. They reflect on an interview they have conducted with these groups. In spring 2008, all candidates received a rating of acceptable or target on this assessment. The second assessment is the capstone research project in which candidates conduct an action research project. Data were not available for this assessment because the program was implemented in summer 2007 and no candidates have yet enrolled in the capstone course.

The special education P-4 and 4-12 instructional specialist candidates are required to develop a collaborative lesson with a general education teacher. They are also assessed on the Teacher Candidate Rating Instrument (TCRI). No data were available for either of these assessments because the program had recently been redesigned and candidates have not yet completed signature assessments. The program is nationally recognized with conditions because of this lack of data; a response to the conditions has been submitted to CEC.

Advanced candidates are also required to enroll in an educational technology course which includes varied assignments to assist them in helping all students learn. Candidates reported that they are required to use multimedia presentations for all presentations required in their coursework.

Although other data were lacking, interviews with candidates, graduates, and stakeholders verified that all advanced teacher candidates possess the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to be effective teachers.

Graduate survey results are inconsistent across years. In 2005 and 2006, only 67 percent of graduates rated a majority of the pedagogy indicators as satisfactory or better on a five-point scale. In 2007, a majority of the indicators were rated as satisfactory or better by 100 percent of the candidates. The small sample may be a factor in the results of the survey. These results are not disaggregated by program or by program level; therefore, they apply to both initial and advanced programs.

The principal survey shows that in fall 2007, fall 2008, and spring 2008, 83 percent of the principals rated the graduates as strong or better on a five-point scale on all indicators related to pedagogy content knowledge and skills. These data were not disaggregated by program or by program level; therefore, they apply to both initial and advanced programs.

**1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates**

| Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – | |
Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

All initial programs are state-approved or nationally recognized by their respective SPAs. The TCRI is used during the internship to determine to what extent teacher candidates possess professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. This instrument is consistent with the Praxis III Pathwise assessment and includes assessment in four domains. These domains are: organizing content knowledge for student learning, creating an environment for student learning, teaching for student learning, and teacher professionalism. A review of data for each program report showed that all candidates successfully demonstrate proficiency for all domains at the acceptable level or better on a five-point scale.

Interviews with candidates and school administrators provided information that supports the results of the assessments. Candidates believed they had learned specific instructional strategies, assessment practices, and practice in collaboration with caregivers and colleagues. The administrators provided several specific examples of the candidates’ professional knowledge and skills.

The principal and the graduate surveys also provide evidence that the majority of the candidates possess the professional and pedagogical knowledge to be effective teachers. In spring 2008, principals rated graduates of the program in the area of professionalism. On 10 of the 13 items, principals rated the graduates as satisfactory or better on a five-point scale. In the area of pedagogy, principals rated a majority of the graduates of the program as fair or better on 14 of the 18 items on the survey. In 2007, graduates rated their preparation in the area of professionalism as satisfactory or better on six of the seven items on a five-point scale and rated their preparation in the area of pedagogy as fair or better on 17 of the 21 items. The sample for each of these surveys is small; therefore, the results may not be useful data for program improvement.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

The revised performance-based M.Ed. program was implemented in summer 2007; therefore, there are not data for all assessments in the program. However, the program has received state approval. The program uses a research project, a student learning assessment project, an instructional technology project, and a comprehensive essay on six principles of IDEA to assess candidates’ professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Engaging in these professional activities demonstrates candidates’ awareness of current research and their knowledge of school policies and best practices.

The special education P-4 and 4-12 instructional specialist programs assess candidates through a differentiated unit lesson plan, a case-based education plan, a comprehensive educational evaluation, and a comprehensive essay on six principles of IDEA. Because the programs are new, data are not available for all assessments. However, they are nationally recognized with conditions, and a review of the data that were provided in the program report shows that candidates possess the professional knowledge and skills to be effective teachers.

Because the principal and graduate surveys are not disaggregated by program level, the data provided for initial programs also pertains to the advanced program candidates.

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates
Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Initial programs assess student learning using different assessments. The MAT program requires candidates to develop and implement a philosophy of assessment consistent with their teaching methods and strategies. They prepare students’ assessment results using three methods that include criterion-referenced fixed percentage, criterion-referenced total points, and norm-referenced methods. In spring 2008, data show that 80 percent of the candidates can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social, and personal development, and can use formal and informal assessment method to insure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of learners.

The middle level program requires candidates to conduct an action research project. Data from fall 2007, show that at least 80 percent of the candidates achieved an acceptable or better rating on a three-point scale. Candidates in the early childhood and 2+2 early childhood programs are required to teach a math or science lesson that includes a pre- and post-test assessment instrument. Once they have determined the impact on student learning, they share the analysis in a multi-media class presentation. Data from spring 2007, fall 2007, and spring 2008 show that all candidates received a rating of acceptable or better on a three-point scale. All candidates in the health and physical education program achieved a rating of target on the Pre- and Post-Discrete Skills Test.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, and administrators supported the results of assessments. In addition, graduate and principal survey results also showed that candidates have the ability to use data to design instruction. These surveys are not disaggregated by program or program level; therefore, the results apply to both initial and advanced candidates.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

The special education P-4 and 4-12 instructional specialist candidates complete a progress monitoring project to show that they can analyze data to design appropriate instruction for all students. In spring 2008, 90 percent of the candidates achieved a rating of acceptable or higher on a three-point scale on all indicators of the rubric.

The M.Ed. Program candidates use knowledge of test blueprints, assessments, and state standardized testing formats to develop a philosophy of assessment that validates student achievement of standards and meeting learning targets. In spring 2008, all candidates achieved a rating of acceptable or better on a three-point scale.

Interviews with candidates and faculty supported the results of the assessments. They believe that candidates can use data from different assessments to design instruction and impact the learning of all students.

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:
The educational leadership program is nationally recognized by ELCC. Results of the School Leadership Licensure Assessment (SLLA) exam and the assessments designated to assess content knowledge indicate that 100 percent of the candidates have acquired the knowledge and skills necessary for performing as effective administrators. They are able to interpret school data in literacy and math and compare and contrast the data with two other schools in order to prepare a presentation to the school board. They also have shown the ability to analyze school data to identify an area of concern and collaborate with the community to develop a strategic plan.

Interviews with school administrators revealed that candidates were extremely well prepared to carry out the tasks of a building administrator. Candidates themselves gave examples of specific assignments in which they were required to carry out tasks that are appropriate to a principal's position.

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

Student Learning for Other School Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The graduate survey for the educational leadership program is the assessment designated to determine candidate support for student learning. It has not yet been administered since graduates only recently exited the program, and they must first hold a position as a principal before the survey will be administered. Although there are no data for this assessment, the program is nationally recognized by ELCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[In order to determine whether the unit had adequately addressed a previously cited AFI, the team looked for evidence that educational leadership candidates could demonstrate their ability to have an effect on the P-12 learning environment prior to completion of their program. However, ELCC had advised the unit to submit a follow-up survey as evidence of this competency and granted national recognition to the program. In addition to the survey, the unit has developed an in-program assessment that addresses candidate ability to have an impact on P-12 student learning. This assessment will be administered as candidates proceed through the program.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although the data are lacking, school administrators and graduates believe that they have the ability to support student learning. Graduates gave specific examples of assignments in which they analyzed school data to make school improvements and to provide support to teachers in order to help all students learn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Initial candidates are expected to demonstrate professionalism in relation to all areas of teaching content
knowledge, pedagogy, diversity, and the use of instructional technology. The dispositions survey consists of 15 items rated on a five-point scale ranging from "never" to "often" to "almost always." Candidates’ dispositions are assessed at transition point one through a candidate self-evaluation, and at transition points two and three through the disposition rubric, which is administered in designated professional courses by faculty and in the internship by the cooperating teacher and building administrator.

