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**Initial Programs Assessment Committee (IPAC) Purpose Statement**

The Initial Programs Assessment Committee (IPAC**)** will serve as the oversight committee for the initial programs assessment activities of the EPP Unit. The CAEP Coordinator and the Professional Education Program Director will serve as Ex Officio members of the IPAC. Committee responsibilities will include:

1. Annually review and analyze unit assessment artifacts;
2. Annually review the assessment system as it applies to initial programs.
3. Annually review assessment procedures to ensure fairness, accuracy, consistency, and the avoidance of bias.
4. Prepare an annual unit assessment report. The completed report will be sent to the Head of Unit no later than ~~May 31~~ March 15th (Changed as of November 11, 2019) of each year. The report should include areas of strength and/or areas of improvement.

(*Retrieved from: Educator Preparation Provider Unit Governanced Handbook, College of Education and Behavioral Science Educator Preparation Provider, on May 15, 2020*)

**Quality Assurance Plan**

Columns listed on page 20 of the current Quality Assurance Plan should be duplicated on page 5 to support clarity and context. Specifically, columns for schedule, responsibilities, data distribution, and data utilization should be listed.

**Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA)**

**Note:** Data is currently not available.

**Overview**

The EDA is still not being completed with fidelity by all programs at required times. Audrey Bowser is working with several people to create an easy and efficient way to collect EDA data and make it available to all who need it.

Kimberley Davis expressed concerns that the same deficits appear year after year, but yet such deficits are not being addressing within programs.

**Recommendation**

* More consistency needs to be visible as an assessment group of ensuring the work towards improvement is observed. If gaps are visible, concern should be voiced and follow through recommendations should be addressed with COPE.

**edTPA**

**Completed by:** Nicole Covey

##### **Overview**

##### The overall pass rate is about 48%. Some programs have higher pass rates than others, but no rhyme or reason as to what programs are doing to contribute to higher scores is visible. However, students whose program has a strong writing component in coursework tend to perform better. Assessing of open response writing is not being conducted in programs at the level edTPA evaluators expects. Assessment at higher levels of inquiry is necessary in the majority of programs. Nicole Covey noted that the current focus now is to integrate the writing component of edTPA.

##### **Recommendation**

##### Advanced inquiry level writing to edTPA prompts is needed in junior and senior level program coursework.

* A section on using students personal and cultural assets to make instructional decisions for students to be very difficult for Teacher Candidates a module is recommended to address this area.

**EPP Intern Exit Evaluation**

##### **Overview**

##### Area reports were provided to all programs by Prathima Appaji and the PEP office. Audrey Bowser explained that the results of the EPP Intern Exit Evaluation report is a grand mean across all programs. While it can be observed that students continue to struggle/excel in certain areas, it is clear that longitudinal growth in all four domains has occurred in the past three years. When looking at components, student behavior, communicating with families, and organizing physical space are the top 3 deficit components. Some specific content areas typically score lower on all domain component scores than the grand mean scores for the unit overall. These students may not be as satisfied with their preparation or it might be the low frequency level associated with specific programs. There are 2 questions at the end about the perception of our EPP program as a whole. Both scored high, but there are specific programs who have significantly lower scores than the grand means. We need to make sure these reports are getting to everyone—not stopping at program directors or chairs. We have got to ensure everyone who has a stake in teaching these students has access to this data.

**Limitations**

* Some programs have a small number of participants in the evaluation. The lowest number used is n=3. Scores with an n lower than three are banked until they have three or more.
* It should be noted that the deviation of scores is small (1-4 likert rating). Due to limited variance in scoring, discrimination in results may be limited.

**Recommendations**

* An effort needs to be made to ensure these reports get to everyone—not simply program directors or chairs. Everyone who has a stake in teaching students should have access to this data.

**Novice Teacher Survey**

##### **Completed by:** Jacque D. Singleton and Dixie Keyes

##### **Overview**

Issues that were of concern in past years have been observed again this year, classroom management and diversity. Graduate MATs are a great concern across all themes. It is clear there is a lack of understanding concerning the Danielson Model. Nicole Covey stated that she goes over this with MAT ELED and MLED candidates in her effective teaching course but it is not as deep as it needs to be.

**Recommendations**

* An assignment should be utilized for MATs beginning to ensure all teacher candidates in ELED and MLED gain a greater understanding of the Danielson Model.
* Seminars should be scheduled with MAT students to ensure the same level of support for MATS as is provided for all initial licensure teacher candidates.
* Data should be taken to PLCs as there are potential growth areas within teams.

