

## CAEP Annual Report (filed April, 2019)

### Data from Academic Year 2017-2018 [September 1, 2017 – August 31, 2018]

CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation) has eight annual reporting measures which are used to provide information to the public on both program outcome and program impact. Following is the list of the CAEP measures with links to data tables and information providing supporting evidence for each measure.

[Summary of data and trends available here](#)

1. [Measure 1: Impact completers' teaching has on P-12 learning and development](#)
2. [Measure 2: Indicators of completers' teaching effectiveness](#)
3. [Measure 3: Results of employer surveys including retention and employment milestones](#)
4. [Measure 4: Results of completer surveys](#)
5. [Measure 5: Completer graduation rates including rates for successful completion of student teaching by program areas](#)
6. [Measure 6: Ability of completers to meet licensing / certification requirements](#)
7. [Measure 7: Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they are prepared](#)
8. [Measure 8: Student loan default rates and other consumer information](#)

### Program Completer Data

#### Annual Program Completers

	Traditional	Nontraditional (MAT)	Combined	Advanced Programs
Completers 2017-2018	196	85	281	239
Completers 2016-2017	143	88	231	220
Completers 2015-2016	148	107	255	178
Completers 2014-2015	176	107	283	135
Completers 2013-2014	164	88	252	123
Completers 2012-2013	165	84	249	n/a
Completers 2011-2012	143	87	230	n/a
Completers 2010-2011	153	79	232	n/a

[RETURN TO TOP OF DOCUMENT](#)

## Summary of Data and Trends

CAEP Required Measure	Description of Data Provided	Summary of Data and Trends
<a href="#"><u>Measure 1: Impact completers' teaching has on P-12 learning and development</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arch Ford IOSL Data on 2016-17 completers – Summary Data</li> <li>Little Rock School District VAM Case Study on 15-16 and 16-17 completers</li> </ul>	<p>Arch Ford data represents performance of 13 UCA graduates performing in schools under the Arch Ford Educational Services Cooperative umbrella. These placements are primarily rural and suburban. Graduates included teachers prepared by both undergraduate and MAT programs. Graduates were teaching in grades K-12 and in subjects including math, science, health, social studies, English, business, and art. All candidates saw a positive impact on student learning as measured by classroom-based criterion assessments.</p> <p>Little Rock schools data represents performance of 16 UCA graduates performing in schools within the LRSD. These placements are urban. Graduates included teachers prepared by both undergraduate and MAT programs. Graduates were teaching in grades 1-8, and data reflects student performance on standardized, norm-referenced test administration (NWEA and ACT Aspire). The student VAM performances were positive for teachers in grades 3-8 with only one graduate having a “low” mean growth percentile category rating and all others showing “average” to “high” growth percentile category ratings. In contrast, 3 of the teachers in grades 1-2 saw declines in student performance in reading scores and 4 of the teachers in grades 1-2 saw declines in student performance in math. Only one teacher saw a notable increase in student performance in reading.</p> <p>Faculty in the elementary (ELSE) program faculty have reviewed the data and are discussing curriculum changes to benefit candidate ability to positively impact student performance. Additionally, ELSE program faculty are discussing what courses teacher candidate take which will expose them to district use of Map Growth assessments (NWEA). Map Growth is used by many Arkansas districts to measure students' literacy and math performance in order to inform teachers for planning and differentiating student learning.</p> <p>The CAEP standard 4 committee is also recommending that programs raise candidate awareness to the types of data the state and the EPP are tracking so that they can see the relationship between their teaching, student learning, and EPP preparation of them for their professional role.</p>

CAEP Required Measure	Description of Data Provided	Summary of Data and Trends
<a href="#">Measure 2: Indicators of completers' teaching effectiveness</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observation data for graduates involved in the UCA induction project.</li> <li>• Observation data for graduates involved in the Arch Ford induction initiative.</li> <li>• Graduate self-reporting</li> <li>• Induction project survey results of EPP preparation of candidates</li> </ul>	<p>Graduates appear to be scoring relatively lower in the following areas and reflect trends from the previous year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designing coherent instruction</li> <li>• Designing student assessments</li> <li>• Managing student behavior</li> <li>• Using questioning and discussion techniques</li> <li>• Engaging students in learning</li> <li>• Using assessment in instruction</li> </ul> <p>In 2016-2017, the EPP adopted a mobile 1:1 initiative for all undergraduate initial preparation programs with explicit instructional focus on using technology to design instruction and to design assessments with a lens for transformative pedagogy. The graduates in the 2016-2017 data set would not have taken part in that initiative. The 2017-2018 cohort were fully immersed in this initiative. Scores <u>do</u> show an increase in all of those areas, but are still the low spots relative to their respective data sets. These data should be considered baseline with future reporting years analyzed for the impact of the mobile initiative on these areas.</p> <p>An increased focus on (1) designing and using assessment and (2) classroom management the classroom will be a focus for the 2019-2020 school year based on trend data for both the MAT and Undergraduate Initial Licensure programs. Additionally, the CAEP Standard 4 committee has recommended an EPP focus for next academic year on improving resources and instruction for supporting students from diverse populations with particular focus culturally responsive teaching and secondary foci on (1) assessment and (2) classroom management</p>

CAEP Required Measure	Description of Data Provided	Summary of Data and Trends
<a href="#">Measure 3: Results of employer surveys including retention and employment milestones</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ADE Employer Survey – Initial Programs</li> <li>• UCA Employer Survey – Initial Programs</li> <li>• Arch Ford Employer Survey – Initial Programs</li> <li>• Employment Milestones ADE Data – Initial Programs</li> <li>• Employment Milestones Arch Ford Novice Teacher Survey – Initial Programs</li> <li>• Employment Milestones Student Data Tracker – Initial Programs</li> <li>• UCA Employer Survey – Advanced Programs.</li> <li>• Employment Milestones – Advanced Programs</li> </ul>	<p>Across the data, graduates appear to be scoring relatively lower in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Setting instructional outcomes</li> <li>• Managing classroom procedures</li> <li>• Managing student behavior</li> <li>• Using questioning and discussion techniques</li> <li>• Using assessment in instruction</li> <li>• Knowledge of classroom assessment.</li> <li>• Working with diverse students</li> </ul> <p>In 2016-2017, the EPP adopted a mobile 1:1 initiative with explicit instructional focus on using technology to design instruction and to design assessments with a lens for transformative pedagogy. The graduates in this 2016-17 data set would not have taken part in that initiative and should be considered baseline. Data do show an increase in 2017-2018 but still reflect relative low points in the data set.</p> <p>In 2016-2017, the EPP engaged in an analysis of current clinical practices with an eye for increasing quality clinical experiences for all candidates by offering more supported, embedded, and authentic placements. Part of that re-design included a consideration of field assignments to focus on classroom management and managing student behavior. Additionally, the re-design focused on providing candidates with more understanding of the needs of diverse students. The program faculty spent 2017-2018 engineering the redesign, and program faculty have agreed to focus ad hoc committee structures in 2018-2019 on supporting diverse students and families. Faculty assert that low scores in classroom management are tied to a lack of experience with diverse students and are committed to focusing attention on these areas in the 2018-2018 academic year.</p> <p>Data on employment retention and milestones tell us that 60-65% of graduates find work in Arkansas Public Schools and are satisfied with their salary. Data from novice teachers and their supervisors indicate novice teachers were able to meet their PGP goals according to supervisor feedback. The Arch Ford case study participants indicate that 100% intend to remain in the field for a second year. Additionally, close to 30% of recent initial program graduates have enrolled in advanced programs to earn additional endorsements or licenses.</p> <p>Advanced program data indicate that employers feel candidates are well prepared. Program faculty are currently examining the relative low point in the data tied to candidate ability to understand and use research to improve practice. Most advanced program graduates currently hold degrees tied to their advanced licensure or endorsement coursework and indicate a high degree of satisfaction with their salary.</p>

CAEP Required Measure	Description of Data Provided	Summary of Data and Trends
<a href="#">Measure 4: Results of completer surveys</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UCA End of Program Survey – Initial Programs</li> <li>• ADE Novice Teacher Survey Results - Initial Programs</li> <li>• UCA Post-Graduation Survey – Initial Programs</li> <li>• UCA End of Program Survey – Advanced Program</li> <li>• UCA Post-Graduation Survey – Advanced Programs</li> </ul>	<p>Analysis of data across these measures indicate graduates score their experiences relatively lower in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managing classroom procedures</li> <li>• Managing student behavior</li> <li>• Communicating with families</li> <li>• Student assessments (using assessment in instruction, digital age assessments)</li> <li>• Engaging students in questioning and discussion</li> <li>• Promoting and modeling digital citizenship and responsibility</li> <li>• Content knowledge preparation (MAT candidates only)</li> </ul> <p>Program faculty spent 2017-2018 on program re-design focused on providing candidates with more understanding of the needs of diverse students. Additionally program faculty have agreed to focus ad hoc committee structures in 2018-2019 on supporting diverse students and families. Faculty assert that low scores in classroom management are tied to a lack of experience with diverse students and are committed to focusing attention on these areas in the 2018-2018 academic year. Additionally, the program faculty have increased a focus in EDUC 4210 on digital citizenship and are bringing online a badging system for initial candidates in digital pedagogy.</p> <p>The MAT program will continue to communicate to candidates that the program is a pedagogical program predicated on the candidate entering the program with content knowledge in place.</p> <p>Additionally, the surveys provide guidance for individual programs using the UCA aggregate data as a comparison benchmark. Programs analyze their performance relative to the benchmark in drafting and implementing program-specific continuous improvement.</p> <p>For advanced programs, no clear trends were evidence in year 1 data (2016-2017) or in year 2 data (2017-2018). Again, the surveys provide guidance for individual programs using the UCA aggregate data as a comparison benchmark. Programs are asked to analyze their performance relative to the benchmark in drafting and implementing program-specific continuous improvement.</p>

CAEP Required Measure	Description of Data Provided	Summary of Data and Trends
<a href="#">Measure 5: Completer graduation rates including rates for successful completion of student teaching by program areas</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Admission to Graduation Retention – Undergraduate Initial Programs</li> <li>• Internship Retention – Undergraduate Initial Programs</li> <li>• Admission to Graduation Retention – MAT Programs (1)</li> <li>• Admission to Graduation Retention – MAT Programs (2)</li> <li>• Internship Retention – MAT Initial Programs</li> <li>• Annual Retention and Graduation Rate Data – Advanced Programs</li> </ul>	<p>Initial undergraduate program data indicate that the EPP has an overall 97% retention rate with the majority of students who do not continue electing to withdraw from programs due to a shifting interest in the profession or a perceived lack of fit. Additionally, trends indicate that the EPP does have some students who complete the final internship semester but choose to graduate without licensure. In the 2016-17 cohort, 97% of those who entered internship completed with 89% of that cohort filing for their teaching license. In the 2017-2018 cohort, 97% of those who entered internship completed with 90% of that cohort filing for their teaching license. Focus group and interview data indicate that the majority of those candidates who choose to not license do so after experiencing the internship semester and gaining a deeper understanding of the demands of the profession. This appears to be more prevalent in some programs than in others which will be a continued focus of investigation in the 2019-2020 academic year.</p> <p>MAT program data indicate that the EPP has an admission to graduation retention rate ranging from 48% to 55% according to institutional data based on fall admission cohorts only. Analysis of in-house EPP data for fall, spring, and summer admission indicates retention rates of 32% with licensure specific retention rates ranging from 0-100%. The MAT program faculty are currently conducting research into retention to examine these trends. In the 2016-17 cohort, 100% of those who entered internship completed with 90% of that cohort filing for their teaching license. In the 2017-2018 cohort, 91% of those who entered internship completed with 98% of that cohort filing for their teaching license. Focus group and interview data indicate that the majority of those candidates who choose to not license do so after experiencing the internship semester and gaining a deeper understanding of the demands of the profession.</p> <p>Data on advanced programs indicate that some programs are doing well with 1-year and 6-year retention rates (LIBM, RDNG, SLMA). However others are reporting retention rates at below 50%. The graduate program faculty worked to build retention strategies in the Spring 2019 term to include in the new Graduate Programs recruitment and retention plan. Data from 2011-2012 and 2016-2017 cohorts should be viewed as baseline data against which new retention effort success will be measured.</p>