In spring 2008, the unit compiled a summary of all data on the dispositions rubric for all candidates in the program except for educational leadership candidates. Results show that, for a majority of the indicators, at least 95 percent of the candidates were rated as exhibiting the disposition often, very often, or almost always. On only five of the thirteen indicators were 30 percent of the candidates rated as sometimes displaying the disposition. These indicators included (a) respects and values beliefs of other cultures, (b) treats others fairly and with respect, (c) encourages students to reach their full potential, (d) seeks opportunities for collaboration, and (e) accepts responsibility for own actions. Although these data were not disaggregated by program or program level, the unit has disaggregated disposition data from the principal survey, the cooperating teacher survey, and the graduate survey. These surveys are based on the TCRI instrument, which is aligned with the conceptual framework.

Although the data do not provide compelling support for diversity dispositions and the belief that all students can learn, information from faculty, candidate, and cooperating teachers, and school administrators provide strong support for candidates understanding and respect for diversity and believing all students can learn.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Advanced candidates’ dispositions are assessed using the same process as is used for initial candidates. The disposition rubric is used for a self-evaluation by candidates and scored by faculty during specified courses throughout the program and by supervisors in their capstone/internship experience. Because the data are not disaggregated by program level, the data summary is presented with the data for initial candidates. Just as for initial programs, the interviews with candidates, faculty, and supervisors provided evidence that candidates actually do display behaviors indicative of appropriate diversity dispositions and the belief that all students can learn.

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Educational leadership candidates are assessed on their dispositions in one professional course and in their capstone/internship course. The survey is based on the conceptual framework and on ELCC standards.

Data were available for transition points two and three. Results of the surveys showed that candidates in the educational leadership program display dispositions aligned to the conceptual framework and the ELCC standards. The survey is rated on a scale from one to five from never (1) to always (5). One item on the disposition assessment is used to determine if the school leader holds “A school vision of high quality standards of learning, expectations, and performances.” On this item, 92 percent of the candidates were rated as four or higher. Only one candidate was rated as three on the scale. These results show that 100 percent of the educational leadership candidates believe that all students can learn.

Three items on the survey directly relate to collaboration. These are (a) collaboration and communication with all members of the school community, (b) involvement of families and other stakeholders in school decision-making processes, and (c) the proposition that families are partners in the education of their children and have the best interests of their children in mind. On all items except one, 100 percent of the candidates were rated as three or higher. Only on the second item concerning
involvement with families were 92 percent of the candidates rated as three on the scale. These data indicate that candidates have the dispositions to include the family and community in planning for the students and the school.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

The unit has provided evidence through the IR, exhibits, and on-site interviews that candidates in all programs have the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all children learn. Initial and advanced candidates demonstrate an acceptable level of content knowledge through course requirements and various assessments as presented in SPA and state reports or reports to other professional organizations. Pedagogical skills are demonstrated through capstone courses and internships appropriate to each program. Candidates in both initial and advanced programs demonstrate abilities to lead and to affect change. They show that they can impact students or school communities, as appropriate. Candidates in all programs demonstrate the professional dispositions delineated by institutional, state, and professional standards. They leave the program equipped with the knowledge and skills in pedagogy, technology, professionalism, and diversity.

**Strengths** [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The unit lacks a systematic process to determine candidates' effects on P-12 student learning.</td>
<td>All programs are nationally recognized or recognized with conditions by the respective SPA or approved by the Arkansas Department of Education. Every initial and advanced program within the unit has developed an assessment to assess candidates' effects on student learning. Data have been aggregated for all programs except the educational leadership program, which has not yet administered the assessment approved by ELCC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFIs from last visit: Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New AFIs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation for Standard 1**
**Corrections to the Institutional Report** [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

None

---

**Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

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

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 2 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes               No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

---

**2a. Assessment System**

| Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Assessment System – Advanced Preparation       | Acceptable |

---

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

The professional education unit at UAM has involved its professional community to design a comprehensive unit assessment system that assesses candidate performance in initial programs. The undergraduate initial programs have the following four transition points: 1: Pre-Admission, 2: Admission to Teacher Education, 3: Admission to Clinical Internship, and 4: Graduation and Licensure. The Master of Arts in Teaching initial licensure program has the following four transition points: 1: Pre-Admission, 2: Master of Arts in Teaching Program of Study, 3: Program Completion, and 4: Graduation.

The criteria for these transition points include the review of such items as GPA, background checks, portfolios, observations, evaluations, use of instructional technology, Praxis II, interviews, and surveys. The unit has also identified specific “signature assessments” for each of the initial programs; these assessments have common rubrics and are required of all candidates within those programs. Each has been carefully aligned with the unit’s conceptual framework, as well as INTASC, Pathwise, state, and
national program standards. The unit also conducts candidate interviews for admission to teacher education and to the internship and surveys its graduates and their employers each year after program completion. Candidates are not allowed to progress from one phase to the next without meeting stated requirements that are based on multiple assessment measures.

The unit uses multiple strategies and assessments to measure the effectiveness of the unit operations and program quality. These operations include 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 assessments, annual faculty evaluations, candidate evaluations of faculty instruction, pre- and post-internship surveys, cooperating teacher surveys, graduate surveys, and employer surveys. The unit also reviews other aspects of the unit operations such as faculty workloads, internship placements, the number of graduates from the program, and the number of minorities graduating each year.

The unit also uses a variety of means to ensure that its signature assessments are accurate. For example, all signature assessments are aligned with the specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions outlined in state and national standards; they are regularly reviewed in preparation for state and national program reporting, and at faculty and Teacher Education Committee meetings.

Program faculty members have developed signature assessments that use common rubrics to ensure fairness and consistency of the data. Assessments and scoring rubrics are reviewed periodically by faculty committees to ensure that they are free of racial and ethnic stereotypes and cultural insensitivity that might interfere with candidate performance or favor some candidates over others. In addition, all university supervisors and cooperating teachers are trained to use the Teacher Candidate Rating Instrument (TCRI) to evaluate interns. Each intern is evaluated multiple times by the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher during the internship process.

The unit has also implemented several efforts to ensure professional community involvement and to maintain fairness and freedom from bias in its assessments. It solicits formal review and feedback from its Teacher Education Committee, which includes both university and P-12 representation, and during its annual Stakeholders Meeting each spring. Faculty also rely heavily on their daily interactions with teachers in the schools for feedback on candidate assessments.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The professional education unit at UAM has involved its professional community to design a comprehensive unit assessment system that assesses candidate performance in advanced programs. The advanced non-licensure Master of Education program is composed of the following four transition points: 1: Pre-Admission, 2: Admission to Master of Education Program, 3: Capstone Course Requirement, and 4: Graduation. The advanced licensure Master of Education in Educational Leadership program has the following four transition points: 1: Pre-Admission, 2: Admission to Master of Education Program in Educational Leadership, 3: Portfolio Defense, and 4: Graduation and Licensure.