**PRAXIS II REPORT**

**Completed by:** Sarah Labovitz and Heloisa CursiCampos

**CAEP Standard**: 1.3 (Content Knowledge for Candidates)

**Analysis of Praxis II Data 2018-19**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **# of Passed Students** | **# of Failed**  **Students** | **# of Failed Attempts** |
| **ELED** | 75 | 3 | 7 |
| **MLED** | 24 | 0 | 1 |
| **MLED MATH** | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **SPED** | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **AGRI** | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **ART** | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **ENG** | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| **BIO** | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **MATH** | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| **MUSIC-INST** | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| **MUSIC-VOC** | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **PE** | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| **SOCIAL STUDIES** | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| **TOTAL** | **133** | **3** | **9** |

This population had the following average sub scores in the five subcategories of the PLT:

1. Students as Learner 68.58 (Lowest)
2. Instructional Progress 72.61
3. Assessment 72.91
4. Professional Development, Leadership, Community 74.88 (Highest)
5. Analysis of Instructional Scenarios 72.11

**Content Tests**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **# of Passed Students** | **# of Failed**  **Students** | **# of Failed Attempts** |
| **ELED** | **Reading** | 50 | 3 | 9 |
| **Math** | 49 | 0 | 8 |
| **Social Studies** | 58 | 16 | 91 |
| **Science** | 57 | 10 | 48 |
| **MLED** | **English** | 4 | 4 | 13 |
| **Math** | 6 | 0 | 2 |
| **Social Studies** | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| **Science** | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| **MLED MATH** | | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **SPED** | | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| **AGRI** | | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **ART** | | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| **ENG** | | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| **BIO** | | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **MATH** | | 4 | 6 | 18 |
| **MUSIC-INST** | | 9 | 0 | 2 |
| **MUSIC-VOC** | | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| **PE** | | 5 | 0 | 2 |
| **SOCIAL STUDIES** | | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| **TOTAL** | | **283** | **48** | **229** |

This population has 283 students passing their content area tests (85.5%) and 48 students failing their content area tests (14.5%). However, this same population has 283 passed attempts (55.3%) and 229 failed attempts (44.7%). While we are close to meeting the 88.14% student pass rate established by ADHE, we need to think about our much lower our pass attempt rate (55.3%) and the cost that brings our students.

Every content test is different. Below is the lowest scoring and highest scoring sub-score for each area.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Lowest Sub-score** | **Highest**  **Sub-score** |
| **ELED** | Reading Language Arts: Writing, Speaking, Listening 23.5%  Math: Geometry and Measurement, Data, Statistics, Probability 62.4%  Social Studies: World History and Economics: 54.7%  Science: Earth Science 59.8% | Reading Language Arts: Reading 71.5%  Math: Numbers and Operations 81.8%  Social Studies: United States History, Government, Citizenship 59.7%  Science: Life Science 69.5% |
| **MLED** | English: Constructed Response 52.9%  Math: Geometry and Data 69.1%  Social Studies: Short Content Essays 46.1%  Science: Physical Sciences 56.6% | English: Reading 75.7%  Math: Arithmetic and Algebra 75.9%  Social Studies: World History 62.7%  Science: Scientific Methodology, Techniques, History 74.1% |
| **MLED MATH** | Geography 21.4% | Economics  71.4% |
| **SPED** | Planning and the Learning Environment 69.2% | Foundations and Professional Responsibilities  80.8% |
| **AGRI** | Leadership and Career Development  29.4% | Power, Structure, Technical Systems 66.7% |
| **ART** | Historical and Theoretical Foundations of Art 60.3% | Art Making 67.8% |
| **ENG** | Constructed Responses 59.3% | Reading 75.4% |
| **BIO** | Science Technology and Social Perspectives 52.6% | Nature of Science 94.1% |
| **MATH** | Geometry, Probability Statistics, Discrete Mathematics 55.1% | Number and Quantity, Algebra Functions, Calculus 58% |
| **MUSIC-INST** | Music History and Theory 55.4% | Pedagogy, Professional Issues, and Technology 66.8% |
| **MUSIC-VOC** | Theory and Composition 49.5% | Pedagogy, Professional Issues, and Technology 63.1% |
| **PE** | Health Education Content 65.8% | PE Planning, Instruction, Student Assessment 78.2% |
| **SOCIAL STUDIES** | Geography 52.7% | Government/Civics 61.5% |

**Overall Thoughts**

This population is passing the PLT at a higher rate than they are passing their Content Area Tests. Perhaps course and curriculum revision should be explored to spend more time on areas that are the lowest scoring. The area that is the lowest scoring is unique to each department. The number of students from each program is also unique to each department and varies from 1 to 80 while the number of failed attempts by the same student varies from 1 to 9. Thus, the lowest and highest sub-scores should be analyzed by each program to reflect common areas of strengths or weaknesses over the years and not specific strengths and weaknesses of a single or few students and/or multiple failed attempts. Subcommittee members noted that ASTATE TC scores are still below the benchmark score of 88.4% , we are at 85.5%.