CAEP Required Measure	Description of Data Provided	Summary of Data and Trends
<a href="#"><u>Measure 6: Ability of completers to meet licensing / certification requirements</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UCA Praxis Data – Initial Programs – 2017-2018</li> <li>• UCA Praxis Data - MAT Programs – 2017-2018</li> <li>• UCA Praxis Data – Advanced Programs 2017-2018</li> </ul>	Praxis data indicate strong Praxis scores across most content exams. There are programs with relatively low initial pass rates; however, for the most part, the UCA pass rates are equal to or exceed the state and national pass rates provided by ADE and/or ETS. Programs where there are concerns have been examining content in relation to the exams and making curriculum revisions. The COE Dean has incentivized faculty to take the exams themselves to prepare for any curriculum revision process (e.g., elementary social studies, secondary math, middle school math, secondary art, gifted and talented). Data trends are being tracked to continue to inform programs of their options in program revision to seek continuous improvement.
<a href="#"><u>Measure 7: Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they are prepared</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ADE EPPR – UCA Initial Program Graduates employed in Arkansas Public Schools</li> <li>• UCA Post-Graduation Survey – Initial Programs’ Graduate Reporting on Base Salary</li> <li>• Arch Ford Novice Teacher Survey – Initial Programs</li> <li>• Completers’ Graduate Program Enrollment – Student Data Tracker</li> <li>• Employment Milestones – Advanced Programs</li> </ul>	<p>Data indicate that UCA EPP graduates are finding employment in districts across the state. Of the UCA 2015-2016 initial program completers, 65% taught in Arkansas Public Schools in the 2016-2017 school year representing 14.05% of novice teachers in the state. Of the UCA 2016-2017 initial program completers, 60% taught in Arkansas Public Schools in the 2016-2017 school year representing 14.39% of novice teachers in the state. This is a consistent trend across time. At the point of graduation, more than 40% of candidates have already secured positions prior to the summer “school hiring” season with at least 40% indicating plans to continue their education in advanced programs. Candidates in math, science, and from the nontraditional MAT programs have the highest success rates in securing early positions. Additionally, the advanced program candidates report high rates of employment commiserate with their area of advanced licensure. Base salaries reported by graduates indicate they are earning commiserate with Arkansas mean starting salaries for their level of earned degree, and graduates report overall satisfaction with their salary.</p> <p>Additional data from the new Arch Ford partnership initiative tells us that 72.73% of graduates working in Arch Ford coop school districts will be successful in completing their first year annual PGP goals and that 100% of that group intend to remain in the teaching profession. Additional data from the student data tracker tell us that at least 30% initial program graduates enroll in graduate school 2-3 years after receiving initial licensure that the majority of these students are pursuing advanced endorsement or licensure in the field of education.</p>
<a href="#"><u>Measure 8: Student loan default rates and other consumer information</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UCA Loan Default Rate</li> <li>• Consumer index data</li> </ul>	Loan default rates can indicate how well UCA is supporting students in college attendance without undue reliance on loans, particularly unsubsidized loans. The official student loan default rate for a school is calculated by measuring how many students are in default three years after graduation. Note that the default rate only takes into account federal loans, not private.

## Measure 1: Impact on P-12 Learning and Development (CAEP Standard 4.1)

Arch Ford IOSL Data on 2016-17 completers – Summary Data<sup>1</sup>

EPP	n	Pre Range	Post Range	Avg Gain/Loss	Avg GPA Pre	Avg GPA Post	Avg GPA Gain
UCA	13	≤60	90-94%	13.85	1.71	3.19	1.48
Aggregate	39	≤60	95-100%	12.90	1.74	3.15	1.41

EPP	Grade	Subject	Pre (39)	Post (39)	Gain/Loss	Avg Gain/Loss	GPA Pre	GPA Post	GPA Gain
Teacher 1	6	Math	65-69%	75-79%	10	13.85	1.3	2.3	1
Teacher 2	7-12	Math	65-69%	85-89%	20		0	2.3	2.3
Teacher 3	4-8	Science	65-69%	85-89%	20		2.3	2.6	0.3
Teacher 4	7-12	Science	65-69%	85-89%	20		1.3	3.3	2
Teacher 5	9-12	Health	65-69%	90-94%	25		1.3	3.3	2
Teacher 6	1	Social Studies	70-74%	85-89%	15		1.3	3.3	2
Teacher 7	5	ELA	75-79%	80-84%	5		1.6	3.3	1.7
Teacher 8	7-12	Biz/Career	80-84%	85-89%	5		2.6	3.3	0.7
Teacher 9	8	Science	80-84%	90-94%	10		3.3	3.3	0
Teacher 10	K-12	Science	85-89%	85-89%	0		1.3	3.6	2.3
Teacher 11	K-4	Art	85-89%	90-94%	5		2.6	3.6	1
Teacher 12	K-12	Art	Below 60%	75-79%	15		3.3	3.6	0.3
Teacher 13	10-12	Science	Below 60%	90-94%	30		0	3.6	3.6

<sup>1</sup> NT in Arch Ford NT Program participated in IOSL project and reported IOSL data tied to an implemented instructional unit. Individual scores listed below. GPA Calculations computed on standard scale A=4.0, A-=3.6, B+=3.3, B=3.0, B-=2.6, C+=2.3, C=2.0, C+=1.6, D+=1.3, D-=.6, F=0. Survey format .pdf file DW file "2018 CAEP-Completers-Arch Ford-Arch Ford NT Student Impact Response Form - Google Forms". Aggregate benchmark included candidates from other Arkansas EPPs to include (APPEL = 2, ASU = 4, ATU =12, and UAM = 2)



## Little Rock School District VAM Case Study on 15-16 and 16-17 completers<sup>2</sup>

### LRSD Data on 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 completers - NWEA Grades 1,2

READING	Grade	Fall 2017-2018		Winter 2017-2018		Spring 2017-2018	
Teacher 1	2	169.4	LoAvg 21-40th%ile	176.7	LoAvg 21-40th%ile	179.4	LoAvg 21-40th%ile
Teacher 2	2	161.7	Low 1-20th%ile	167.9	Low 1-20th%ile	174.4	Low< 1-20th%ile
Teacher 3	2	188	High above 81st%ile	190.5	HiAvg 61-80th%ile	192.5	Avg 41-60th%ile
Teacher 4	1	171.5	HiAvg 61-80th%ile	181.9	HiAvg 61-80th%ile	188.5	HiAvg 61-80th%ile
Teacher 5	1	164.3	HiAvg 61-80th%ile	170	Avg 41-60th%ile	175.4	Avg 41-60th%ile
Teacher 6	1	134.1	Low 1-20th%ile	141.8	Low 1-20th%ile	143.5	<Below Low 1-20th%ile
Teacher 7	1	157	LoAvg 21-40th%ile	165.4	LoAvg 21-40th%ile	175	Avg 41-60th%ile

MATH	Grade	Fall 2017-2018		Winter 2017-2018		Spring 2017-2018	
Teacher 1	2	169.4	LoAvg 21-40th%ile	178.4	LoAvg 21-40th%ile	180	Low 1-20th%ile
Teacher 2	2	166.8	LoAvg 21-40th%ile	172.2	Low 1-20th%ile	177.6	Low 1-20th%ile
Teacher 3	2	183.9	HiAvg 61-80th%ile	187.1	Avg 41-60th%ile	191.5	Avg 41-60th%ile
Teacher 4	1	167.5	HiAvg 61-80th%ile	181.1	HiAvg 61-80th%ile	187.8	HiAvg 61-80th%ile
Teacher 5	1	165.9	HiAvg 61-80th%ile	170.4	LoAvg 21-40th%ile	177	LoAvg 21-40th%ile
Teacher 6	1	126.3	<BelowLow1-20th %ile	136.8	<Below Low 1-20th%ile	139.2	<Below Low 1-20th%ile
Teacher 7	1	157.2	LoAvg 21-40th%ile	167.1	LoAvg 21-40th%ile	175	LoAvg 21-40th%ile

<sup>2</sup> NT in Arch Ford NT Program participated in IOSL project and reported IOSL data tied to an implemented instructional unit. Individual scores listed below. GPA Calculations computed on standard scale A=4.0, A-=3.6, B+=3.3, B=3.0, B-=2.6, C+=2.3, C=2.0, C-=1.6, D+=1.3, D-=.6, F=0. Survey format .pdf file DW file "2018 CAEP-Completers-Arch Ford-Arch Ford NT Student Impact Response Form - Google Forms". Aggregate benchmark included candidates from other Arkansas EPPs to include (APPEL = 2, ASU = 4, ATU =12, and UAM = 2)

LRSD Data on 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 completers – ACT Aspire Grades 3-8

ACT Aspire: English	Grade	2016-2017		2017-2018	
		Mean Student Growth Percentile	Mean Growth Percentile Category	Mean Student Growth Percentile	Mean Growth Percentile Category
Teacher 1	5	53.1	Average	68.5	High
Teacher 2	6	36.8	Average	35.8	Average
Teacher 3	6	38.5	Average	41.4	Average
Teacher 4	5			44.3	Average
Teacher 5	4	54.6	Average	59.9	Average
Teacher 6	6	39.5	Average	36.7	Average
Teacher 7	5			53.3	Average
Teacher 8	5			37	Average

*Low < 35, Average 35-65, High >66*

ACT Aspire: Math	Grade	2016-2017		2017-2018	
		Mean Student Growth Percentile	Mean Growth Percentile Category	Mean Student Growth Percentile	Mean Growth Percentile Category
Teacher 1	5	68.7	High	57.9	Average
Teacher 2	8	67.2	Average	47.5	Average
Teacher 3	5			40.3	Average
Teacher 4	4	53	Average	59	Average
Teacher 5	6	48.7	Average	34.6	Average
Teacher 6	5			41.3	Average
Teacher 7	5			33.3	Low

*Low < 35, Average 35-65, High >66*

ACT Aspire: Reading	Grade	2016-2017		2017-2018	
		Mean Student Growth Percentile	Mean Growth Percentile Category	Mean Student Growth Percentile	Mean Growth Percentile Category
Teacher 1	5	57.5	Average	62.5	Average
Teacher 2	5			44.5	Average
Teacher 3	4	50.8	Average	55.5	Average
Teacher 4	5			56.8	Average
Teacher 5	5			43.2	Average

*Low < 35, Average 35-65, High >66*

## Measure 2: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (CAEP Standard 4.2)

### UCA Induction Initiative Teacher Performance Observations

Domain / Component	Fall 2016					Fall 2017				
	UCA Aggregate	ELSE	MSIT	SecEd	MAT	UCA Aggregate	ELSE	MSIT	SecEd	MAT
N	19	5	7	2	5	32	5	9	11	7
1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	2.53	2.20	2.67	*	2.80	2.90	2.40	3.00	3	3.00
1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	2.67	2.60	2.00	*	3.00	3.28	3.20	2.89	3.63	3.43
1c. Setting Instructional Outcomes	2.53	2.20	2.67	*	2.80	2.96	2.60	3.00	3	3.17
1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	2.69	2.40	2.50	*	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.88	3.17
1e. Designing Coherent Instruction	2.36	2.25	2.33	*	2.40	2.79	2.40	3.00	2.88	2.71
1f. Designing Student Assessments	2.20	1.80	2.67	*	2.20	2.81	2.80	2.88	3	2.50
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	2.63	2.40	2.57	*	2.80	3.09	3.20	2.89	2.91	3.57
2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	2.42	2.00	2.43	*	2.80	2.78	2.60	2.56	2.73	3.29
2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	2.56	2.00	2.71	*	2.60	2.81	3.00	3.00	2.55	2.86
2d. Managing Student Behavior	2.53	2.20	2.57	*	2.60	2.66	2.80	2.56	2.45	3.00
2e. Organizing Physical Space	2.68	2.20	2.86	*	3.20	2.97	3.00	3.22	2.73	3.00
3a. Communicating With Students	2.78	2.20	3.00	*	3.00	2.88	2.60	3.00	2.82	3.00
3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	2.37	2.20	2.43	*	2.60	2.59	2.40	2.67	2.45	2.86
3c. Engaging Students in Learning	2.21	1.60	2.43	*	2.40	2.75	2.40	2.44	2.82	3.29
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	2.11	1.80	2.29	*	2.00	2.74	2.40	2.89	2.64	3.00
3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	2.79	2.60	3.00	*	2.80	3.00	3.00	3.11	2.64	3.43
4a. Reflecting on Teaching	2.57	2.20	3.00	*	2.60	3.07	3.33	3.00	2.75	3.43
4b. Maintaining Accurate Records	3.00	3.00	3.00	*	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.71	3.67
4c. Communicating with Families	3.13	3.00	3.00	*	3.33	2.95	2.67	3.00	2.71	3.33
4d. Participating in a Professional Community	2.75	2.50	3.00	*	2.67	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.71	3.67
4e. Growing and Developing Professionally	2.67	2.50	-	*	3.00	3.16	3.00	3.17	3	3.43
4f. Showing Professionalism	2.89	2.50	3.00	*	3.50	3.32	3.33	3.11	3.22	3.71

Scale 1 = unsatisfactory, 2 = basic, 3 = proficient, 4 = distinguished

Domain / Component	Fall 2017		Spring 2018	
	AF Aggregate	UCA	AF Aggregate	UCA
	<b>124</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>11</b>
1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy			3.14	3.36
1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students			3.23	3.27
1c. Setting Instructional Outcomes			3.01	3.00
1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources			3.08	3.36
1e. Designing Coherent Instruction			2.93	3.18
1f. Designing Student Assessments			2.85	2.91
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	3.02	3.09	3.06	3.45
2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	2.90	2.96	3.04	3.36
2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	2.78	2.83	2.90	3.00
2d. Managing Student Behavior	2.73	2.68	2.71	2.73
2e. Organizing Physical Space	3.13	3.17	3.25	3.27
3a. Communicating With Students	3.02	2.96	3.14	3.27
3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	2.75	2.78	2.86	3.09
3c. Engaging Students in Learning	2.85	2.83	3.04	3.18
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	2.81	2.87	2.94	3.09
3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	3.04	2.91	3.10	3.18
4a. Reflecting on Teaching			3.10	3.18
4b. Maintaining Accurate Records			3.13	3.36
4c. Communicating with Families			3.04	3.55
4d. Participating in a Professional Community			3.11	3.45
4e. Growing and Developing Professionally			3.18	3.36
4f. Showing Professionalism			3.20	3.55