As with the initial programs, advanced candidates are assessed using multiple assessment measures at multiple transition points. These assessments include the review of such items as GPA, portfolios, observations, evaluations, the SLLA examination for the Educational Leadership program, a capstone research project, interviews, and surveys. The unit has also identified specific “signature assessments” for each of the advanced programs; these assessments have common rubrics and are required of all candidates within those programs. Each has been carefully aligned with the unit’s conceptual framework, as well as NBPTS, Pathwise, and national program standards as appropriate. A committee of
university and public school faculty and administrators assess advanced candidates during their oral
defense of the capstone research project. University faculty and outside evaluators assess Educational
Leadership candidates during the oral defense of their portfolio. The unit also conducts candidate
interviews at designated transition points and surveys its graduates and their employers each year after
program completion. Candidates are not allowed to progress from one phase to the next without meeting
stated requirements that are based on multiple assessment measures.

The unit’s process for assessing unit operations at the advanced level is similar to that described for
initial programs. It also takes similar steps to ensure that its advanced program assessments are fair,
consistent, accurate, and free of bias.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

| Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit has developed and maintains a comprehensive assessment system that allows it to gather,
analyze, and evaluate data on both candidate performance and unit operations. Performance data are
monitored throughout all candidates’ programs, from admission to the program through the follow-up of
graduates and their employers.

Program and unit operations data are collected, analyzed, and evaluated on a semester or annual basis as
appropriate. However, the process for distributing and collecting the follow-up surveys from graduates
and employers has not been systematic and has not yielded a significant response rate. In addition,
follow-up data cannot be disaggregated by program area, which limits their use for program
improvement.

The unit offers the M.A.T. and 2+2 programs substantially online and/or in a distance education format.
The assessment system allows candidate performance data for these programs to be regularly
disaggregated. As noted in Standard 1, the unit has found no discernible difference in candidate
performance based on the disaggregated data for these two programs.

The unit assessment system maintains data on all initial and advanced candidates admitted into the
teacher education program and is supported by the following basic technologies. University-required
student data are housed on UAM’s Poise system, while unit-level candidate data are entered into an
Access database and analyzed using NCSS statistical software as appropriate. The database access point
for faculty is a product of Visual Studio 2008, which allows them to access data on individual
candidates including Praxis test data, GPAs, key assessments, completed courses, and contact
information. In addition, both initial and advanced candidates maintain electronic portfolios on
TaskStream. The assessment coordinator is responsible for developing and ongoing updating of the
database and produces summary data for the unit in the form or reports, charts, and/or graphs.

The unit systematically collects, summarizes, and analyzes its candidate performance data. It has
developed a data protocol that identifies the source of the evidence; where, how, and by whom data are
collected; and when reports are completed. The assessment coordinator produces data reports for review
at department faculty and committee meetings. Reports are also prepared as data become available (e.g.,
ETS Praxis II reports) and can be prepared on faculty request.
Each spring the unit holds a stakeholders’ meeting that includes representatives from education and arts/sciences faculty from initial and advanced programs, plus other stakeholders from the public schools, the educational cooperative, and the community at large. They review a comprehensive Annual Stakeholders Report that contains relevant data regarding applicant/candidate qualifications, candidate proficiencies, graduates’ competence, and program operations and quality. Their charge is to discuss the implications of data and then recommend changes for unit and program improvements. They also ensure that the curriculum, instruction, field experiences, and assessments are aligned with the conceptual framework and address the mission, purpose, and goals of the unit.

The unit has a candidate grievance and appeals policy that includes procedures for both academic course and program concerns and ensures due process. A record of any formal complaints for unit candidates is maintained by the dean of the School of Education. Candidate concerns and the unit response to those concerns are housed on the university’s SharePoint system.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The summary of findings provided for initial programs also applies to advanced programs in the unit.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

As a result of its process for collecting assessment data for both candidate performance and unit operations, the unit has been able to systematically use data results for program improvement. The unit provided several examples of changes to initial and advanced courses, programs, and clinical experiences that have been made based on analysis of such data. For example, over the past several years the unit has:

- developed one-hour test preparation courses to help pre-candidates be more successful on the Praxis I test.

- adopted new textbooks and increased the study of assessment techniques in the curriculum to improve candidate knowledge of assessment strategies in the P-4 Early Childhood program.

- revised all programs to include additional field experiences for candidates in diverse settings.

- used Praxis II Special Education data to eliminate the Blended P-4 Early Childhood/Special Education program and then develop three separate licensure programs: an initial P-4 Early Childhood program, and two advanced programs (P-4 Instructional Specialist in Special Education and 4-12 Instructional Specialist in Special Education).

- in addition, the unit currently is monitoring performance data in a number of areas before making any major adjustments to programs or courses.
Finally, the unit provided evidence that they have made many other changes that are not necessarily data-driven, but are responses to state mandates, anecdotal information, etc.

Faculty have access to candidate assessment data through SharePoint, and may also request specific information or reports from the assessment coordinator as necessary. They use these data as they reflect on their own practice and design their own professional development plans. Candidates also receive feedback on their performance on a regular basis as they complete course assignments and signature assessments.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The summary of findings provided for initial programs also applies to advanced programs in the unit.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has developed and implemented a comprehensive assessment system that collects, analyzes, and evaluates performance data for review by all stakeholders and provides significant data for program improvement. However, it has not developed an effective system for collecting and analyzing follow-up survey data for program improvement. The unit has identified transition points for both initial and advanced programs and has developed signature assessments that assess candidate development of expected proficiencies. It is supported by appropriate technology. There is a comprehensive system for the reporting of data, and the unit regularly uses candidate performance and unit operations data for program improvement.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The unit does not have consistent and systematic evidence of how candidate performance data from internal and external sources are collected, analyzed, and evaluated.</td>
<td>The unit has developed and implemented a comprehensive assessment system that collects, analyzes, and evaluates performance data for review by all stakeholders and provides significant data for program improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The process for distributing and collecting the follow-up surveys from graduates and employers has not been systematic and does not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The unit has not developed an effective system for collecting and analyzing follow-up survey data for program improvement. Include all eligible participants. To date, the process has yielded an extremely low response rate. In addition, follow-up data cannot be disaggregated by program area, which limits their use for program improvement.

**Recommendation for Standard 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corrections to the Institutional Report** [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

None

**Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**
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.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 3 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes  No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

**3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

Several groups that impact the design and delivery of field experiences and clinical practices have representatives from both the university and the public schools. The unit’s Teacher Education Committee, unit faculty, program coordinators, public school administrators and faculty, and candidates collaborate with the Partnership/Field Experience Office to plan the design and delivery of field experiences and clinical practice experiences during regularly scheduled meetings. Feedback from school-based partners is obtained through annual stakeholders meetings and provides the unit with suggestions on how to improve the design and delivery of field experiences and clinical practice experiences. Formal collaboration with school partners is articulated in a partnership agreement that is
signed annually by all partners. Evidence of the collaboration was found in the minutes of committees and during interviews.

Candidates complete field experiences in every education course prior to the two semesters of clinical practice. The unit collaborates with thirteen primary partner school districts partners. Partner schools have a range of diverse populations and provide candidates with opportunities for early and frequent field experiences and clinical practice. Specific field experiences and clinical practice placements for initial licensure candidates are determined though communications between the candidates, university faculty, public school representatives, and the partnership/field experience coordinator. Assignments for field experiences and clinical practice experiences are based on the licensure area of the candidate and the requirements of the program. Candidates select a group of schools from a matrix for field experiences, depending on the course in which they are enrolled and the location of the school.