**Limitations**

##### Content areas were broken down by program. Categories are different for each program. There are programs with only one student who took the content exam. Such low numbers make it difficult to use that limited data to make program level decisions.

##### Due to limited sample size and possible deficiencies in testing instruments, low scores are not necessarily indications of lack of training in programs.

**Recommendations**

##### Timing of when students should take the exams should be discussed. Timing of when TC’s take the exams could impact the overall scores.

##### PLT data is across the unit. It may be necessary to separate out the data for PLT by grade level: K-6, 5-9, 7-12, K-12.

* Examination of data across multiple years with same test and curriculum may strengthen analysis

**Technology Assessment Plan**

***Note:*** *The Technology Action Plan has yet to be implemented. Pedogogical and cognitive data intended to be collected from that plan is unavailable for review and analysis.*

**Completed by:** Scott Doig, Nicole Covey

**Intern Technology Survey Report Analysis**

**Findings:**

**Summary Table Analysis**

Overall scores were above a 4.00 for all survey questions. Areas of concern were visible for technology knowledge questions 2 (I keep up with important new technologies; Mean = 4.14; SD = .90) and 3 (I know about a lot of different technologies; Mean = 4.11; SD = .88) due to low grand mean and high standard deviation.

**Summary Table by Major Area**

Areas of concern were visible due to low means and high standard deviation for the following areas (Numbers were highlighted in yellow if they were – Mean < 4.20, SD > .90; Numbers highlighted in green if Mean was high and SD low enough so that lowest score would not drop below 4.00):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **ELED** | | **MLED** | | **MLED MAT** | | **SPED** | | **Secondary** | |
| Question | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| TK1 | 4.36 | .93 | 4.41 | .56 | 4.43 | 1.13 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 4.44 | .65 |
| TK2 | 4.22 | .95 | 4.19 | .74 | 4.29 | .76 | 3.57 | 1.27 | 4.07 | .86 |
| TK3 | 4.18 | .94 | 4.19 | .74 | 4.00 | 1.15 | 3.57 | 1.27 | 4.06 | .77 |
| TCK1 | 4.38 | .81 | 4.59 | .50 | 4.29 | 1.11 | 4.29 | .49 | 4.43 | .71 |
| TCK3 | 4.43 | .82 | 4.52 | .51 | 4.29 | 1.11 | 4.43 | .53 | 4.53 | .56 |
| TPK3 | 4.38 | .83 | 4.17 | 1.18 | 4.57 | .53 | 4.29 | .49 | 4.31 | .87 |
| TPACK1 | 4.51 | .79 | 4.50 | .51 | 4.57 | .53 | 4.14 | .69 | 4.47 | .60 |
| TPACK4 | 4.51 | .86 | 4.41 | .61 | 4.67 | .52 | 4.00 | .58 | 4.53 | .53 |

**Summary Table by Campus**

Areas of concern were visible due to low means and high standard deviation for the following areas (Numbers were highlighted in yellow if they were – Mean < 4.20, SD > .90; Numbers highlighted in green if Mean was high and SD low enough so that lowest score would not drop below 4.00):

***NOTE:*** *Mountain Home is not detailed due to all questions qualifying as areas of concern*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Jonesboro** | | **Beebe** | | **Mid-South** | |
| Question | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| TK2 | 4.19 | .88 | 4.17 | .81 | 4.11 | .60 |
| TK3 | 4.15 | .86 | 4.17 | .70 | 4.22 | .67 |
| PK4 | 4.46 | .69 | 4.53 | .65 | 4.11 | .60 |
| TPK3 | 4.37 | .88 | 4.43 | .56 | 3.89 | 1.17 |
| TPACK3 | 4.53 | .66 | 4.56 | .50 | 4.11 | .93 |

**Areas of concern:**

Questions noted below are questions that were highlighted areas of concern. These areas should be considered by programs for assessment of gaps in curriculum.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ID | Question |
| TK1 | I know how to solve my own problems |
| TK2 | I keep up with important new technologies |
| TK3 | I know about a lot of different technologies |
| PK4 | I know how to organize and maintain classroom management |
| TCK1 | I know about technologies that I can use for teaching specific concepts in my subject matter |
| TCK3 | I know about technologies that I can use for enhancing the understanding of specific concepts in my subject matter |
| TPK3 | My teacher education program has stimulated me to think more deeply about how technology could influence the teaching approaches I use in my classroom |
| TPACK1 | I can teach lessons that appropriately combine my subject matter, technologies, and teaching approaches |
| TPACK3 | I can use strategies that I learned about in my coursework to combine content, technologies, and teaching approaches in my classroom |
| TPACK4 | I can provide leadership in helping others to coordinate the use of content, technologies, and teaching approaches at my school |