Scale 1 = unsatisfactory, 2 = basic, 3 = proficient, 4 = distinguished

	2016-2017					2017-2018									
Are you willing to share your TESS scores with us. If so, what were your scores <sup>3</sup>	UCA	ELSE	ML	MAT ML	MAT SECED	UCA	ELSE	ML	ENGL	Music	SS	STEM	MAT ML	MAT SECED	
	14	5	1	2	6	21	1	2	3	2	1	1	6	5	
Overall TESS <sup>4</sup>	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
TESS, Domain 1 Score	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.0	
TESS, Domain 2 Score	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.2	4.0	2.5	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.4	
TESS, Domain 3 Score	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.0	
TESS, Domain 4 Score	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.2	

<sup>3</sup> All TESS scores provided by 1<sup>st</sup> year-out graduates except one 2<sup>nd</sup> year SecEd English teacher

<sup>4</sup> Key: Unsatisfactory (1); Basic (2); Proficient (3); Distinguished (4)

## Measure 3: Employer Surveys

### ADE Employer Survey - Initial Programs<sup>5</sup>

	2016-2017				2017-2018			
	Candidates from 2015-2016				Candidates from 2016-2017			
	UCA		Arkansas		UCA		Arkansas	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
N	58	58	494	494	50	50	443	443
1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	3.4	0.72	3.4	0.66	3.52	n/a	3.49	n/a
1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	3.2	0.76	3.3	0.68	3.38	n/a	3.42	n/a
1c. Setting Instructional Outcomes	3.1	0.71	3.2	0.69	3.38	n/a	3.32	n/a
1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	3.3	0.68	3.3	0.69	3.49	n/a	3.43	n/a
1e. Designing Coherent Instruction	3.3	0.73	3.3	0.69	3.48	n/a	3.42	n/a
1f. Designing Student Assessments	3.2	0.80	3.2	0.73	3.33	n/a	3.27	n/a
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	3.3	0.78	3.4	0.71	3.38	n/a	3.48	n/a
2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	3.2	0.80	3.4	0.71	3.42	n/a	3.40	n/a
2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	3.0	0.92	3.1	0.83	3.24	n/a	3.26	n/a
2d. Managing Student Behavior	2.9	0.96	3.0	0.87	3.06	n/a	3.13	n/a
2e. Organizing Physical Space	3.2	0.76	3.4	0.64	3.54	n/a	3.54	n/a
3a. Communicating With Students	3.3	0.74	3.4	0.69	3.50	n/a	3.44	n/a
3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	3.1	0.79	3.1	0.75	3.22	n/a	3.23	n/a
3c. Engaging Students in Learning	3.2	0.84	3.2	0.73	3.35	n/a	3.33	n/a
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	3.1	0.77	3.1	0.73	3.23	n/a	3.21	n/a
3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	3.3	0.71	3.3	0.70	3.32	n/a	3.38	n/a
4a. Reflecting on Teaching	3.2	0.76	3.3	0.71	3.38	n/a	3.38	n/a
4b. Maintaining Accurate Records	3.3	0.66	3.4	0.65	3.36	n/a	3.46	n/a
4c. Communicating with Families	3.2	0.84	3.2	0.70	3.22	n/a	3.30	n/a
4d. Participating in a Professional Community	3.2	0.82	3.4	0.70	3.43	n/a	3.44	n/a
4e. Growing and Developing Professionally	3.3	0.79	3.4	0.68	3.48	n/a	3.46	n/a
4f. Showing Professionalism	3.4	0.88	3.5	0.65	3.56	n/a	3.56	n/a
Avg of all 22 items	3.21	0.78	3.29	0.71	3.38	n/a	3.38	n/a

*Scale 1 = not prepared, 2 = minimally prepared, 3 = adequately prepared, 4 = well prepared*

<sup>5</sup> Source: 2016-2017 data provided directly from ADE (personal correspondence. 2017-2018 data available from ADE EPPR: <https://eis.ade.arkansas.gov/eppr/default.aspx>

## UCA Employer Survey – Initial Programs

	2016-2017 <sup>6</sup> Candidates from 2015-2016					2017-2018 <sup>7</sup> Candidates from 2016-2017				
How well do you feel UCA prepared its graduate(s) to understand and implement the following components of effective teaching during their first year(s) of teaching?	UCA	ELSE	MSIT	SECED	MAT	UCA	ELSE	MSIT	SECED	MAT
N	70	29	14	18	2	83	33	15	29	3
Domain 1	3.51	3.41	3.57	3.72	*	3.55	3.55	3.47	3.62	*
Domain 2	3.30	3.14	3.43	3.39	*	3.34	3.42	3.33	3.28	*
Domain 3	3.46	3.34	3.57	3.67	*	3.52	3.53	3.53	3.52	*
Domain 4	3.50	3.41	3.50	3.78	*	3.49	3.61	3.33	3.48	*
Knowledge of learner development	3.30	3.31	3.36	3.39	*	3.43	3.42	3.47	3.45	*
Consideration of student diversity	3.41	3.38	3.43	3.47	*	3.40	3.46	3.40	3.32	*
Ability to work with students with special needs	3.18	3.14	2.92	3.35	*	3.37	3.50	3.27	3.29	*
Ability to create an effective learning environment	3.37	3.31	3.36	3.44	*	3.45	3.55	3.47	3.31	*
Managing student behavior	3.11	2.97	3.14	3.28	*	3.20	3.32	3.27	3.07	*
Knowledge of content	3.54	3.39	3.64	3.78	*	3.55	3.47	3.60	3.62	*
Implementing effective instructional methods or strategies	3.35	3.29	3.57	3.44	*	3.48	3.50	3.40	3.48	*
Use of instructional technology	3.57	3.56	3.57	3.56	*	3.60	3.61	3.60	3.59	*
Knowledge of classroom assessment	3.25	3.22	3.14	3.56	*	3.35	3.42	3.13	3.34	*
Effective parent and family communication	3.30	3.32	3.21	3.28	*	3.25	3.37	3.07	3.24	*

<sup>6</sup> Survey sent to 154 principals of identified UCA EPP graduates in May 2017 of the 2014-2015 & 2015-2016 graduates identified by ADE as teaching in APS. 2016-2017 UCA received 70 fully completed survey responses = response rate of 46.98%.

<sup>7</sup> Survey sent to 175 principals of identified UCA EPP graduates in May 2018 of the 2016-2017 graduates identified by ADE as teaching in APS. 2016-2017 UCA received 83 fully completed survey responses = response rate of 47.43%.

## Qualitative Comments

2016-2017 AY (2015-2016 Compl.)		2017-2018 AY (2016-2017 Compl.)	
Recommendations	Commendations	Recommendations	Commendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates need more support in classroom management</li> <li>• More understanding of needs of diverse students to include: high risk, SPED, low SES / high poverty, urban</li> <li>• More TESS knowledge</li> <li>• More hands-on practice; less theory</li> <li>• More on AR teaching standards</li> <li>• Communicating with parents</li> <li>• More on reading, "science of reading"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates very well prepared</li> <li>• High marks for professionalism</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates need more support in classroom management</li> <li>• Limited understanding of needs of diverse students to include: ELL, low SES / high poverty, urban</li> <li>• How to communicate with parents (particularly parents where English is not the first language)</li> <li>• More innovative and less traditional approaches to learning</li> <li>• Promote learning, not teaching</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates well prepared overall</li> <li>• Strong knowledge of phonics</li> <li>• Strong knowledge of literacy intervention and instruction</li> </ul>



## Arch Ford Employer Survey – Initial Programs<sup>8</sup>

Employers of 2016-2017 UCA Graduates Involved in 2017-2018 Arch Ford Induction Initiative	Scale	AF Aggregate	UCA	Elem	Middle	SecEd	1 <sup>st</sup> Year	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year
	N	121	41	14	11	13	34	7
Do you anticipate this novice completing meeting their PGP goals for 17/18?	for sure (3), maybe (2), no (1)	2.82	2.84	2.71	3	2.75	2.85	2.67
How prepared do you believe this novice came to your school?	exceptionally prepared (4), satisfactorily prepared (3), less than satisfactorily prepared (2), ill prepared (1)	3.27	3.24	3.14	3.55	3.08	3.32	2.86
How would you categorize this novice's growth from the beginning of their teaching experience until now?	exceptional growth noted in all areas (4), exceptional growth noted in many areas (3), exceptional growth noted in few areas (2), exceptional growth not noted (1)	3.1	3.1	3.21	3.36	2.54	3.21	2.57
Overall, how would you categorize this novice's performance in Planning & Preparation (Domain 1)?	Exceptional (4), satisfactory (3), needs improvement (2), unsatisfactory (1)	3.28	3.37	3.21	3.64	3.15	3.44	3
Overall, how would you categorize this novice's performance in Professional Responsibilities? (Domain 4)		3.21	3.39	3.43	3.45	3.15	3.44	3.14
Overall, how would you categorize this novice's performance in Establishing the Classroom Environment? (Domain 2)		3.21	3.39	3.5	3.45	3.15	3.41	3.29
Overall, how would you categorize this novice's performance in Instruction (Domain 3)		3.18	3.34	3.43	3.36	3.08	3.38	3.14
Overall, how effective do you believe the Arch Ford novice teacher mentoring system has been this year in supporting this novice?	Very effective (4), effective (3), partially effective (2), unsatisfactory (1)	3.24	3.18	3.36	3	3	3.21	3

<sup>8</sup> Arch Ford mentoring program began in AY 2017-2018. Data reported for EPPs participating in Arch Ford NT induction program with n ≥ 5. Overall Arch Ford NT program included up to 145 total participants over the academic year. Other EPPs in data set include: Abilene Christian (n = 1); CBC (n = 3); Furmin U (n = 1); Harding (n = 3); Henderson (n = 2); John Brown (n = 1); SAU (n = 3); Ouachita (n = 1); PPTL (n = 2); SAU (n = 2); UAF (n = 2); UALR (n = 2); UAM (n = 2); Uofo (n = 2); Not identified (n = 3)

**Completers employed in Arkansas Public Schools<sup>9</sup>**

	<b>2016-2017 Graduates</b>		<b>2017-2018 Graduates</b>	
	<b>UCA</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>UCA</b>	<b>State</b>
Completers	255	1904	272	1890
Employed in Arkansas Public Schools 1-year later	167	1189	163	1156
%	65%	62%	60%	61%

**Graduate Reporting on Base Salary<sup>10</sup>**

	<b>2016-2017</b>		<b>2017-2018</b>	
	<b>Undergraduate Initial Teacher Licensure</b>	<b>MAT Initial Teacher Licensure</b>	<b>Undergraduate Initial Teacher Licensure</b>	<b>MAT Initial Teacher Licensure</b>
N	16	16	18	17
	1 = 0-19,000 1 = 20-29,000 12 = 30-39,000 2 = 40-49,000	10 = 30 – 39,000 4 = 40-49,000 2 > 50,000	1 = 20-29,000 11 = 30-39,000 5 = 40-49,000 1 > 50,000	1 = 0-19,000 0 = 20-29,000 6 = 30-39,000 8 = 40-49,000 2 > 50,000
Mean Starting Salary in State	\$34,339	\$38,317	34339.00	38317.00
Satisfaction with Salary (Key: Dissatisfied (1); Neutral (2); Satisfied (3))	2.32	2.66	2.39	2.35
Overall Satisfaction with EPP Preparation for current teaching position (Key: Very Dissatisfied (1) – Very Satisfied (5))	4.63	4.39	4.28	4.41

<sup>9</sup> Source: ADE EPPR - <https://eis.ade.arkansas.gov/eppr/EPPReport.aspx>

<sup>10</sup> Source: IR Post-Graduation Survey

## Employment Milestones Arch Ford Novice Teacher Survey – Initial Programs

<b>2016-2017 UCA Graduates Involved in 2017-2018 Arch Ford Induction Initiative</b>	<b>AF Aggregate</b>	<b>UCA</b>
<b>N</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>22</b>
% anticipate PGP goals being marked complete by your principal - Yes	63.64	72.73
% anticipate PGP goals being marked complete by your principal - No	4.55	
% anticipate PGP goals being marked complete by your principal - Not sure	31.82	27.27
% Intending to continue teaching next year	98.5	100