The Clinical Handbook describes how the schools and the unit share expertise to support candidates’ learning in field experiences and clinical practice. Schools are expected to provide candidates with a variety of opportunities in the classroom to support their learning. The university supervisors and the school facility work as partners in guiding and evaluating the field experience and clinical practice. The university supervisor and the cooperating teacher each conduct at least three evaluations, two formative and one summative, using the Teacher Candidate Rating Instrument (TCRI) during each semester of the two clinical practices. Regular conferences with the cooperating teacher and candidates regarding their performance and appropriate participation at particular stages of the field experience and clinical practice are held. Information in the IR was supported by evidence found in the clinical and faculty handbooks, candidate portfolios, and interviews with candidates, school facility, and clinical faculty.

No differences exist in the collaboration with school partners for initial distance learning programs.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

Both unit and school-based faculty are also involved in designing, implementing, and evaluating the unit’s advanced programs; they each participate in the unit’s strong collaborative partnership activities as described in the narrative for initial programs.

The Master of Education (M.Ed) program for advanced teacher preparation is a school-based experience with assigned tasks that are to be completed in candidates' work settings and a required capstone action research project. School leadership internship placements are determined collaboratively by faculty of the Department of Leadership and school-based partners. M.Ed candidates complete field experiences in their own classrooms, and if not currently employed by a P-12 school district, placements are arranged by collaboration between university faculty and the graduate coordinator. The graduate faculty and public school partners jointly share their expertise to the support candidates' learning in the field experiences and the practicum.

No differences exist in the collaboration with school partners for distance learning programs for other school professionals or building level administrators.

**3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

| Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – |
Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The criteria candidates must meet before being admitted to clinical practice (Internship I and II) include completing the requirements for transition point III. Candidates are enrolled in a clinical practice for two semesters. The first semester requires candidates to complete 15 weeks with a total of 360 clinical experience hours in their assigned public school. All Intern II candidates complete 15 weeks with a total of 600 hours in their assigned public school. Candidates must complete both Internship I and Internship II requirements for degree conferral.

University supervisors and school faculty use multiple measures and assessments to evaluate a candidate’s skill, knowledge, and professional dispositions in relation to professional, state, and institutional standards. During interviews, candidates reported the use of individual projects, group projects, exams, reflections, observation rubrics, and signature assessments to evaluate their skills, knowledge, and professional dispositions.

All activities and assessments used to help candidates progressively develop the desired content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions are aligned to the unit's conceptual framework. Portfolios contain artifacts divided into the five strands of the conceptual framework, which are aligned to national professional standards.

Candidates use information technology to support teaching and learning during clinical experiences by developing lesson plans that incorporate a variety of multimedia experiences. Candidate portfolios, lesson plans, and observation assessments confirm the use of varied technology to support teaching and learning. Interviews with school faculty, P-12 administrators, candidates, and university faculty also confirmed the use of technology.

During clinical practice, candidates develop and demonstrate proficiencies in their professional roles by assuming the roles and duties of a classroom teacher. Field experiences provide candidates with the opportunity to develop as professional educators through a variety of activities listed on the field experience matrix. Candidates write a reflection on each field experience and clinical practice describing what they learned from the experience.

School faculty are accomplished professionals who meet the Arkansas requirements for at least three years of teaching experience, hold a standard teaching license, and are Pathwise-trained. Additional unit criteria include candidate placement with school faculty who are fully licensed and experienced in their teaching area(s) and are approved by public school and SOE administrators.

During interviews, school faculty reported being prepared for their roles as cooperating teachers by participating in training provided by unit and offered each semester. The training and the handbook provide school faculty with the unit's guidelines on how to provide support their candidates. Regular and continued support for clinical practice and interns is provided by university supervisors through formative and summative evaluations of observations. University supervisors communicate and support candidates with face-to-face conferencing, e-mails, video tapes, and Web CT.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Candidates in advanced programs for teachers are required to take three courses with 40 hours of field experiences that include observation and small- and large-group activities, as well as 40 hours spent on a
capstone research project. Interviews indicated the use of technology in candidates' assigned tasks.

Candidates in advanced programs for teachers are required to complete a capstone action research project experience focusing on improving an aspect of their work. They are assigned a university advisor who closely monitors their progress and is in constant communication to provide support.

The field experience/internship requirement for the educational leadership program includes prescriptive activities and projects in addition to the work with the administrator mentor. Five courses during the program require field experiences, including observation and small- and large-group activities, for a total of 40 hours. Educational leadership faculty members of the unit serve as the clinical supervisors, and each candidate is assigned an experienced building-level administrator as a mentor.

The one-semester educational leadership internship requires a minimum of 180 hours covering 28 capstone/internship activities for program completion. Admission to the educational leadership clinical practice is completed in the final semester of coursework after successfully completing all other coursework for the degree/program. An orientation is required prior to beginning clinical practice.

### 3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

| Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

Mastery of content areas and pedagogical and professional knowledge is demonstrated before admission to the clinical practice during earlier coursework and field experiences. Candidates are assessed on content areas and pedagogical and professional knowledge during clinical practice by formative and summative evaluations completed by school faculty and university supervisors. The university supervisor shares formal written unit evaluations with the candidate three times a semester. The current evaluation form, the TCRI, is used by each of the certification areas and is aligned with the conceptual framework. Portfolios include artifacts reflecting multiple experiences in personal growth and development.

The effect candidates have on student learning is assessed during clinical practice through classroom lesson plans, as well as formative and summative observations and evaluations. The portfolios and interviews provided evidence on the effect candidates have on student learning. Candidates reported writing reflections and receiving feedback from peers and university supervisors on their work; the reflections and feedback are used to help develop strategies for improving student learning.

Candidates have the opportunity to develop and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn during field experiences and clinical practice. The field experience matrix and intern handbook include required activities that help candidates to develop and demonstrate skills for helping all students learn. Activities, reflections, and assessments completed during field experiences and clinical practice document a variety of opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn.
Candidates are placed in a variety of classroom settings during field experiences, providing opportunities to work with students from diverse groups. The unit researched the student population demographics of the area schools to develop a matrix of partner schools. Schools were grouped according to the characteristics of the student population. Each group of schools is matched with each of the courses requiring field experiences, providing candidates with the option of selecting from four different groups depending on their geographic location. Candidates must complete observation hours at each of the schools in the selected group to fulfill field experience requirements. As candidates complete the required field experience courses, they will have observed in schools with diverse populations. Clinical practice internships occur at one or more of the partner schools and require candidates to work in multiple schools and grade levels, depending on the licensure area they are seeking.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

M.Ed. field experience assessments vary by course, and outcome expectations are based on candidate-provided data and reflections. Candidates complete the field experiences and are evaluated on the required reflections on these experiences. The culminating experience for M.Ed. candidates is the capstone action research project. This project requires candidates to plan, conduct, and research a problem related to their content area, teaching practice, or public school role.

M.Ed. candidates are assigned advisors who closely monitor their progress and are in constant communication to provide support. Candidates have the opportunity to work with students from diverse populations both in their own school setting and during the required summer classes that meet on the campus.

Artifacts for the educational leadership activities are assessed by the university supervisor and the building-level administrator mentor using a scoring rubric aligned to the ELCC standards and placed in an electronic portfolio. Candidates are required to participate in a portfolio defense at the end of the internship period. The artifacts in the portfolio are directly linked to the ELLC Standards to ensure mastery of the proficiencies identified in state and professional standards, which are aligned with the unit’s conceptual framework.