**Additional Recommendations**

* We need to consider whether our students on low performing campuses are taking technology courses online or face-to-face and who's responsible for delivery
* There has to be a point person responsible for figuring out which people are now Apple certified and which are Google Certified, who in each program are doing Tech-related assignments in their coursework and then what are those assignments and how are they assessed and how does that correlate to the TPACK rubric. The biggest issue is who is the person collecting the data and ensuring that data is being collected and where are we putting it. Without a point person the technology action plan will not be put into motion and data will not be collected.
* The recommendation for the development of an ad hoc implementation committee was forwarded to COPE. That committee has been formed to review and implement the Technology Action Plan.

**Diversity Survey**

**Completed by:** Jacque D. Singleton and Dixie Keyes

**Overview**

Elements were examined and broken down with a focus on the rating of each. Based off the information garnered it seemed like MLED and MAT Majors consistently scored a little higher than other groups. They scored a little higher on questions that stress the importance of the teacher's role in the diversity in the classroom. Also no one group had really negative thoughts about diversity. Most Majors disagreed with negative statements such as everyone should speak English and it being a hindrance to learning. Everyone overwhelmingly agreed that they needed more professional development on diversity and MLED Majors were the ones that felt like they were the most prepared looking at the numbers that we looked at here and we often talked about the importance of diversity but we did not provide them with strategies on how to implement diversity and related topics.

Based on the commentary from the open-ended questions there are some statements that allude to the fact that some programs address diversity much or not at all; some of us in the unit have more experience with and expertise and even publications related to diversity-- Multicultural education, culturally relevant pedagogy, critical literacy, things like that. With regards to backgrounds of the faculty, it seems like perhaps that we can come together and ask each other what do we want our students to know and be able to apply when it comes to diversity because with this instrument I'm not sure we're getting what we want. I'm not on the diversity committee-I think Kim put me on it recently-but it's really relevant when you're getting to the concept of differentiation and its really relevant with classroom management; it's really relevant with them responding to cultural needs. We have a wide variety of things going on in the unit for our teacher candidates but over and over and over again the field experiences and the internships were the most important factor to learning, more than just being in the classroom with teachers here on campus.

**Limitations**

* The questions within the survey aren't really questions, they are statements so the language may need to change.
* There seems to be some content missing in relation to diversity such as, implicit bias, culturally responsive curriculum, asset deficit perspectives, language diversity. Everything that we want the students to walk away with is actually in a survey for Multicultural education. I think we might be talking about two different things.
* “Dealing” with different learners or when “dealing” with second-language learners has a negative connotation so we may want to look at a new instrument.

**Recommendations**

* If a new instrument is necessary, we need to be thinking about where we are in terms of a CAEP visit so that will have three instances of data, as right now we only do the diversity report every Academic Year. For data to be of use from a new instrument, the new instrument would need to be in place starting in the new Academic Year of 2020-21.
* UCA worked with a group from Harvard. It is recommended that a connection be made to investigate possible improvement in diversity data being collected.
* The question should be raised as to whether we want to know teacher candidate beliefs or how well teacher candidates are prepared for the diverse classroom.
* All programs should participate in a online microaggressions module, as part of the secondary methods courses in secondary programs.
* An examination on how culturally responsive education is integrated throughout all courses and programs is recommended. A professional development for faculty may be necessary to avoid “one-shot” delivery of such curriculum.

**General Recommendations**

* To assist in programs in meeting deadlines for all EPP assessments, an assessment timeline of when assessments should occur and who is responsible for completion should be createed to expidite knowledge of what is due dates and responsibilities for all constituents.
* Information is recommended to be housed in several different easily accessable locations.

**Recommendations forwarded to COPE**

* Assessment and Alignment Sub-Committee (these are the recommendations from Dixie and the work her sub-committee, primarily secondary education programs, developed)
* Technology Sub-Committee (“It has been recommended that this be sent to the college technology committee to oversee implementation. Nicole developed a checklist of all things that need to happen for us to get on track with all of the technology plan previously established deadlines/dates. The head of the EPP can determine how this will be disseminated and carried out and then should forward on to COPE as it involves curriculum changes.")
* Technology Sub-Committee ("I  know also one of our concerns when we were thinking about with COPE is how we go about holding people accountable for addressing the changes that are recommended in the plan." "I think this is again another one of the questions that needs to be addressed to COPE and in the technology committee so maybe when we send this forward we are recommending that the technology committee be as transparent as possible about what they're doing and moving forward I think that's going to be one of the important facets here.")