## Employment Milestones - Student Data Tracker<sup>11</sup>

	# of completers	# enrolled in graduate school	% enrolled in graduate school	Areas of study	Institutions
<b>2015-2016 Undergraduate Initial Program Graduates</b>					
ELSE (P-4, K-6)	73	27	36.99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading (8)</li> <li>• School Counseling (2)</li> <li>• Special Education (12)</li> <li>• Occupational Therapy (1)</li> <li>• Mathematics (1)</li> <li>• Unknown (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ASU (2)</li> <li>• ATU (1)</li> <li>• Harding (1)</li> <li>• Henderson (1)</li> <li>• UofA (1)</li> <li>• UCA (21)</li> <li>• Walden (1)</li> </ul>
MSIT (4-8)	17	6	35.29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Counseling (1)</li> <li>• Teacher Leadership (1)</li> <li>• Creative Writing (1)</li> <li>• Leisure/Sport Mgmt (1)</li> <li>• Religious Studies (1)</li> <li>• Unknown (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ASU (1)</li> <li>• Middle TN State (1)</li> <li>• Southern NH (1)</li> <li>• UCA (3)</li> </ul>
<b>2016-2017 Undergraduate Initial Program Graduates</b>					
ELSE (P-4, K-6)	60	19	31.67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher Leadership (1)</li> <li>• Reading (12)</li> <li>• School Counseling (1)</li> <li>• School Leadership (2)</li> <li>• Special Education (1)</li> <li>• Law (1)</li> <li>• Unknown (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adams State (1)</li> <li>• ASU (3)</li> <li>• Charleston (1)</li> <li>• Strayer (1)</li> <li>• UCA (13)</li> </ul>
MSIT (4-8)	25	7	28.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gifted (1)</li> <li>• Teacher Leadership (3)</li> <li>• School Counseling (1)</li> <li>• School Leadership (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UCA (7)</li> </ul>

<sup>11</sup> Source: UCA Office of IR – Student Tracker

How well do you feel UCA prepared its graduate(s) to understand and implement the following skills in their professional practice?	UCA	LIBM
n	13	8
Skills and content specific to their professional role.	3.85	3.75
Use data analysis to support/assess their own professional practice	3.62	3.63
Use data analysis to develop supportive work environments	3.69	3.75
Understand and use research to improve practice	3.54	3.63
Understand and apply professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics, and professional standards appropriate to the professional role	3.85	3.75
Respond to needs of diverse stakeholders (students, parents, community, colleagues).	3.85	3.88
Lead and/or participate in collaborative activities with others such as peers, colleagues, teachers, administrators, community, and/or parents	3.85	3.75
Ability to work with diverse stakeholders	3.85	3.75
Ability to integrate technology in their professional practice.	3.85	3.88

*Scale: Not at all prepared (1), Inadequately prepared (2), Adequately prepared (3), Well prepared (4)*

<sup>12</sup> Survey sent to 53 supervisors of identified UCA EPP Advanced Program graduates in May 2018 for the 2016-2017 graduates identified as working in APS. UCA received 13 fully completed survey responses = **response rate of 24.53%**. AY 2017-2018 was the first year for this survey to come on-line based on collaboration with UCA Office of Institutional Research.

**Graduate Reporting on Base Salary and Status<sup>13</sup>**

	UCA Advanced Programs	School Leadership	Library Media	School Counseling	Reading	Special Education	UCA	EDS	GATE	LIBM	RDNG	SCCN	SLMA	SPED
N	29	11	5	1	3	5	78	19	2	18	5	17	8	2
Currently holding position aligned to licensure	20	8	5	1	2	4	54	12	2	14	3	13	3	2
Base Salary of Position	*	4 = \$40s 3 = \$60s 1 = \$70s	3 = \$30s 1 = \$50s 1 = \$60s	1 = \$40s	1 = \$30s 1 = \$40s	1 = \$20s 1 = \$30s 1 = \$40s 1 = \$50s	*	4 – 30s 2 – 40s 2 – 50s 1 – 60s 1 – 70s 2 – 80s 3 – 90s 2 – 100s	2 – 40s	3 – 30s 7 – 40s 2 – 50s 1 – 60s 1 – 70s	1 – 30s 3 – 40s	5 – 30s 4 – 40s 5 – 50s 3 – 60s	3 – 50s 1 – 80s	1 – 30s 1 – 40s
Satisfaction with Salary (Key: Dissatisfied (1); Neutral (2); Satisfied (3))	2.33	2.13	2.6	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.34	2.67	3.00	2.27	2.25	2.41	2.50	1.50

<sup>13</sup> Source: IR Post-Graduation Survey

## Measure 4: Results of Completer Surveys

### UCA EoP Survey - Initial Programs<sup>14</sup>

#### UCA End of Program Survey Results: Satisfaction with Academic Advising

In reference to your education / professional courses, what is your satisfaction with College of Education Academic Advising?

Program	2016-2017 Satisfaction w/ Academic Advising	2017-2018 Satisfaction w/ Academic Advising
BSE K-6 Elementary	2.57	2.53
BSE K-12 SPED	2.50	2.47
BSE 4-8 Middle Level	2.85	2.75
ART	2.64	3.00
MUSIC – Instrumental	2.55	2.75
MUSIC - Vocal	2.17	2.50
PE	2.82	2.60
ENG	2.78	2.56
FACS	2.50	2.36
SCI – Combined	2.0	2.00
MATH	2.33	2.45
SS	2.25	2.13
MAT K-6 Elementary	2.0	*
MAT 4-8 Middle Level	2.61	2.80
MAT 7-12 & K-12	2.68	2.63
<b>Undergraduate Aggregate</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>2.49</b>
<b>MAT Aggregate</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>2.54</b>
<b>UCA Aggregate</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>2.59</b>

Scale 1-3: Below Average (1); Average (2); Above Average

<sup>14</sup> Responses from graduating cohort. Qualtrics survey provided to interns at exit point. Response rates: AY 2016-2017 = 99.6%; AY 2017-2018 = 99.125%. Programs provided with program data and aggregate benchmark data as well as trend lines. Programs wishing statistical analysis of scores in relation to other programs or benchmark can request that analysis from COE Dean's Office

### UCA End of Program Survey Results **2016-2017** – Initial Program Completers

How well did your program prepare you in the following areas:	UCA Mean	UG Mean	K-6 Elem	K-12 SPED	Mid Lvl	K-12 Art	Instr Music	Vocal Music	K-12 PE	7-12 ENG	7-12 FACS	SCI Comb	7-12 MATH	7-12 SS
N	229	144	60	3	25	4	9	4	11	8	11	3	3	2
Knowledge of learner development (INTASC 1)	4.14	4.18	4.45	*	4.24	*	3.73	*	4.55	4.00	4.07	*	*	*
Consideration of diversity among your students (INTASC 2)	4.26	4.31	4.49	*	4.39	*	3.64	*	4.64	4.78	4.21	*	*	*
Establish a culture for learning (NTASC 3)	4.32	4.35	4.51	*	4.42	*	4.00	*	4.45	4.44	4.29	*	*	*
Creating an effective learning environment (classroom management) (INTASC 3)	4.21	4.27	4.26	*	4.64	*	4.36	*	4.55	4.78	4.29	*	*	*
Managing student behavior (INTASC 3)	3.90	4.00	4.03	*	4.27	*	4.09	*	4.55	4.67	4.00	*	*	*
Content knowledge preparation (INTASC 4)	3.94	4.27	4.25	*	4.00	*	4.91	*	4.73	4.44	4.21	*	*	*
Align your lessons to state and national standards	4.29	4.32	4.45	*	4.12	*	4.18	*	4.64	4.44	4.36	*	*	*
Plan for and implement college and career ready standards	3.98	4.07	4.34	*	3.94	*	3.45	*	4.18	4.33	4.36	*	*	*
Connecting concepts in content area to include differing perspectives, critical thinking, and creativity (INTASC 5)	4.15	4.27	4.32	*	4.27	*	3.55	*	4.64	4.44	4.43	*	*	*
Assessment of student learning (INTASC 6)	4.19	4.24	4.24	*	4.33	*	4.36	*	4.73	4.33	4.36	*	*	*
Reflective decision making (CF)	4.32	4.38	4.38	*	4.45	*	4.55	*	4.64	4.67	4.36	*	*	*
Lesson planning skills (INTASC 7)	4.31	4.38	4.34	*	4.61	*	4.36	*	4.82	4.11	4.43	*	*	*
Instructional strategies and skills (INTASC 8)	4.22	4.28	4.37	*	4.42	*	4.27	*	4.64	3.78	4.43	*	*	*
Leadership, collaboration, and professional growth (INTASC 9)	4.15	4.28	4.30	*	4.39	*	4.27	*	4.64	4.11	4.36	*	*	*
Communicating with families (INTASC 10)	3.67	3.71	3.67	*	3.88	*	3.36	*	4.55	3.56	3.79	*	*	*

Scale 1-4: Not at All Prepared (1); Inadequately Prepared (2); Adequately Prepared (3); Well Prepared (4)



How well did your program prepare you in the following areas:	UCA Mean	UG Mean	K-6 Elem	K-12 SPED	Mid Lvl	K-12 Art	Instr Music	Vocal Music	K-12 PE	7-12 ENG	7-12 FACS	SCI Comb	7-12 MATH	7-12 SS
	229	144	60	3	25	4	9	4	11	8	11	3	3	2
Use of instructional technology (ISTE)	4.10	4.15	4.04	*	4.45	*	4.00	*	4.36	4.67	4.21	*	*	*
How well did your program prepare you to integrate technology into curriculum and instruction?	3.98	3.98	3.97	*	4.18	*	3.82	*	4.27	4.44	3.93	*	*	*
How well did your program prepare you to use technology to improve teaching and learning?	3.90	3.88	3.86	*	4.09	*	3.45	*	4.18	4.44	3.86	*	*	*
How well did your program prepare you to facilitate and inspire student learning and creativity [utilizing technology]?	3.87	3.89	3.76	*	4.21	*	3.45	*	4.36	4.33	4.07	*	*	*
How well did your program prepare you to design and develop digital age learning experiences and assessments?	3.77	3.78	3.63	*	4.30	*	3.18	*	4.27	4.11	3.86	*	*	*
How well did your program prepare you to promote and model digital citizenship and responsibility?	3.69	3.75	3.72	*	4.03	*	3.09	*	4.18	4.22	3.93	*	*	*

Scale 1-4: Not at All Prepared (1); Inadequately Prepared (2); Adequately Prepared (3); Well Prepared (4)

### UCA End of Program Survey Results **2017-2018** – Initial Program Completers

How well did your program prepare you in the following areas:	UCA Mean	UG Mean	K-6 Elem	K-12 SPED	Mid Lvl	K-12 Art	Instr Music	Vocal Music	K-12 PE	7-12 ENG	7-12 FACS	SCI Comb	7-12 MATH	7-12 SS
N	295	210	85	91	15	32	4	8	4	10	9	11	6	11
Knowledge of learner development (INTASC 1)	4.17	4.23	4.43	3.93	4.16	4.50	4.00	3.50	4.30	4.22	4.09	3.67	4.18	3.88
Consideration of diversity among your students (INTASC 2)	4.27	4.30	4.56	4.27	4.03	5.00	4.13	3.00	4.40	4.11	4.27	3.83	4.18	3.75
Establish a culture for learning (NTASC 3)	4.32	4.37	4.53	4.47	4.13	4.75	4.63	4.00	4.20	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.45	3.75
Creating an effective learning environment (classroom management) (INTASC 3)	4.19	4.21	4.23	3.93	4.25	4.75	4.75	4.00	4.20	3.89	4.55	4.00	4.18	3.75
Managing student behavior (INTASC 3)	3.87	3.89	3.89	3.53	3.78	4.50	4.63	4.00	4.20	3.78	3.91	4.00	3.82	3.63
Content knowledge preparation (INTASC 4)	4.12	4.31	4.42	4.13	4.13	5.00	4.88	4.75	4.10	4.00	4.09	4.00	4.18	4.38
Align your lessons to state and national standards	4.39	4.49	4.68	3.87	4.22	5.00	4.25	4.75	4.60	4.44	4.64	4.50	4.55	3.88
Plan for and implement college and career ready standards	4.02	4.08	4.43	3.47	3.59	4.00	3.88	4.25	3.90	4.33	3.64	4.00	4.27	3.75
Connecting concepts in content area to include differing perspectives, critical thinking, and creativity (INTASC 5)	4.18	4.23	4.46	3.80	4.00	4.75	4.50	3.50	4.20	4.22	4.18	3.83	4.18	3.88
Assessment of student learning (INTASC 6)	4.29	4.36	4.53	4.00	4.16	4.75	4.38	4.00	4.60	3.89	4.36	4.50	4.18	4.13
Reflective decision making (CF)	4.36	4.46	4.62	4.27	4.31	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.60	4.33	4.09	4.50	4.45	4.00
Lesson planning skills (INTASC 7)	4.40	4.48	4.70	4.07	4.31	5.00	4.13	4.75	4.60	4.33	4.27	4.50	4.27	4.00
Instructional strategies and skills (INTASC 8)	4.31	4.38	4.58	4.07	4.13	4.50	4.38	4.50	4.60	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.18	4.00
Leadership, collaboration, and professional growth (INTASC 9)	4.22	4.29	4.52	3.93	4.13	4.75	4.50	3.75	4.30	4.33	3.82	3.83	4.27	4.00
Communicating with families (INTASC 10)	3.81	3.83	4.02	3.93	3.50	4.50	4.00	3.00	4.20	3.67	3.45	3.67	3.27	3.88