Educational leadership interns participate in conversations with the university supervisor and the building administrator mentor to develop a professional growth plan and design activities to address areas cited in the plan. The educational leadership candidates also place reflections in their portfolios for each of the 28 field experience assignments that must be completed in the capstone/internship experience. According to interviews, some of the 28 field experience activities must be completed in a different district than their own. The interns also reflect upon their experiences during the portfolio defense at the conclusion of this experience.

Candidates in the educational leadership program collect, review, and analyze the math and literacy scores from a school district of their choice. The candidate must develop a plan for increasing student achievement and present the plan. The plan must demonstrate their ability to develop a building-wide plan for work with students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups, along with their commitment to the belief that all students can learn.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

The unit’s teacher education committee, unit faculty, program coordinators, public school administrators/faculty, and candidates collaborate regularly with the Partnership/Field Experience Office to plan the design and delivery of field experiences and clinical practice experiences. How the schools and units share expertise to support candidates’ learning in field experiences and clinical practice is
described in the Clinical Handbook for school faculty. Candidates use reflections, feedback, and technology in a variety of activities during field experiences and clinical practice. Candidates are assessed in a variety of ways, both formal and informal, during field experiences and clinical practice. Assessments and activities are tied back to the conceptual framework and professional standards. Candidates have the opportunity to work with diverse students during field experiences and clinical practice.

Advanced programs participate in the same collaborative activities as initial candidates for field experiences and clinical practice. Candidates are supported and assessed by the unit faculty. Both advanced programs have a field experience component and a capstone requirement that are tied to the conceptual framework and professional standards. Candidates use technology in facilitating the learning for all students and have the opportunity to work with diverse populations.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

The unit values the collaboration it receives from the various stakeholders who impact the design and delivery of field experiences and clinical practices. Representatives from the university, public school districts, and community members participate in an innovative Annual Stakeholders Meeting, providing the unit with valuable feedback to make changes to improve programs.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The unit's clinical faculty lack clear and consistent guidelines for observing and providing feedback to interns regarding their development of the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to help all students learn.</td>
<td>All unit faculty, clinical supervisors, and school faculty are required to be trained in the use of the Teacher Candidate Rating Instrument (TCRI) scoring rubric to evaluate interns' knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to impact students' learning. During the training unit faculty, clinical supervisors, and school faculty receive a copy and review the contents of the Clinical Handbook, which provides guidelines for working with clinical practice candidates. All school faculty are also required to be trained in Pathwise, upon which the TCRI is modeled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 3
### Corrections to the Institutional Report

Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.

| None |

### Standard 4: Diversity

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.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 4 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

---

### 4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Diversity is a fundamental quality of the mission, vision, and core values of University of Arkansas at Monticello. Recognizing the projected increases in diversity in school populations, the unit prepares candidates at the initial and advanced levels to participate in curricula and field-based experiences that provide multiple opportunities. Diversity is defined broadly including 10 factors that identify diversity. The diversity plan includes seven proficiencies developed from state and national standards that are aligned with the conceptual framework components of knowledge, pedagogy, professionalism and technology.
Several courses are required of all undergraduate initial candidates. These include EDUC 1143, Education for Schools and Society; EDUC 2233, Instructional Technology; EDUC 2253, Needs of Diverse Learners in Inclusive Settings; EDUC 3203, Educational Psychology: Developing Learners; and EDUC 3563, Effective Instructional and Management Strategies. Assignments and activities required in these classes include readings and class discussion covering diversity topics, a united streaming video project, webpage development, an attitudinal diversity survey, a mini-research project entitled “All About Me,” lesson plans, Candidates in the P-4 Early Childhood Program also enroll in ECED 3313, Classroom Management, in which they participate in field experiences. In the MAT program, courses that address diversity issues include EDUC 5033, Teaching Diverse Learners; MLED 5053, Teaching and Learning in the Middle Grades; and EDUC 5053 Law for Public School Teachers. These courses are designed to teach candidates to view students first as unique human beings and then for their individual differences and help them to develop an understanding of how one’s life experiences are shaped by memberships in groups based on culture, race, and socioeconomic status. Candidates also differentiate among general values and attitudes as they relate to modes of instruction.

A review of syllabi show that diversity is addressed in courses other than those specifically designed to teach issues in diversity. Candidates report that diversity is emphasized in all field experiences through the program. The MAT program, a distance learning program, requires candidates to attend classes on campus three weeks during the summer and on Saturdays during the regular semesters. Therefore, they interact with diverse faculty and candidates.

Candidates’ proficiencies in diversity are assessed through a diversity rubric that is used throughout the programs, a graduate survey, and a principal survey. Data are not disaggregated by initial and advanced candidates. A summary of the data for all candidates in all programs shows they achieved ratings of acceptable and above in spring 2007 and spring 2008. In addition, many signature assessments used throughout the program include items related to diversity. For example, the health and physical education program assessment 8 requires candidates to present a Powerpoint reflecting on experiences working with children with special needs, school personnel, and community volunteers in diverse settings during a Special Olympics event.

Candidates provided support for the results of assessments. All candidates said they feel well prepared to work with diverse students. They believe they can effectively teach in classrooms with varied ethnic and racial groups, socioeconomic levels, and ELL students.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

Several courses in the advanced M.Ed. program address diversity. These include EDUC 5053, Law for Public School Teachers; EDFD 5063, Psychological Foundations of Teaching and Learning; EDFD 5273, Teaching the Culturally Different Child; and SPED 5033, Contemporary Issues in Special Education. Just as in the initial programs, these courses are designed to teach candidates to view students as unique, to help them to develop an understanding of how experiences shape lives, and to have the knowledge and skills to differentiate among general values and attitudes as they relate to modes of instruction.

All courses in the educational leadership program address diversity through the analysis of school data, the determination as to whether diversity issues affect the data, and if so, development of a proposal for solving the issue. These courses teach candidates to assist staff through activities that apply principles of effective instruction by making recommendations for design, implementation, enrichment, evaluation, and monitoring of a curriculum that accommodates learners’ diverse needs. Candidates also demonstrate the ability to assess and promote positive school culture by using multiple methods and context-
appropriate strategies that capitalize on the diversity of the school community to improve school programs.

Candidates are required to select an area of expertise and create a professional development workshop for an after-school in-service with handouts (agenda, activities, PowerPoint, transparencies, etc.) to present to the class; participate in group creative drama presentations using information from the textbook, speakers, notes and handouts; and analyze and interpret school data.

Advanced candidates’ proficiencies are assessed in the same way that initial candidates are assessed. Assessments include the diversity rubric, the graduate survey, and the principal survey. Data are not disaggregated for initial and advanced candidates. A summary of the data for all candidates in all programs shows they are achieving ratings of acceptable and above in spring 2007 and spring 2008. In addition, the M.Ed. program includes an individual diversity study as a signature assessment in EDFD 5273, Teaching the Culturally Different Child. No data are available for the assessment because the program was first implemented in summer 2008. All key assessments for the special education and educational leadership programs include an element of diversity. Data for all assessments that have been administered show that at least 90 percent of the candidates in both programs are achieving scores of acceptable or better on items related to diversity.

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

| Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

There are 14 unit faculty who teach at the initial level; thirteen (93%) are White and one (7%) is Black, non-Hispanic. Of the 13 unit faculty who teach at the advanced level, eleven (85%) are White and two (15%) are Black, non-Hispanic. Comparative figures for the university as a whole are 84 percent White and 16 percent minority; P-12 teachers also represent 84 percent White and 16 percent minority.

Faculty represent diversity in age, geographic background, religious belief, socio-economic background, and exceptionality. They have had diverse life experiences in rural, urban, inner city, high poverty, low performing, high performing, predominantly white, and predominantly minority public school settings. They also have had considerable expertise in working with individuals from diverse backgrounds. In addition, faculty have participated in numerous professional development opportunities, such as workshops by Ruby Payne on Frameworks for Poverty, Bridges Out of Poverty, and Detecting Child Maltreatment. Faculty also attend state, regional, and national conferences related to diversity.

The unit has developed a diversity plan that includes a component for recruiting a diverse faculty, as well as increasing the opportunities for candidates to interact with a diverse faculty. These plans include inviting faculty from other academic disciplines, social service agencies, or other professional resources to speak to candidates; establishing relationships with other universities’ teacher education programs through CIV; and including candidates in the annual stakeholders meeting and other advisory committees.

The unit makes a concerted effort to ensure that candidates have the opportunity to interact with diverse faculty and students in the P-12 setting (see narrative for Element 4.d).
Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The summary of findings provided for initial programs also applies to advanced programs in the unit.

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

| Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The majority (87%) of candidates in initial programs are White; thirteen percent are Black, non-Hispanic. The majority of candidates in advanced programs (79%) are also White; twenty-one percent are Black, non-Hispanic. In comparison, the campus-wide student enrollment is 69 percent White, and the White population in the geographical area served by the institution is 62 percent. The initial candidate population is 75 percent female and 25 percent male. The advanced program candidate population is 84 percent female and 16 percent male. Campus-wide, the population is 60 percent female and 40 percent male.

Although the candidates in the unit do represent diversity, they are not as diverse as the general student population at UAM. Consequently, the unit also makes numerous efforts to increase the opportunities for candidates to interact with other diverse candidates. The candidates work with peers from diverse background and experiences through the general education curriculum, distance education opportunities, and the 2+2 programs with community colleges.

Finally, the unit is making good faith efforts to recruit and retain diverse candidates. The faculty work closely to recruit diverse candidates from local schools and have developed Teacher of Tomorrow clubs to foster interest in education. It hosts the Southeast Education Renewal Zone (ERZ) program, one of nine state inter-local agreements to improve public school performance and academic achievement by educating potential teachers to fit the needs of public schools. The Southeast ERZ program plays a major role in recruiting diverse candidates enrolled in the university’s humanities, social science, mathematics, and science programs into the unit’s Masters of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The summary of findings provided for initial programs also applies to advanced programs in the unit.

4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

| Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |
Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

P-12 school data provided by the unit indicate that the percentage of minority students in area schools ranges from a high of 86 percent to a low of 2 percent. The number of students receiving free/reduced lunches ranges from a high of 100 percent to a low of 30 percent. The percentage of students with exceptionalities/disabilities ranges from a high of 15 percent to a low of 10 percent.

The unit ensures initial candidates complete multiple field experiences and two clinical practice experiences in diverse settings through the use of a matrix that groups schools by the diversity of their populations. The unit researched the demographics of the area schools to develop this matrix, which prescribes required placements during required coursework to ensure that candidates experience diverse students population groups.

Settings chosen for field experiences and internships ensure that candidates receive the greatest possible exposure to diverse populations, including English language learners and students with disabilities. Clinical internships require candidates to work in multiple school and grade levels in alignment with the licensure area they are seeking. The collaborative nature of field experience placements creates a system of checks and balances critical to providing candidates with exposure to diverse students groups. The faculty and the partnership coordinator monitor field experiences and clinical practice to arrange for placements. Interviews supported candidates having the opportunity to work with diverse student population groups.

Knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity are systematically integrated into coursework, field experiences, and clinical practice and are integral to the assessment system. This integration assures the alignment of the assessment with the programs of study, conceptual framework, and state and professional standards.

All candidates receive feedback from peers, faculty, mentor administrators, and school faculty in formal and informal discussions. All candidates are required to reflect on their skills in working with diverse students during field experience and all through clinical practice. Candidates keep reflective journals and share them with faculty and peers in classes and in online follow-up discussions. Faculty and university supervisors share feedback with candidates on the results of the diversity and disposition rubrics, which are completed for all candidates at various points throughout the field experience and clinical practice. Data from rubrics are analyzed to ensure that candidates are using feedback to improve their skills in working with diverse students. University supervisors and school faculty use the TCRI to provide formative and summative feedback and data to monitor how candidates use the feedback information for improvement.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

M.Ed. candidates have the opportunity to work with students from diverse populations both in their own school setting and during required summer classes that meet on the campus. They have numerous projects and assignments that require them to address diversity in their plans for student instruction and assessment.

Educational leadership candidates must complete 28 field capstone/internship experience assignments, some of which must be accomplished outside of their own district providing for working with diverse student populations. The interns also reflect upon their experiences during the portfolio defense at the conclusion of this experience. In addition to the field experience, candidates collect, review, and analyze the math and literacy scores from a school district of their choice. The candidate must develop a plan for
increasing student achievement and present the plan. The plan must demonstrate their ability to develop a building-wide plan for work with students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender and socioeconomic groups, along with their commitment to the belief that all students can learn. Candidates receive feedback from their university supervisor and building-level administrative mentor on their field experience.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

Diversity is a major component of the unit's conceptual framework, and it is clearly reflected in the unit's curriculum. Both initial and advanced programs require courses that address the many facets of diversity. Diversity is also included throughout all other coursework, field experiences, and clinical practice. Faculty in initial and advanced programs represent represent diversity and/or diverse backgrounds. They have significant experiences working with diverse populations and participate in professional development activities that address diversity. Candidates also represent diversity and have opportunities to interact with other diverse candidates in multiple settings. P-12 placements provide a wide range of diverse settings for candidates, and they are carefully monitored through a process that ensures each candidate will be able to demonstrate their ability to work with diverse students.

**Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]**

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFIs from last visit: Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New AFIs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation for Standard 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
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.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 5 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

5a. Qualified Faculty

Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation

Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation

Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The unit is committed to having highly qualified faculty members with expertise in the field they teach. The unit has 14 full-time faculty, 11 faculty who are full-time in the university/part-time in the unit, and 17 adjunct faculty. Three of the full-time faculty hold the rank of professor, two are associate professors, five are assistant professors, and four are instructors. All of the tenure-track faculty have the terminal degree in their field. One of the four instructors has an Ed.S. degree, and one is completing his doctorate. The remaining instructors and adjunct faculty members all have master’s degrees and the necessary expertise to teach in their field.

School clinical faculty for initial programs are licensed in the field in which they supervise and have a minimum of three years of teaching experience. They are highly qualified based on Arkansas standards, are Pathwise-trained, and willing to assume the role of a mentor and to work as a team member. Candidates in advanced programs are supervised by faculty teaching in the advanced programs or, for educational leadership, by licensed building-level administrators who have completed the Arkansas building-level mentor training.
The higher education clinical faculty members are licensed by the state and have contemporary professional experiences. Unit faculty members maintain a collaboration with faculty members in the P-12 schools through team teaching, shadowing, providing in-service sessions, and interaction during clinical internships.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

| Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The unit requires all faculty members to use a common template in developing syllabi to ensure alignment with the conceptual framework and SPA standards. These courses enable candidates to develop and expand their skills in content knowledge, pedagogy and instruction, assessment, classroom management, professional growth, understanding diverse populations, and the use of instructional technology.