Scale 1-4: Not at All Prepared (1); Inadequately Prepared (2); Adequately Prepared (3); Well Prepared (4)

How well did your program prepare you in the following areas:	UCA Mean	UG Mean	K-6 Elem	K-12 SPED	Mid Lvl	K-12 Art	Instr Music	Vocal Music	K-12 PE	7-12 ENG	7-12 FACS	SCI Comb	7-12 MATH	7-12 SS
	295	210	91	15	32	4	8	4	10	9	11	6	11	8
Use of instructional technology (ISTE)	4.16	4.04	4.27	3.53	4.22	4.75	4.38	3.25	4.50	4.11	4.36	4.50	4.18	4.25
How well did your program prepare you to integrate technology into curriculum and instruction?	3.94	4.08	3.86	3.40	4.13	4.25	4.50	3.00	3.90	4.11	4.00	4.33	3.45	3.50
How well did your program prepare you to use technology to improve teaching and learning?	3.95	4.07	3.91	3.47	4.09	4.25	4.25	3.00	3.90	4.11	4.09	4.50	3.45	3.50
How well did your program prepare you to facilitate and inspire student learning and creativity [utilizing technology]?	3.93	3.93	3.96	3.27	4.09	4.25	4.63	3.25	3.90	4.33	4.00	4.50	3.36	3.63
How well did your program prepare you to design and develop digital age learning experiences and assessments?	3.79	3.81	3.80	3.33	3.91	4.25	4.00	3.00	3.90	4.00	4.00	4.33	3.36	3.38
How well did your program prepare you to promote and model digital citizenship and responsibility?	3.80	3.69	3.92	3.20	4.06	4.50	3.88	2.75	4.00	4.11	4.09	4.17	3.09	3.50

Scale 1-4: Not at All Prepared (1); Inadequately Prepared (2); Adequately Prepared (3); Well Prepared (4)

### UCA End of Program Survey Results **2016-2018** – MAT Program Completers

	2016-2017				2017-2018				
How well did your program prepare you in the following areas:	UCA Mean	MAT Mean	MAT ML	MAT SECED	UCA Mean	MAT Mean	MAT K-6	MAT ML	MAT SECED
	229	85	30	54	295	85	10	38	37
Knowledge of learner development (INTASC 1)	4.14	4.05	3.89	4.14	4.17	4.01	4.00	4.05	3.97
Consideration of diversity among your students (INTASC 2)	4.26	4.18	4.11	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.40	4.21	4.14
Establish a culture for learning (INTASC 3)	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.20	4.32	4.18	4.60	4.24	4.00
Creating an effective learning environment (classroom management) (INTASC 3)	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.02	4.19	4.15	4.50	4.18	4.03
Managing student behavior (INTASC 3)	3.90	3.71	3.76	3.68	3.87	3.84	4.00	3.92	3.70
Content knowledge preparation (INTASC 4)	3.94	3.29	3.53	3.11	4.12	3.65	3.70	3.71	3.57
Align your lessons to state and national standards	4.29	4.22	4.26	4.18	4.39	4.14	4.30	4.13	4.11
Plan for and implement college and career ready standards	3.98	3.80	3.87	3.75	4.02	3.88	4.10	3.95	3.76
Connecting concepts in content area to include differing perspectives, critical thinking, and creativity (INTASC 5)	4.15	3.91	3.87	3.91	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.00	4.03
Assessment of student learning (INTASC 6)	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.04	4.29	4.12	4.50	4.13	4.00
Reflective decision making (CF)	4.32	4.20	4.26	4.16	4.36	4.12	4.10	4.08	4.16
Lesson planning skills (INTASC 7)	4.31	4.16	4.24	4.09	4.40	4.20	4.30	4.18	4.19
Instructional strategies and skills (INTASC 8)	4.22	4.10	4.24	3.98	4.31	4.12	4.40	4.05	4.11
Leadership, collaboration, and professional growth (INTASC 9)	4.15	3.88	4.00	3.80	4.22	4.05	4.20	3.95	4.11
Communicating with families (INTASC 10)	3.67	3.59	3.84	3.38	3.81	3.78	4.10	3.79	3.68

Scale 1-4: Not at All Prepared (1); Inadequately Prepared (2); Adequately Prepared (3); Well Prepared (4)

	2016-2017				2017-2018				
How well did your program prepare you in the following areas:	UCA Mean	MAT Mean	MAT ML	MAT SECED	UCA Mean	MAT Mean	MAT K-6	MAT ML	MAT SECED
N	229	85	30	54	295	85	10	38	37
Use of instructional technology (ISTE)	4.10	4.00	4.13	3.89	4.16	4.21	4.30	3.97	4.03
How well did your program prepare you to integrate technology into curriculum and instruction?	3.98	3.96	3.97	3.93	3.94	3.89	4.30	4.03	4.08
How well did your program prepare you to use technology to improve teaching and learning?	3.90	3.96	3.97	3.93	3.95	3.90	4.20	3.97	4.14
How well did your program prepare you to facilitate and inspire student learning and creativity [utilizing technology]?	3.87	3.84	4.03	3.69	3.93	3.93	4.20	3.89	3.89
How well did your program prepare you to design and develop digital age learning experiences and assessments?	3.77	3.74	3.87	3.64	3.79	3.78	4.00	3.74	3.84
How well did your program prepare you to promote and model digital citizenship and responsibility?	3.69	3.57	3.76	3.42	3.80	3.84	4.00	3.68	3.62

Scale 1-4: Not at All Prepared (1); Inadequately Prepared (2); Adequately Prepared (3); Well Prepared (4)

**ADE Novice Teacher Survey Results EPPR Reflecting Graduates' TESS Preparedness**

Domain	Category	Spring 2016		Spring 2017		Spring 2018		
		UCA	State	UCA	State	UCA UG	UCA MAT	State
		102	1512	217	1666	60	34	921
1a.	Knowledge of content and pedagogy	4.35	4.17	3.65	3.55	3.32	3.06	3.17
1b.	Knowledge of students	4.33	4.21	3.67	3.57	3.42	3.21	3.25
1c.	Instructional outcomes	4.19	4.05	3.62	3.51	3.22	3.09	3.05
1d.	Knowledge of resources	4.18	4.06	3.60	3.50	3.22	3.12	3.07
1e.	Coherent instruction	4.24	4.07	3.63	3.52	3.23	3.18	3.12
1f.	Student assessments	4.07	3.94	3.53	3.44	3.25	2.97	3.02
2a.	Environment of respect and rapport	4.42	4.24	3.65	3.60	3.37	3.35	3.33
2b.	Culture for learning	4.27	4.18	3.64	3.57	3.28	3.24	3.25
2c.	Managing classroom procedures	4.16	4.03	3.49	3.45	3.13	3.12	3.02
2d.	Managing student behavior	4.15	3.98	3.44	3.39	3.08	2.97	2.90
2e.	Organizing physical space	4.27	4.14	3.60	3.52	3.27	3.32	3.14
3a.	Communicating with students	4.29	4.17	3.65	3.56	3.33	3.29	3.26
3b.	Questioning and discussion techniques	3.98	3.96	3.55	3.47	3.15	3.00	3.07
3c.	Engaging students in learning	4.16	4.08	3.59	3.51	3.20	3.12	3.15
3d.	Using assessment in instruction	3.95	3.94	3.54	3.47	3.18	3.00	3.05
3e.	Flexibility and responsiveness	4.27	4.11	3.64	3.53	3.28	3.15	3.21
4a.	Reflecting on teaching	4.37	4.20	3.65	3.55	3.50	3.29	3.27
4b.	Maintaining accurate records	4.06	3.96	3.54	3.45	3.23	3.26	3.06
4c.	Communicating with families	4.11	3.97	3.51	3.42	3.07	3.03	3.00
4d.	Participating in professional community	4.23	4.11	3.64	3.55	3.32	3.35	3.24
4e.	Growing and developing professionally	4.25	4.16	3.66	3.57	3.47	3.38	3.29
4f.	Showing Professionalism	4.41	4.30	3.74	3.64	3.68	3.44	3.48
	Average of all 22 Items	4.21	4.09	3.60	3.52	3.28	3.18	3.15

Scale: 1=not at all prepared; 2=inadequately prepared; 3=adequately prepared; 4=well prepared; 5=very well prepared.

<sup>15</sup> Source: ADE EPPR Report published annually - <https://eis.ade.arkansas.gov/eppr/EPPReport.aspx>

**ADE Novice Teacher Survey Results EPPR Reflecting Graduates' TESS Preparedness  
Spring 2018 Disaggregated Results<sup>16</sup>**

Domain	Category	State	UCA	UCA Trad	ELSE	MI	SecED	UCA MAT	MAT Elem	MAT ML	UCA SecEd	1 <sup>st</sup> Year (n=141)	2 <sup>nd</sup> year (n=34)
N		1725	184	78	39	9	27	106	7	32	53	141	34
1a.	Knowledge of content and pedagogy	3.38	3.27	3.40	3.36	3.33	3.61	3.16	3.57	3.16	3.04	3.32	3.06
1b.	Knowledge of students	3.25	3.35	3.27	3.46	3.22	3.39	3.34	3.86	3.31	3.21	3.36	3.32
1c.	Instructional outcomes	3.27	3.22	3.26	3.38	3.11	3.26	3.16	3.43	3.13	3.09	3.26	3.03
1d.	Knowledge of resources	3.27	3.20	3.21	3.33	3.00	3.22	3.16	3.57	3.09	3.08	3.23	3.06
1e.	Coherent instruction	3.18	3.26	3.32	3.44	3.11	3.43	3.16	3.57	3.13	3.08	3.31	3.00
1f.	Student assessments	3.43	3.09	3.12	3.28	3.00	3.22	3.00	3.43	3.00	2.92	3.11	2.94
2a.	Environment of respect and rapport	3.37	3.40	3.46	3.54	3.44	3.57	3.32	3.86	3.31	3.15	3.42	3.29
2b.	Culture for learning	3.20	3.25	3.25	3.44	3.22	3.35	3.18	3.71	3.22	2.98	3.26	3.15
2c.	Managing classroom procedures	3.14	3.09	3.10	3.21	2.89	3.30	3.02	3.43	2.97	2.89	3.12	2.94
2d.	Managing student behavior	3.29	3.03	3.02	3.15	2.89	3.17	2.97	3.43	2.94	2.81	3.01	3.00
2e.	Organizing physical space	3.35	3.18	3.28	3.36	3.00	3.35	3.08	3.71	3.03	2.96	3.21	3.03
3a.	Communicating with students	3.19	3.26	3.27	3.41	3.00	3.39	3.19	3.57	3.28	3.04	3.29	3.06
3b.	Questioning and discussion techniques	3.26	3.07	3.00	3.10	2.78	3.13	3.08	3.29	3.19	2.89	3.11	2.88
3c.	Engaging students in learning	3.20	3.21	3.25	3.36	3.22	3.26	3.15	3.57	3.09	3.02	3.25	3.03
3d.	Using assessment in instruction	3.32	3.15	3.15	3.26	3.11	3.22	3.10	3.43	3.13	2.94	3.19	2.91
3e.	Flexibility and responsiveness	3.37	3.24	3.32	3.41	3.22	3.52	3.13	3.43	3.16	2.98	3.29	3.03
4a.	Reflecting on teaching	3.17	3.33	3.38	3.51	3.22	3.35	3.25	3.43	3.28	3.17	3.40	3.00
4b.	Maintaining accurate records	3.16	3.09	3.08	3.33	3.00	3.00	3.03	3.43	3.09	2.85	3.11	2.91
4c.	Communicating with families	3.35	3.03	3.03	3.41	2.89	2.83	2.94	3.43	3.03	2.77	3.08	2.79
4d.	Participating in professional community	3.37	3.26	3.18	3.41	3.00	3.17	3.25	4.00	3.22	3.06	3.29	3.09
4e.	Growing and developing professionally	3.51	3.27	3.26	3.44	3.11	3.35	3.21	3.57	3.19	3.06	3.33	3.00
4f.	Showing Professionalism	3.00	3.45	3.48	3.59	3.22	3.70	3.37	3.86	3.25	3.25	3.49	3.26
	Average of all 22 Items	3.27	3.21	3.23	3.37	3.09	3.31	3.15	3.57	3.14	3.01	3.25	3.04

<sup>16</sup> Source 2018 (Spring) Novice Teacher Survey (EPPR) – raw data provided to EPPs October 2017. Data includes 140 first year teachers, 3 teachers