Faculty integrate diversity and technology into their teaching across all initial and advanced programs. They use a variety of instructional strategies to provide candidates with the skills to teach students from diverse backgrounds and also modify their own instruction to accommodate the diversity of the unit candidates. All of the unit classrooms where educational classes are taught are equipped with a compressive technology system (SMART classroom). Faculty also teach online and web-based courses.

Instructional strategies vary and include lecture, whole group and small group discussions, multimedia presentations, web-enhanced learning, written reflections, cooperative learning activities, brainstorming, graphic organizers, concept maps, jig-saw, and simulations. Faculty use and model formative and summative assessment strategies. Assessments also include checklists, rubrics, reflective papers and journals, online and classroom discussions, research papers, individual and group projects, and e-portfolios.

Faculty use a variety of strategies to assess their teaching, including a review of the data from student evaluations, peer evaluations, a self-evaluation, and the dean's annual evaluation. Unit faculty members also prepare an additional self-evaluation that assesses their knowledge, pedagogical skills, and professional dispositions as it is related to the conceptual framework.

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

| Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The university states that faculty members should be involved in creating, revising, and sharing knowledge through activities such as research, writing, and presentations at professional meetings. In
addition to generating “new” knowledge, faculty members are charged with synthesizing existing knowledge and presenting it in new and challenging ways to students and others. Scholarship is broadly defined and may take many forms, including research producing new knowledge; research producing new applications of knowledge; synthesizing knowledge; extending the audience for new knowledge through new communications; pedagogical application of new methods, information, and knowledge; performance; creation of art, music, or literature; and invention or design. Products of scholarship may include materials such as books, published and in progress; research papers; computer-assisted instruction materials; recitals; computer programs; copyrighted materials; leadership in professional organizations; monographs; instructional materials for professional peers; grant submission with funding; book reviews; works of art; video productions; television programming; and speeches and addresses.

Whether the product of scholarship is published or not, the scholarship itself must be evaluated by university peers.

Based on the unit’s mission, the unit further defines scholarly activity to include reports required by the Arkansas State Department, SPAs, and NCATE that require the collecting, interpreting, and applying of data between visits, as well as the preparation and presentation of materials that present new information at conferences and to local schools.

In 2007-2008, 92 percent of the faculty attended national and state conferences; 86 percent presented at conferences. During that same time period, 29 percent conducted research, and 56 percent of the faculty wrote and submitted a grant. One hundred percent of the faculty wrote a portion of SPA or state reports and participated in developing School of Education plans. Faculty members are also engaged in public school collaborations, research for the state and national reports, preparation for accreditation, and leadership in professional organizations.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation

Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

UAM faculty are expected to engage in campus, professional and community service where appropriate; this service includes faculty involvement in departmental and campus governance, academic and organizational advising, leadership in professional organizations, and sharing of professional time and expertise within the community. Service is one of the categories of the annual review for all faculty members.

Each unit faculty member performs service to the unit, university, the profession and to the larger communities. In 2007-2008, 77 percent of the faculty served on one or more university committees, and 100 percent served on one or more unit committees. One hundred percent of the faculty worked with various community groups, and all held memberships and/or leadership positions in a variety of professional organizations related to their discipline.

The unit faculty members, along with other faculty members from other departments, are also involved in significant collaboration with the P-12 schools. They speak at public schools, team teach, serve as liaisons between the unit and the public schools, and provide workshops for the public school teachers.
They collaborate with arts and sciences faculty in the ERZ High School Redesign project and participate in other activities of the Educational Renewal Zone, the South East Arkansas Educational Cooperative, and the SOE Math/Science Center.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

| Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

All full-time, part-time and adjunct faculty in the unit are evaluated annually by candidates, their peers, and the unit head. Faculty also complete a self-evaluation that includes a component for evaluating their performance based on the five strands of the unit conceptual framework. Non-tenure-track and pre-tenure faculty are evaluated each semester by students in each course that they teach; tenured faculty are evaluated in one course each year. In addition, all faculty receive a peer evaluation and complete a self-evaluation annually. Tenured faculty must complete a full evaluation review process once every six years. The dean/unit head reviews all relevant evaluations in an annual conference with each faculty member. Together they identify any steps that may need to be taken to improve faculty performance.

The provost, in consultation with the dean, makes final decisions regarding merit salary adjustments, successive appointment for non-tenured faculty, and recommendations concerning professional development and academic responsibilities. Faculty who receive "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" assessments for teaching, service, scholarship and professional renewal must work with the dean to address the deficiencies before the next annual evaluation. Non-tenured faculty who receive non-reappointment or dismissal notices work with the dean to complete their present assignments satisfactorily.

In 2007, on a five-point scale ranging from unsatisfactory to excellent, 86 percent of the unit faculty received a teaching performance rating of excellent and 14 percent were rated as good. Corresponding figures for scholarship were 36 percent rated as excellent and 64 percent rated as good. Service ratings were 86 percent as excellent and 14 percent as good. Professional renewal ratings were 71 percent as excellent and 29 percent as good. Overall performance ratings were 86 percent as excellent and 14 percent as good. No faculty received a rating of satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory on any of the categories.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

| Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

The unit has a Professional Development Committee, appointed by the dean, that is charged with
developing and monitoring a mentor system for new faculty members, assisting faculty members who are working toward tenure or promotion, developing and monitoring a long-range plan for the professional development of all unit faculty members, monitoring faculty professional development activities, developing in-house professional development activities, and recommending outside consultants and others who can assist with faculty professional development.

The professional development activities offered to faculty members within the unit are focused on the needs identified in faculty evaluations and on the five strands of the conceptual framework. Faculty members regularly participate in professional activities that focus on technology, including sessions on using SharePoint, WebCT, the InterWrite Pad and Board, and the Wii. Faculty members also participate in frequent unit professional development sessions on diversity, exemplary classroom and best practice strategies, and assisting candidates to develop better assessment techniques.

One hundred percent of unit faculty have participated in university- and unit-sponsored professional development activities.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

The unit faculty members are highly qualified; the majority hold the terminal degree, have P-12 teaching experience, and are making contributions toward scholarship, service and leadership in their professional organizations. All unit supervisors, both full-time and adjunct, cooperating teachers, and mentor administrators are licensed in the fields in which they teach and/or supervise.

The unit has a comprehensive evaluation process that is targeted toward improving teaching effectiveness. An addition evaluation covering the five strands of the SOE’s conceptual framework is also completed annually by faculty members along with the university evaluation. The university and the unit provide numerous opportunities for faculty professional development, and unit faculty regularly participate in these activities.

**Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]**

Faculty have designed an addendum to the university faculty evaluation form that is aligned to the unit’s conceptual framework. These evaluations are used to designing professional development initiatives to improve teaching effectiveness based on the unit's mission.

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFIs from last visit: Continued**
Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation | Met
Advanced Preparation | Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

None

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources
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.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 6 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes | No
| |

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

Unit Leadership and Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable
Unit Leadership and Authority – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):
The School of Education is the unit on the University of Arkansas at Monticello campus that is responsible for programs for the preparation of teachers at the initial and advanced levels and other school professionals at the advanced level. The Arkansas Department of Education and the university
grant the School of Education the authority to plan, deliver, and coordinate all professional education programs at the university. The dean is supported by an NCATE/assessment coordinator, a partnership coordinator/field experience director, a teacher education coordinator for recruitment and retention, a graduate coordinator, and five program coordinators. Consistent with the conceptual framework, the unit plans programs and assessments, maintains assessment data, and collaborates with other units on campus, community and regional stakeholders, and P-12 partners.