## UCA Post-Graduation Survey – Initial Programs <sup>17</sup>

	2016-2017		2017-2018	
	Undergraduate Initial Teacher Licensure	MAT Initial Teacher Licensure	Undergraduate Initial Teacher Licensure	MAT Initial Teacher Licensure
N	22	19	64	46
TESS, Domain 1 Score	3	3	3.69	3.62
TESS, Domain 2 Score	3.11	3.1	3.58	3.55
TESS, Domain 3 Score	3.3	3.16	3.73	3.60
TESS, Domain 4 Score	3.11	3	3.71	3.78

*Scale: Unsatisfactory (1), Basic (2), Proficient (3), Distinguished (4)*

	2016-2017		2017-2018	
	Undergraduate Initial Teacher Licensure	MAT Initial Teacher Licensure	Undergraduate Initial Teacher Licensure	MAT Initial Teacher Licensure
	22	19	64	46
Knowledge of Learner Development	4.21	3.47	3.82	3.83
Consideration of diversity among your students	3.91	4.01	3.74	3.94
Establish a culture for learning	4.19	3.79	3.95	3.95
Creating an effective learning environment (classroom management)	4.05	3.95	3.80	3.74
Managing student behavior	3.66	3.79	3.33	3.50
Content knowledge preparation	4.28	3.3	4.20	3.23
Align your lessons to state and national standards	4.44	3.57	4.21	4.12
Plan for and implement college and career ready standards	4.34	3.74	3.86	3.72
Content to include dif. perspectives, crit thnkg, and creativity	4.25	3.84	3.91	3.74
Assessment of student learning	4.14	4	4.08	3.94
Reflective decision making	4.43	4.12	4.26	3.93
Lesson planning skills	4.35	3.91	4.27	4.09
Instructional strategies and skills	4.27	3.86	4.15	4.09
Leadership, collaboration, and professional growth	4.04	3.96	4.16	4.00
Communicating with families	3.96	3.84	3.32	3.45
Use of instructional technology	4.41	3.51	4.02	3.98
Integrate technology into curriculum and instruction	4.16	3.84	3.86	3.85
Use technology to improve teaching and learning	4.27	3.68	3.88	3.69
Facilitate and inspire student learning and creativity with technology	4.04	3.78	3.71	3.72
Design and develop digital age assessments	3.8	4	3.82	3.57
Promote and model digital citizenship and responsibility	3.73	3.88	3.69	3.50

*Scale: Not at all prepared (1), Inadequately prepared (2), Adequately prepared (3), Well prepared (4), Very well prepared (5)*

<sup>17</sup> The UCA Office of Instructional Research collaborated with the COE to design post-graduation surveys to distribute to students 1- and 2- post-graduation. Data presented here were collected in May 2017 on all 2015-2016 COE graduates (response rates: UG 15.4%, MAT 21.6%) and May 2018 on all 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 graduates (response rates: UG 22.0%; MAT 23.6%).



<b>2017-2018 Data Subset Analysis<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>UCA</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Yr</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Yr</b>	<b>ELSE</b>	<b>ML</b>	<b>SecEd</b>	<b>MAT ML</b>	<b>MAT SECED</b>
<b>Graduates assessment of their EPP program preparation...</b>	63	58	5	14	5	19	11	14
TESS Domain 1	4.10	4.09	4.20	4.00	4.67	4.05	3.91	4.31
TESS Domain 2	3.94	3.91	4.20	4.21	4.33	3.76	3.91	3.85
TESS Domain 3	4.13	4.11	4.40	4.21	4.67	4.19	3.82	4.08
TESS Domain 4	4.02	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.33	3.95	4.00	3.77

*Scale: Unsatisfactory (1), Basic (2), Proficient (3), Distinguished (4)*

<b>2017-2018 Data Subset Analysis</b>	<b>UCA</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Yr</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Yr</b>	<b>ELSE</b>	<b>ML</b>	<b>SecEd</b>	<b>MAT ML</b>	<b>MAT SECED</b>
<b>Graduates assessment of their EPP program preparation...</b>	63	58	5	14	5	19	11	14
Knowledge of Learner Development	3.81	3.81	3.80	4.14	3.67	3.57	3.91	3.77
Consideration of diversity among your students	3.81	3.77	4.20	4.07	3.33	3.43	4.00	4.08
Establish a culture for learning	3.89	3.86	4.20	3.93	4.33	3.86	3.73	3.92
Creating an effective learning env (classroom management)	3.69	3.67	4.00	3.71	4.33	3.62	3.55	3.77
Managing student behavior	3.31	3.28	3.60	3.07	4.00	3.38	3.09	3.46
Content knowledge preparation	3.81	3.82	3.60	4.00	4.33	4.19	3.55	3.08
Align your lessons to state and national standards	4.03	4.02	4.20	3.93	4.67	4.24	3.82	3.85
Plan for and implement college and career ready standards	3.74	3.70	4.20	3.79	4.67	3.71	3.82	3.46
Content to include dif. perspectives, crit thnkg, and creativity	3.76	3.75	3.80	3.64	3.00	3.86	3.82	3.85
Assessment of student learning	4.03	4.02	4.20	4.07	4.33	3.90	3.91	4.23
Reflective decision making	4.18	4.18	4.20	4.14	4.67	4.33	4.00	4.00
Lesson planning skills	4.11	4.12	4.00	4.00	4.67	4.19	4.00	4.08
Instructional strategies and skills	4.02	4.02	4.00	3.86	4.33	4.05	3.91	4.15
Leadership, collaboration, and professional growth	3.97	3.93	4.40	3.79	4.67	4.10	3.91	3.85
Communicating with families	3.32	3.28	3.80	3.43	3.33	3.19	3.55	3.23
Use of instructional technology	3.90	3.84	4.60	3.93	4.33	4.05	3.73	3.69
Integrate technology into curriculum and instruction	3.76	3.70	4.40	3.64	4.33	3.86	3.91	3.46
Use tech to collect data to improve teaching and learning	3.76	3.75	3.80	3.64	5.00	3.76	3.91	3.46
Facilitate and inspire student lrng and creativity with tech	3.58	3.56	3.80	3.64	4.33	3.38	3.82	3.46
Design and develop digital age assessments	3.69	3.67	3.90	3.68	5.00	3.59	3.87	3.39
Promote and model digital citizenship and responsibility	3.58	3.60	3.40	3.43	5.00	3.48	3.82	3.38

*Scale: Not at all prepared (1), Inadequately prepared (2), Adequately prepared (3), Well prepared (4), Very well prepared (5)*

<sup>18</sup> Not all candidates identified their program of study due to a design flaw in the survey. For those candidates who did identify their program of study, data were disaggregated and analyzed.

## UCA End of Program Survey Results 2016-2018 –Program Completers

	2016-2017									2017-2018								
In reference to your education / professional courses, what is your satisfaction with:	UCA	COUN	GATE	LIBM	RDNG MSE	SLMA BLDG	SLMA DIST	EDS	SPED	UCA	COUN	GATE	LIBM	RDNG MSE	SLMA BLDG	SLMA DIST	EDS	SPED
N	170	30	9	44	19	14	7	12	18	193	42	11	56	17	13	5	10	15
The academic advising you received for your program (CAEP 3.4)	4.25	4.40	4.22	4.0	4.63	4.71	3.71	4.17	3.94	4.14	4.38	4.30	3.73	4.45	4.00	4.80	4.90	4.27
The accessibility of your UCA instructors (CAEP 3.1)	4.35	4.47	4.78	4.43	4.68	4.50	3.71	4.50	3.61	4.38	4.38	4.91	4.29	4.61	4.15	5.00	4.80	4.40
UCA instructors' responsiveness to your concerns (CAEP 3.1)	4.31	4.50	4.78	4.34	4.68	4.50	3.43	4.50	3.44	4.31	4.31	5.00	4.09	4.65	4.08	5.00	4.80	4.33
The amount of work required of you in your program of study (CAEP 4.4)	4.16	4.10	4.44	4.11	4.42	4.43	4.14	4.58	3.61	4.05	4.21	4.64	3.59	4.17	4.00	4.80	4.50	4.27
The quality of your financial investment in your program of study (CAEP 4.4)	3.96	3.76	4.33	4.09	4.35	4.36	3.43	4.33	3.06	4.05	4.12	4.09	3.79	4.26	4.23	4.80	4.50	4.21
The ability of your UCA instructors to model best practices in your program area (CAEP 1.1)	4.30	4.30	4.78	4.39	4.53	4.57	3.57	4.67	3.67	4.27	4.36	4.55	4.05	4.30	4.31	4.80	4.60	4.53
The ability of your UCA instructors to integrate technology in your licensure area? (CAEP 1.5)	4.33	4.13	4.78	4.52	4.63	4.46	3.29	4.67	3.83	4.36	4.29	4.82	4.32	4.39	4.46	4.80	4.50	4.53
The value of your clinical (i.e., field) experiences required by your program (e.g., practicum, internship, etc.) (CAEP 2.3)	4.33	4.47	4.33	4.39	4.24	4.57	4.14	4.70	3.56	4.21	4.29	4.50	4.16	4.26	3.77	4.80	4.20	4.21

Scale 1-5: Not at All Prepared (1); Inadequately Prepared (2); Adequately Prepared (3); Well Prepared (4); Very Well Prepared (5).

<sup>19</sup> Responses from graduating cohort. Qualtrics survey provided to interns at exit point. Response rates: AY 2016-2017 = 76.83%; AY 2017-2018 = 69.84%. Programs provided with program data and aggregate benchmark data as well as trend lines. Programs wishing statistical analysis of scores in relation to other programs or benchmark can request that analysis from COE Dean's Office Administered to UCA candidates at the end of their graduating term as they conclude their program experience. Gate program data includes completers from 2015-2016 to generate compiled n large enough for reporting. UCA N also includes data from COE programs that do not report to CAEP.

### UCA End of Program Survey Results 2016-2017 –Program Completers

	2016-2017									2017-2018								
How well did your program prepare you in the following areas:	UCA	COUN	GATE	LIBM	RDNG MSE	SLMA BLDG	SLMA DIST	EDS	SPED	UCA	COUN	GATE	LIBM	RDNG MSE	SLMA BLDG	SLMA DIST	EDS	SPED
N	170	30	9	44	19	14	7	12	18	193	42	11	56	17	13	5	10	15
Your ability to respond to needs of diverse stakeholders (students, parents, community, colleagues).	4.44	4.37	4.44	4.52	4.42	4.57	4.29	4.67	4.17	4.31	4.17	4.30	4.39	4.43	4.15	4.80	4.70	4.27
The instruction you received specific to the content and skills necessary for your program.	4.42	4.50	4.67	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.00	4.83	4.06	4.36	4.29	4.55	4.32	4.52	4.15	4.80	4.70	4.33
The instruction you received in qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed methods research.	4.32	4.30	4.44	4.47	4.42	4.29	4.29	4.58	3.94	4.14	3.95	4.44	4.18	4.27	3.85	5.00	4.40	4.27
The instruction you received specific to using research/evidence to support/assess your professional practice.	4.38	4.43	4.67	4.41	4.37	4.57	4.29	4.67	3.94	4.26	4.14	4.40	4.31	4.35	4.38	5.00	4.70	4.13
The instruction you received specific to using data to support/assess your professional practice.	4.36	4.40	4.67	4.40	4.47	4.57	4.29	4.75	3.83	4.25	4.17	4.55	4.31	4.43	4.38	4.80	4.40	4.13
Your ability to integrate technology in your professional practice.	4.46	4.43	4.67	4.66	4.63	4.46	3.71	4.83	4.00	4.41	4.29	4.64	4.55	4.35	4.31	4.80	4.70	4.47

*Scale 1-5: Not at All Prepared (1); Inadequately Prepared (2); Adequately Prepared (3); Well Prepared (4); Very Well Prepared (5).*

## UCA Post-Graduation Survey – Advanced Programs<sup>20</sup>

	2016-2017						2017-2018							
Please rate the following ...	UCA	LIBM	SCCN	RDNG	SLMA / EDS	SPED	UCA	EDS	GATE	LIBM	RDNG	SCCN	SLMA	SPED
N	37	5	1	3	11	5	128	19	2	23	7	20	13	5
Academic Advising	4.32	3.40	*	*	4.36	4.60								
Accessibility of instructors	4.51	4.80	*	*	4.45	4.60								
Instructors' responsiveness	4.59	4.60	*	*	4.36	4.80								
Amount of work program required	4.30	4.40	*	*	4.18	4.40								
Quality of your financial investment	4.08	4.00	*	*	4.18	4.20	4.43	4.89	5	4.56	4.36	4.35	4.17	4.40
Ability of UCA Instructors to model best practices	4.41	4.80	*	*	4.36	4.20	4.62	4.89	5	4.74	5.00	4.65	4.65	4.40
Ability of UCA instructors to integrate technology	4.43	4.80	*	*	4.36	4.40	4.39	4.79	5	4.82	4.68	4.40	4.48	4.20
Value of your clinical experiences	4.22	4.40	*	*	4.45	4.20	4.47	4.58	5	4.48	4.36	4.75	4.46	4.00

Scale: Poor (1), Fair (2), Good (3), Very Good (4), Excellent (5)

	2016-2017						2017-2018							
The instruction you received ...	UCA	LIBM	SCCN	RDNG	SLMA / EDS	SPED	UCA	EDS	GATE	LIBM	RDNG	SCCN	SLMA	SPED
N	37	5	1	3	11	5	128	19	2	23	7	20	13	5
To support your ability to respond to needs of diverse stakeholders	4.45	4.80	*	*	4.40	4.00	4.43	4.75	4	4.55	5.00	4.45	4.49	4.00
Specific to the content and skills necessary for your program	4.55	5.00	*	*	4.50	4.40	4.50	4.75	5	4.64	4.82	4.55	4.30	4.20
Specific to using research/evidence to support/assess your professional practice	4.42	4.80	*	*	4.30	4.20	4.50	4.94	5	4.60	5.00	4.25	4.40	4.20
Specific to using data to support/assess your professional practice	4.39	4.80	*	*	4.40	4.00	4.40	4.75	4.5	4.41	4.82	4.30	4.40	4.40
To support your ability to integrate technology in your professional practice	4.45	4.80	*	*	4.50	4.20	4.42	4.75	4.5	4.64	5.00	4.15	4.40	4.20

Scale: Not at all (1); Inadequately (2); Adequately (3); Well (4); Very Well (5)

<sup>20</sup> The UCA Office of Instructional Research collaborated with the COE to design post-graduation surveys to distribute to students 1- and 2- post-graduation. Data presented here were collected in May 2017 on all 2015-2016 COE graduates (response rates: 21%) and May 2018 on all 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 graduates (response rates: 29.6%). UCA N also includes data from COE programs that do not report to CAEP.

## Measure 5: Completer Graduation Rates

### Admission to Graduation Retention – Undergraduate Initial Programs

	Fall 2016					Spring 2017					Fall 2017					Spring 2018					Avg Ret Rate
	# Admit	# Active	# Cnsld Out	# WD	# Completer	# Admit	# Active	# Cnsld Out	# WD	# Completer	# Admit	# Active	# Cnsld Out	# WD	# Completer	# Admit	# Active	# Cnsld Out	# WD	# Completer	
K-6 Elem	26	19		2	5	28	26		2		33	33				32	32				96.73
4-8 Middle Level	12	1			11	11	8			3	9	7			2	9	9				98.21
7-12 English	5	2		1	2	5	3		1	1	1	1				3	3				77.78
7-12 FACS	6	1			5	6	3			3	3	2			1	6	6				96.43
7-12 Life Science	3	1		2		3			1	2	2	2				3	3				68.75
7-12 Math	4	1			3	4	3			1	3	2			1	5	5				94.74
7-12 Physical Sci.	3	1		1	1	1	1				3	3				1	1				88.89
7-12 Soc Stud.	3				3	2	1			1	4	2			2	2	2				92.86
K-12 Art	2				2	3	1			2	2	1		1	5	5					93.33
K-12 Music	8	4			4	7	6		1		7	6		1		9	9				94.44
K-12 PE/Health	3			2	1	7	4			3	10	10			8	8					91.67
K-12 Spanish	1	1																			100.00
K-12 SPED	9	7	1	1		6	6				8	8				14	14				95.45
<b>Total Admitted</b>	85	38	1	9	37	83	62		5	16	85	77		2	19	97	84				96.73

## Internship Retention – Undergraduate Initial Programs

	2016-2017				2017-2018			
	Total # in Internship	# completers	# licensed	Codes	Total # in Internship	# completers	# licensed	Codes
K-6 Elem	68	68	65	G (3)	88	87	80	R (1), G (7)
4-8 Middle Level	33	32	25	R (1), G (6)	30	29	24	W (1)
7-12 English	9	9	8	G (1)	7	7	6	W (1), G (5)
7-12 FACS	12	12	12		10	10	10	
7-12 Life Science	2	2			5	5	4	G (1)
7-12 Math	4	4	3	G (1)	9	7	5	X (2), G (2)
7-12 Physical Sci.	2	2	2					
7-12 Soc Stud.	3	3	2	G (1)	6	6	4	G (2)
K-12 Art	8	8	6	G (2)	4	4	4	
K-12 Music – Instrumental	10	9	8	W(1), G(1)	9	9	9	
K-12 Music – Vocal	4	4	4		3	3	3	
K-12 PE/Health	12	12	12		10	10	10	
K-12 Spanish					1	1	1	
K-12 SPED	3	3	3		15	15	15	
<b>Total</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>150</b>		<b>197</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>175</b>	
<b>% completion or licensed</b>		<b>97.67</b>	<b>89.29</b>		<b>97.97</b>	<b>90.67</b>		

### Admission to Graduation Retention – MAT Programs (1)<sup>21</sup>

Program	2016-2017					2017-2018					Avg Ret Rate
	Admitted	Active	Graduated	Inactive	Withdrew	Admitted	Active	Graduated	Inactive	Withdrew	
K-6 Elem	16	7	7	2		24	16		4	4	57.50
4-8 Middle Level	60	7	15	35	3	36	18		13	5	26.04
4-12 Business Tech	3		1	2		5	2	1	1	1	25.00
7-12 English	17	2	5	9	1	13	4		4	5	20.00
7-12 FACS	8	4	1	3		7	2		4	1	40.00
7-12 Life Science	8	2	2	4		6	3			3	35.71
7-12 Math/Physics											
7-12 Mathematics	10	4	3	3		7	2		4	1	35.29
7-12 Physical Sci.	4		1	3							0.00
7-12 Social Studies	10	1	2	7		12	6		4	2	31.82
7-12 Speech/Drama	2		1	1		4	2		2		33.33
K-12 Art	6	1	2	3		3	2		1		33.33
K-12 Music – Instr.						1	1				100.00
K-12 Music – Vo						2	1		1		50.00
K-12 PE/Health	8	1	1	5	1	5	4		1		38.46
K-12 Spanish	5	2	1	2		1	1				50.00
K-12 SPED	0	*	*	*	*	18	12		5	1	66.67
Unspecified						3	1		2		33.33
<b>Total Admitted</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>31.58</b>

### Admission to Graduation Retention – MAT Programs (2)<sup>22</sup>

ADHE Degree Code	Program	Fall 2016 Cohort			Fall 2011 Cohort			Fall 2017 Cohort			Fall 2012 Cohort		
		1 Year Retention			Six Year Graduation Rate			1 Year Retention			Six Year Graduation		
		Cohort	#	%	Cohort	#	%	Cohort	#	%	Cohort	#	%
5543	MAT in Teaching	61	37	60.7	56	31	55.4	54	34	63.0	54	26	48.1
6953	MAT in Special Education K-12	*	*	*	*	*	*	2	1	50.0%	*	*	*

<sup>21</sup> Source: MAT AirTable

<sup>22</sup> Source: UCA Office of Institutional Research

## Internship Retention – MAT Initial Programs

	2016-2017				2017-2018			
	Total # in Internship	# completers	# licensed	Codes	Total # in Internship	# completers	# licensed	Codes
P-4 Early Childhood	1	1	1		3	3	3	
K-6 Elem					8	8	7	X (1)
4-8 Middle Level	35	35	29	G (6)	34	29	29	G (2), W (1)
4-12 Business	8	8	8		2	2	2	
7-12 English	11	11	8	G (3)	9	8	8	X (1)
7-12 FACS	5	5	5		3	2	2	W (1)
7-12 Life Science	7	7	7		9	8	8	X (1)
7-12 Math	6	6	6		9	9	9	
7-12 Physical Sci.	1	1	1		1	1	1	
7-12 Soc Stud.	8	8	7	G (1)	6	6	6	
7-12 Speech/Drama	1	1	1					
K-12 Art	3	3	3		3	3	3	
K-12 Music – Instrumental	1	1	1					
K-12 Music – Vocal								
K-12 PE/Health	6	6	6		4	4	4	
K-12 Spanish	4	4	4		2	2	2	
K-12 SPED								
<b>Total</b>	97	97	87		93	85	84	
<b>% completion or licensed</b>		100	89.69			91.40	98.82	



## Annual Retention and Graduation Rate Data – Advanced Programs<sup>23</sup>

		Fall 2011 Cohort			Fall 2012 Cohort			Fall 2016 Cohort			Fall 2017 Cohort		
		Six Year Graduation Rate			Six Year Graduation Rate			1 Year Retention Rate			1 Year Retention Rate		
ADHE Degree Code	Program	Cohort	#	%	Cohort	#	%	Cohort	#	%	Cohort	#	%
4980	GC in Special Education K-12	0			0			0	0		4	1	
5120	EDS in Educational Leadership	3	1	33.3%	9	3	33.30%	14	7	50.0%	3	2	66.7%
5121	PMC in District-Level Administration	0	0		0			1	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%
5870	MSE in Special Education K-12	3	1	33.3%	1	0	0.00%	4	3	75.0%	9	5	55.6%
6310	MS in Library Media and Information Technologies	26	22	84.6%	18	14	77.80%	21	16	76.2%	12	9	75.0%
6470	MS in School Counseling K-12	8	5	62.5%	7	5	71.40%	28	20	71.4%	31	28	90.3%
6790	GC in Gifted and Talented Education				0			5	1	20.0%	0		
6910	MSE in Reading K-12	6	4	66.7%	2	1	50.00%	12	7	58.3%	6	5	83.3%
6911	GC in Dyslexia Interventionist				0			2	0	0.0%	0		
6920	MS in School Leadership, Management, & Administration	3	2	66.7%	4	3	75.00%	7	7	100.0%	3	2	66.7%
6941	PMC in School-Based Leadership-Special Ed. Program Admin.	1	0	0.0%	0			1	0	0.0%	0		
6960	PMC in School-Based Leadership-Curriculum Administration												
6980	PMC in School-Based Leadership-Building Administration							2	1	50.0%			
6991	GC in Integrated Early Childhood Education												

<sup>23</sup> Source: UCA Office of Institutional Research. Student graduated with degree program that they entered for or are retained in degree program they entered for.

## Measure 6: Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing Requirements

Title II Reports - <http://uca.edu/panda/panda-reports/title-ii-reports/>

### UCA Praxis Data – Initial Programs

Undergraduate Programs			UCA Data						Statewide Comparative Data		
Test #	Test Name	Passing Score	UCA Pass Rate	First Time Pass Rate	# UCA Test Takers	UCA Mean	SD	UCA Range	# AR Test Takers	Statewide Pass Rate	Statewide Avg Scaled Score
5134	Art: Content Knowledge (new)	158	*	*	4	*	*	*	33	94	169
5235	Biology: Content Knowledge	142	*	*	5	167.40	16.43	144-184	24	100	161
5002	Elementary (K-6) – Reading and LA	157	100	95.12	87	172.53	9.17	157-195	429	99	171
5003	Elementary (K-6) – Mathematics	157	98	90.24	86	173.83	11.40	157-200	429	99	177
5004	Elementary (K-6) – Social Studies	155	93	96.30	83	165.86	9.88	155-197	429	95	165
5005	Elementary (K-6) – Science	159	97	90.91	84	171.79	9.49	159-199	428	96	170
5039	English Language Arts: Content & Analysis	168	*	*	6	177.50	4.97	169-183	68	93	175
5122	Family and Consumer Sciences	153	99	100	10	162.10	7.17	153-171	14	93	164
5857	Health and Physical Education: Content	155	100	100	10	174.10	8.05	163-185	117	96	165
5161	Mathematics: Content Knowledge	160	*	*	7	170.57	8.00	161-185	42	86	167
5169	Middle School Mathematics	165	85	76.92	18	171.17	5.55	165-185	80	84	171
5047	Middle School English Language Arts	164	82	71.43	9	168.78	4.68	164-177	47	85	167
5440	Middle School Science	150	*	66.67	8	160.50	8.60	150-177	55	84	158
5089	Middle School Social Studies	149	94	92.31	16	166.88	9.67	153-184	53	91	164
5113	Music: Content Knowledge	157	100	100	12	174.75	10.21	161-191	89	97	169
5621	Principles of Learning & Teaching: EC	157	*	*	2	*	*	*	51	100	172
5622	Principles of Learning & Teaching: K-6	160	100	100	100	178.18	7.35	161-198	473	99	176
5623	Principles of Learning & Teaching: 5-9	160	100	100	33	177.12	9.08	161-193	126	99	175
5624	Principles of Learning & Teaching: 7-12	157	98	95.92	50	175.22	9.28	159-196	467	97	173
5086	Social Studies: Content and Interp.	153	*	*	6	168.00	11.06	157-186	72	97	162
5195	Spanish: World Language	168	*	*	1	*	*	*	10	90	176
5354	Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications	151	100	100	15	178.00	9.06	160-195	41	100	175
5841	World Languages Pedagogy	158	*	*	1	*	*	*	11	100	187

## UCA Praxis Data – MAT Programs

MAT Programs			UCA Data						Statewide Comparative Data		
Test #	Test Name	Passing Score	UCA Pass Rate	First Time Pass Rate	# UCA Test Takers	UCA Mean	SD	UCA Range	# AR Test Takers	Statewide Pass Rate	Statewide Avg Scaled Score
5134	Art: Content Knowledge (new)	158	*	*	2	*	*	*	6	*	*
5135	Art: Content and Analysis (old)	161	*	*	1	*	*	*	2	*	*
5235	Biology: Content Knowledge	142	*	*	9	161.13	17.13	142-186	22	100%	156
5101	Business Education: Content Knowledge	154	*	*	2	*	*	*	9	*	*
5245	Chemistry: Content Knowledge <sup>24</sup>	150	*	*	3	*	*	*	5	*	*
5022	Early Childhood: Content Knowledge	157	*	*	3	*	*	*	3	*	*
5002	Elementary (K-6) – Reading and LA	157	100	95.24	8	176.25	7.38	168-188	33	97%	168
5003	Elementary (K-6) – Mathematics	157	89	90.24	7	174.71	14.23	157-195	33	91%	168
5004	Elementary (K-6) – Social Studies	155	94	92.86	8	172.63	13.06	159-195	34	94%	166
5005	Elementary (K-6) – Science	159	89	88.24	8	171.75	10.94	159-186	33	91%	166
5039	English Language Arts: Content & Analysis	168	*	*	8	175.38	4.66	168-182	25	92%	173
5122	Family and Consumer Sciences	153	*	*	2	*	*	*	3	*	*
5857	Health and Physical Education: Content	155	*	*	4	*	*	*	21	90%	158
5161	Mathematics: Content Knowledge	160	*	*	9	160.67	5.57	160-168	14	93%	163
5169	Middle School Mathematics	165	100	80	18	174.17	6.33	165-188	46	91%	171
5047	Middle School English Language Arts	164	100	71.43	17	171.88	5.80	164-187	50	94%	169
5440	Middle School Science	150	*	*	15	157.40	6.82	150-173	39	87%	156
5089	Middle School Social Studies	149	100	92.31	21	167.40	10.59	153-186	46	98%	162
5621	Principles of Learning & Teaching: EC	157	*	*	3	*	*	*	10	100%	169
5622	Principles of Learning & Teaching: K-6	160	100	100	12	174.08	8.75	160-185	54	98%	173
5623	Principles of Learning & Teaching: 5-9	160	100	100	32	177.25	6.68	161-192	88	99%	176
5624	Principles of Learning & Teaching: 7-12	157	100	100	38	178.05	9.63	158-195	135	99%	175
5086	Social Studies: Content and Interpretation	153	*	*	6	170.33	9.52	158-183	32	97%	167
5195	Spanish: World Language	168	*	*	2	*	*	*	3	*	*
5221	Speech Communication: Content	141	*	*	1	*	*	*	2	*	*
5841	World Languages Pedagogy	158	*	*	2	*	*	*	3	*	*

<sup>24</sup> One MAT life science candidates also took Chemistry exam.

Program	Test #	Test Name	Pass Score	UCA Pass Rate	# UCA Test Takers	UCA Mean	UCA SD	UCA Range	#AR Test Takers	Statewide Pass Rate	Statewide Ave Scaled Score
Birth-Kindergarten Integrated	5023	Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education	160	100	5	180.25	7.5	172-190	21	100	179.33
	5024	Education of Young Children	160	100	5	168.25	1.71	166-185	29	86.21	169.76
Coaching	5095	Physical Education: Content and Design	169	*	1	169	*	*	12	33.33	164.75
	5857	Health and PE: Content Knowledge	155	100	9	174.33	8.29	163-185	169	79.88	161.09
Reading	5301	Reading Specialist	164	94.44	23	178.87	8.78	166-198	57	89.47	179.49
Library Media	5311	Library Media Specialist	148	100	55	167.02	9.94	148-188	76	100	166.00
Speech	5331	Speech-Language Pathology	162	100	8	174.38	4.66	168-180	52	96.15	175.17
Gifted and Talented	5358	Gifted Education	155	85.71	8	164.63	3.96	159-170	72	76.39	160.26
Special Education*	5354	Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications	151	100	17	175.35	9.78	156-193	265	98.11	174.05
ESL	5362	English to Speakers of Other Languages	155	*	1	177	*	*	310	99.68	177.04
School Psychology	5402	School Psychologist	147	100	6	168.33	16.71	147-184	14	100	169.57
School Counselor	5421	Professional School Counselor	156	94.44	62	168.26	7.74	156-188	133	96.24	168.21
	PLT	PLT – Initial Counselor	*	94.21	11	173.27	7.90	162-182	*	*	*
Dyslexia	5621	PLT: EC	157	90.00	11	171.45	7.26	162-181	73	95.89	171.34
	5622	PLT: K-6	160	100	7	180.57	10.53	165-195	657	93.76	173.96
	5623	PLT: 5-9	160	100	1	170.00	*	*	282	95.04	174.26
Building Administrator	6011	School Leaders Licensure Assessment	163	100	26	177.85	6.94	166-191	610	89.51	173.18
Program Administrator – Curriculum	6011	School Leaders Licensure Assessment	163	100	4	175.75	8.50	164-182	610	89.51	173.18
Program Administrator – Special Education	6011	School Leaders Licensure Assessment	163	100	3	177.67	11.15	165-186	610	89.51	173.18
District Administration	6021	School Superintendent Assessment	160	*	7	170.71	6.29	164-181	57	89.47	167.39
Driver's Education	PLT	PLT	*		4	175.25	10.91	166-191	*	*	*

<sup>25</sup> Source SOATEST for UCA data and ETS data manager for state data

## Measure 7: Ability of Completers to be Hired

ADE EPPR – UCA Initial Program Graduates Employed in Arkansas Public Schools<sup>26</sup>

	2016-2017 Graduates		2017-2018 Graduates	
	UCA	State	UCA	State
Completers	255	1904	272	1890
Employed in Arkansas Public Schools 1-year later	167	1189	163	1156
%	65%	62%	60%	61%

## UCA Post-Graduation Survey – Initial Programs’ Graduate Reporting on Base Salary<sup>27</sup>

	2016-2017		2017-2018	
	Undergraduate Initial Teacher Licensure	MAT Initial Teacher Licensure	Undergraduate Initial Teacher Licensure	MAT Initial Teacher Licensure
N	16	16	18	17
	1 = 0-19,000 1 = 20-29,000 12 = 30-39,000 2 = 40-49,000	10 = 30 – 39,000 4 = 40-49,000 2 > 50,000	1 = 20-29,000 11 = 30-39,000 5 = 40-49,000 1 > 50,000	1 = 0-19,000 0 = 20-29,000 6 = 30-39,000 8 = 40-49,000 2 > 50,000
Mean Starting Salary in State	\$34,339	\$38,317	\$34,339.00	\$38,317.00
Satisfaction with Salary (Key: Dissatisfied (1); Neutral (2); Satisfied (3))	2.32	2.66	2.39	2.35
Overall Satisfaction with EPP Preparation for current teaching position (Key: Very Dissatisfied (1) – Very Satisfied (5))	4.63	4.39	4.28	4.41

<sup>26</sup> Source: ADE EPPR - <https://eis.ade.arkansas.gov/eppr/EPPReport.aspx>

<sup>27</sup> Source: IR Post-Graduation Survey

## Arch Ford Novice Teacher Survey – Initial Programs

<b>2016-2017 UCA Graduates Involved in 2017-2018 Arch Ford Induction Initiative</b>	<b>AF Aggregate</b>	<b>UCA</b>
<b>N</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>22</b>
% anticipate PGP goals being marked complete by your principal - Yes	63.64	72.73
% anticipate PGP goals being marked complete by your principal - No	4.55	
% anticipate PGP goals being marked complete by your principal - Not sure	31.82	27.27
% Intending to continue teaching next year	98.5	100

## Completers' Graduate Program Enrollment - Student Data Tracker<sup>28</sup>

	# of completers	# enrolled in graduate school	% enrolled in graduate school	Areas of study	Institutions
<b>2015-2016 Undergraduate Initial Program Graduates</b>					
ELSE (P-4, K-6)	73	27	36.99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading (8)</li> <li>• School Counseling (2)</li> <li>• Special Education (12)</li> <li>• Occupational Therapy (1)</li> <li>• Mathematics (1)</li> <li>• Unknown (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ASU (2)</li> <li>• ATU (1)</li> <li>• Harding (1)</li> <li>• Henderson (1)</li> <li>• UofA (1)</li> <li>• UCA (21)</li> <li>• Walden (1)</li> </ul>
MSIT (4-8)	17	6	35.29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Counseling (1)</li> <li>• Teacher Leadership (1)</li> <li>• Creative Writing (1)</li> <li>• Leisure/Sport Mgmt (1)</li> <li>• Religious Studies (1)</li> <li>• Unknown (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ASU (1)</li> <li>• Middle TN State (1)</li> <li>• Southern NH (1)</li> <li>• UCA (3)</li> </ul>
<b>2016-2017 Undergraduate Initial Program Graduates</b>					
ELSE (P-4, K-6)	60	19	31.67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher Leadership (1)</li> <li>• Reading (12)</li> <li>• School Counseling (1)</li> <li>• School Leadership (2)</li> <li>• Special Education (1)</li> <li>• Law (1)</li> <li>• Unknown (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adams State (1)</li> <li>• ASU (3)</li> <li>• Charleston (1)</li> <li>• Strayer (1)</li> <li>• UCA (13)</li> </ul>
MSIT (4-8)	25	7	28.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gifted (1)</li> <li>• Teacher Leadership (3)</li> <li>• School Counseling (1)</li> <li>• School Leadership (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UCA (7)</li> </ul>

<sup>28</sup> Source: UCA Office of IR – Student Tracker

## Employment Milestones – Advanced Programs

### Graduate Reporting on Base Salary and Status<sup>29</sup>

	UCA Advanced Programs	School Leadership	Library Media	School Counseling	Reading	Special Education	UCA	EDS	GATE	LIBM	RDNG	SCCN	SLMA	SPED
N	29	11	5	1	3	5	78	19	2	18	5	17	8	2
Currently holding position aligned to licensure	20	8	5	1	2	4	54	12	2	14	3	13	3	2
Base Salary of Position	*	4 = \$40s 3 = \$60s 1 = \$70s	3 = \$30s 1 = \$50s 1 = \$60s	1 = \$40s	1 = \$30s 1 = \$40s	1 = \$20s 1 = \$30s 1 = \$40s 1 = \$50s	*	4 – 30s 2 – 40s 2 – 50s 1 – 60s 1 – 70s 2 – 80s 3 – 90s 2 – 100s	2 – 40s	3 – 30s 7 – 40s 2 – 50s 1 – 60s 1 – 70s	1 – 30s 3 – 40s	5 – 30s 4 – 40s 5 – 50s 3 – 60s	3 – 50s 1 – 80s	1 – 30s 1 – 40s
Satisfaction with Salary (Key: Dissatisfied (1); Neutral (2); Satisfied (3))	2.33	2.13	2.6	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.34	2.67	3.00	2.27	2.25	2.41	2.50	1.50

<sup>29</sup> Source: IR Post-Graduation Survey



## Measure 8: UCA Loan Default Rate and Consumer Information

University-wide rate of default on student loans for the years 2013, 2014 and 2015, based on data provided by the Office of Federal Student Aid. This rate is provided to UCA by the USDE and reported to HLC each year. The FY 2015 rate: 8.2%.

UCA OPE ID	School	School Type	Control	Programs		FY2015	FY2014	FY2013
00109200	University of Central Arkansas	Master's Degree or Doctor's Degree	Public	Both (FFEL/FDL)	Default Rate	8.1	8.8	8.2
					No. In Default	228	232	218
					No. in Repay	2,796	2,615	2,639
					Enrollment Figures	13,255	12,838	12,939
					Percentage Calculation	21	20.3	20.3

ENROLLMENT: To provide context for the Cohort Default Rate (CDR) data we include enrollment data (students enrolled at any time during the year) and a corresponding percentage (borrowers entering repayment divided by that enrollment figure). While there is no direct relationship between the timing of when a borrower entered repayment (October 1 through September 30) and any particular enrollment year, for the purpose of these data, we have chosen to use the academic year ending on the June 30 prior to the beginning of the cohort year (e.g., FY 2014 CDR Year will use 2012-2013 enrollment).

Source: <https://www2.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/defaultmanagement/cdr.html>

### Additional Consumer Index Data:

Federal School Code (FAFSA)	001092
In-State Tuition	\$7,889
Out-of-State Tuition	\$13,806
Average Net Yearly Cost	\$13,063
Percent of students receiving loans	52%
Average Monthly Loan Payment	\$221
Salary After Attending	\$36,900
Average Net Yearly Cost by Family Income	
Under \$30,000	\$11,248
\$30,000 - \$48,000	\$11,913
\$30,000 - \$48,000	\$14,392
\$30,000 - \$48,000	\$15,584
Above \$111,000	\$15,759

Number of Undergraduate Students	9340
Full Time	88%
Part Time	12%
Male Students	41%
Female Students	59%
ACT Average (1-36)	23
Graduation Rate	45%
Retention Rate	72%

- <https://www.fafsa-application.com/colleges/university-of-central-arkansas-conway-arkansas-ar-001092>
- <https://datausa.io/profile/university/university-of-central-arkansas/#intro>