The dean is responsible for the operations of the unit and for convening the Teacher Education Committee; she exercises oversight of all unit operations, including supervision of faculty, professional staff, and support staff. The Teacher Education Committee, which is chaired by the dean and includes unit faculty, members of the university community, and the professional community, is charged with the responsibility for all matters related to teacher education courses, programs, program requirements, curricular proposals, and policies. The Teacher Education Committee meets four times during the academic year; however, ad-hoc committees are formed and meet as needed.

The unit ensures that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling. The unit publishes its admission, retention, and completion (exit) policies in the UAM catalog, in the Teacher Education and Internship Handbooks, on the UAM School of Education website, and in materials distributed to candidates and faculty. Academic calendars and grading policies are described in the UAM catalog. University recruiting and admissions policies are clear and consistent in publications. Academic calendars, catalogs, publications, advertising, and web pages are accurate and current.

### 6b. Unit Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

The School of Education budget for FY 2008/2009 is $1.29 million. Actual expenditures for FY 2007/2008 were $1.3 million and FY 2006/2007 were $1.23 million. The UAM budget process is based on the current and projected needs of the units in the university and is not directly related to the student semester credit hours (SSCH) used by the university to establish FTE. The dean of each unit presents yearly budget proposals to the university executive council. The executive council reviews all university unit budget requests and allocates funds based upon unit need, size, and specific program needs. Allocations are dependent upon the available state and university revenue projections.

Interviews with the provost, unit head, and chief financial officer indicate the unit budget is adequate to support programs preparing candidates at both the initial and advanced levels. A review of the financial data among the units on campus indicates equity and support for the School of Education. The unit also has additional budgets resulting from grants ($604,000 in FY 07/08), continuing education programs ($75,000 in FY 08/09), and indirect costs ($44,000 in FY 07/08) that support additional professional development and special needs of the unit.

### 6c. Personnel
**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

The unit maintains clear policies detailing faculty workloads. Workload policies at UAM are based upon a work unit, which is equivalent to one class hour per week for a semester or one and one-third non-classroom laboratory hours of work per week for a semester. Included for each of these class hours is time for class preparation, grading, office hours, and other work with students outside class. The workload for full-time, tenure-track undergraduate faculty is 12 work units. The workload for full-time non-tenure track undergraduate faculty (instructors) is 15 work units. The workload policy for full-time graduate faculty is nine semester hours.

Faculty may be assigned to daytime or evening teaching, CIV or web-based instruction, and on-campus or off-campus teaching. Full-time faculty members are expected to advise students, serve on committees, and perform service. Expectations for full-time faculty also include individual research, scholarly or creative endeavors, and professional development. Professional staff with academic qualifications may be assigned teaching duties. In such cases, the individual receives a split appointment of instructor/staff. The workload for these split appointments is pro-rated. Clinical internship supervision is translated into the supervision of four-to-five interns as equivalent to three work units.

Part-time faculty are employed by the unit on an as-needed basis to provide additional expertise as a result of temporary enrollment increases, program growth, or unfilled vacancies. Part-time faculty are chosen for their expertise in P-12 settings and for their ability to support instruction, supervision, and content delivery. To ensure the integrity of the program, part-time faculty, are required to use approved syllabi and are trained and evaluated based on the tenets of the conceptual framework.

The number of support personnel is adequate to meet the needs of the unit. Support personnel serve in a variety of roles to aid in the efficiency of the unit. The number of actual support personnel is greater than comparable units on campus. In addition to the support personnel employed, the unit receives funds and encouragement from the UAM administration to hire student and non-student workers to assist with clerical and technology support activities.

**6d. Unit Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

The unit facilities are more than adequate and support the most recent developments in technology that allow faculty to model, and candidates to master, current instructional technologies. All unit classrooms are equipped with up-to-date smartroom technology for faculty to use, and to model the use of instructional technology for candidates. A computer lab is located on the first floor of the unit and is used for instructional technology courses and as an open computer lab for candidates. It features
computers, software, printers, and scanners.

In 2007, the university funded a $1,303,690 major renovation of the unit facility. The renovation included new heating and cooling systems; new lighting, windows, and doors; renovation of classroom space; new carpet and paint; new technology including a CIV laboratory and Smart Rooms; and the addition of an elevator. The university has a replacement cycle of every three years for instructional computer laboratories. The dean requests replacement of computers as needed to enable faculty members to maintain access to upgraded technology and equipment.

In August 2008, UAM completed a campus-wide fiber plant that connects all buildings on campus with state-of-art ultra-high speed fiber optic cable. In the spring of 2009, UAM, a founding member of ARE-ON (Arkansas Research and Education Optical Network), will be connected to the ARE-ON network, which will allow access to high speed national networks.

6e. Unit Resources including Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

UAM and the unit support current technologies, and faculty and candidates expressed their gratitude for the technology available. Technology resources to support faculty and candidates appear to be more than sufficient and are evidenced in multiple venues. Current software such as WebCT and TaskStream are available for faculty and candidate use. Faculty and candidates are required to use WebCT for online courses, and faculty use WebCT to support all courses with supplemental material and communication.

Review of the conceptual framework and course syllabi revealed that faculty and candidates are required to use multiple instructional technology tools for unit coursework and teaching in the P-12 setting. Faculty and candidates receive professional development from the IT department and from unit faculty in the development and use of WebCT, CIV instruction, Smart Room technology, flip cameras, video streaming, digital cameras, accessing education-related websites, and web conferencing. In addition, all candidates are also required to complete an instructional technology course and to develop an electronic portfolio using TaskStream.

The development and implementation of the unit’s assessment system is well funded and supported. In 2006, the dean appointed an assessment coordinator. The coordinator was charged to work with the faculty and staff to ensure that the appropriate data are collected, entered in a timely and systematic manner, analyzed with the appropriate statistical package, continuously updated, and reported electronically in a manner that allows faculty to access data on candidates. As a result of this appointment and through continued support, the unit has a well designed assessment management system that provides faculty, administration, candidates, and other stakeholders with data to make individual, program-level, and unit-level decisions.

Sufficient library and curricular resources exist at the institution. The library provides access to numerous research databases, over 800 full-text electronic journals, periodicals, publications, and interlibrary loan services for all faculty, professional education candidates, and P-12 teachers. It also houses a technology center with computer laboratories and an additional CIV laboratory.
**Overall Assessment of Standard**

The unit has clear leadership authority and ability for the overall operation for the teacher education programs. There are sufficient budget and resources, including technology resources, to prepare initial and advanced candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. Facilities and technology have been updated and are more than adequate to foster an environment that allows unit faculty to model the use of technology and candidates to practice its use.

**Strengths** [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

The unit makes available the technology necessary to promote best practice by both faculty and candidates. The unit has developed an assessment management system that allows robust data collection and wide distribution of analyzed results for program improvement.

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The School of Education's campus facility does not support candidate and faculty use of information technology.</td>
<td>UAM and the unit support current technologies. Technology resources to support faculty and candidates appear to be more than sufficient and are evidenced in multiple venues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFIs from last visit: Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New AFIs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation for Standard 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corrections to the Institutional Report** [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables,]
percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.

None

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

You may either type the sources of evidence and persons interviewed in the text boxes below or upload files using the prompt at the end of the page.

Documents Reviewed

Persons Interviewed

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documents Reviewed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

(Optional) State Addendum: