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## Mission Statement

The Graduate Certificate in Language and Literacy Education is designed for individuals seeking advanced professional preparation to increase knowledge and skills in addressing the literacy and academic learning needs of elementary and secondary English learners and Alaska Native students through culturally sustaining practice, grounded in multicultural epistemologies. Those who teach languages in public or private settings, both in the United States and abroad, may enhance their knowledge and practice by completing this standards-based program.

## Program Student Learning Outcomes

* Demonstrate knowledge of English language structures, English language use, second language acquisition and development, and language processes to help English Language Learners (ELLs) acquire academic language and literacies specific to various content areas (TESOL 1).
* Demonstrate and apply knowledge of the impact of dynamic academic, personal, familial, cultural, social, and sociopolitical contexts on the education and language acquisition of ELLs as supported by research and theories. Candidates investigate the academic and personal characteristics of each ELL, as well as family circumstances and literacy practices, to develop individualized, effective instructional and assessment practices for their ELLs. Candidates recognize how educator identity, role, culture, and biases impact the interpretation of ELLs’ strengths and needs (TESOL 2).
* Plan supportive environments for ELLs, design and implement standards-base instruction using evidence-based, ELL-centered, interactive approaches. Candidates make instructional decisions by reflecting on individual ELL outcomes and adjusting instruction. Candidates demonstrate understanding of the role of collaboration with colleagues and communication with families to support their ELLs’ acquisition of English language and literacies in the content areas. Candidates use and adapt relevant resources, including appropriate technology, to effectively plan, develop, implement, and communicate about instruction for ELLs (TESOL 3).
* Apply assessment principles to analyze and interpret multiple and varied assessments for ELLs, including classroom-based, standardized, and language proficiency assessments. Candidates understand how to analyze and interpret data to make informed decisions that promote English language and content learning. Candidates understand the importance of communicating results to other educators, ELLs, and ELLs’ families (TESOL 4).
* Demonstrate professionalism and leadership by collaborating with other educators, knowing policies and legislation and the rights of ELLs, advocating for ELLs and their families, engaging in self-assessment and reflection, pursuing continuous professional development, and honing their teaching practice through supervised teaching (TESOL 5).

## Measures

Table 1 below provides summary descriptions of the program outcomes and their administration.. Table 2 summarizes how the assessment measures align to the Program Student Learning Outcomes.

**The program will demonstrate its success in three ways:**

1. Through identified assessments contained in each core course CCG;
2. Through program-level Key Assessments (vetted through validity studies), aligned with *Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages* (TESOL) Standards and administered (using interrater reliability studies) throughout the program;
3. Indicators of satisfaction from various stakeholders, e.g., employers and alumni.

**Table 1: Assessment Measures Description and Administration**

| Assessment Measure | Description | Frequency/  Start Date | Collection Method | Administered by |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment #1: Licensure Assessment, or other Content-based Assessment**  Annotated Bibliography | Candidates locate and analyze original research articles on an approved topic. | EDRL 671: Language, Reading, Culture (first course of the program) | Watermark Assessment Management System | Program Faculty |
| **Assessment #2: Assessment of Content Knowledge in English as a Second Language**  Case Study | Candidates prepare an in-depth biography of a student that addresses his/her unique oral and written language and literacy acquisition processes in and out of school, referencing theories that are demonstrated (incorporating sociocultural, second language acquisition theories, and theories of literacy development). | EDRL 674: Foundational Theories of Language and Literacy Development | Watermark Assessment Management System. | Program Faculty |
| **Assessment #3:**  **Assessment of Candidate Ability to Plan Instruction**  Disciplinary Literacy Instructional Routines & Materials Collection | Candidates generate an ongoing record of instructional routines and ideas for implementation; collect a series of relevant texts; and write a reflective essay that examines their process for designing and implementing ideas, and connections made to the readings in the course. | EDRL 679: Content Area Language and Literacy Development | Watermark Assessment Management System | Program Faculty |
| **Assessment #4: Assessment of Student Teaching**  Final field practicum report | Candidates gather all collected data on 1) Student Identity and Interests; 2) Assessment Tools and Approaches to Gathering Data; 3) Analysis of Data and Explanations/Conclusions; 4) Instructional design; and synthesize their learning in a final report. | EDRL 680: Assessment and Instruction (Final course of the program) | Watermark Assessment Management System | Program Faculty |
| **Assessment #5: Assessment of Candidate Effect on Student Learning**  Final Report: Analysis and Reflection | Candidates provide a final report with their observations, analyses, and final reflections on students’ reading processes and their skill development and strategy use as readers and writers as a result of candidate instruction. | EDRL 675: Language and Literacy Methods | Watermark Assessment Management System | Program Faculty |
| **Assessment #6: Assessment that demonstrates candidates have a philosophy of teaching that reflects candidates’ commitment to the Critical Issues Related to Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students.**  Culturally Responsive Classroom Connections and Implications: Philosophy Essay | As a part of a project on classroom connections and implications as a result of engaging in language and literacy research, candidates articulate a philosophy of teaching that addresses a commitment to critical issues related to culturally and linguistically diverse students. | EDRL 671: Language, Reading, and Culture | Watermark Assessment Management System | Program Faculty |

Table 2: Alignment of Program Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Measures

| **Program Student Learning Outcomes** | **Assessment Measures** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Demonstrate knowledge of English language structures, English language use, second language acquisition and development, and language processes to help English Language Learners (ELLs) acquire academic language and literacies specific to various content areas (TESOL 1). | Assessment:  #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment  #2: Content Knowledge  #3: Ability to Plan Instruction  #4: Student Teaching  #5: Effect on Student Learning |
| 2. Demonstrate and apply knowledge of the impact of dynamic academic, personal, familial, cultural, social, and sociopolitical contexts on the education and language acquisition of ELLs as supported by research and theories. Candidates investigate the academic and personal characteristics of each ELL, as well as family circumstances and literacy practices, to develop individualized, effective instructional and assessment practices for their ELLs. Candidates recognize how educator identity, role, culture, and biases impact the interpretation of ELLs’ strengths and needs (TESOL 2). | Assessment:  #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment  #2: Content Knowledge  #3: Ability to Plan Instruction  #4: Student Teaching  #6: Philosophy Statement |
| 3. Plan supportive environments for ELLs, design and implement standards-based instruction using evidence-based, ELL-centered, interactive approaches. Candidates make instructional decisions by reflecting on individual ELL outcomes and adjusting instruction. Candidates demonstrate understanding of the role of collaboration with colleagues and communication with families to support their ELLs’ acquisition of English language and literacies in the content areas. Candidates use and adapt relevant resources, including appropriate technology, to effectively plan, develop, implement, and communicate about instruction for ELLs (TESOL 3). | Assessment:  #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment  #2: Content Knowledge  #3: Ability to Plan Instruction  #4: Student Teaching |
| 4. Apply assessment principles to analyze and interpret multiple and varied assessments for ELLs, including classroom-based, standardized, and language proficiency assessments. Candidates understand how to analyze and interpret data to make informed decisions that promote English language and content learning. Candidates understand the importance of communicating results to other educators, ELLs, and ELLs’ families (TESOL 4). | Assessment:  #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment  #2: Content Knowledge  #4: Student Teaching  #5: Effect on Student Learning |
| 5. Demonstrate professionalism and leadership by collaborating with other educators, knowing policies and legislation and the rights of ELLs, advocating for ELLs and their families, engaging in self-assessment and reflection, pursuing continuous professional development, and honing their teaching practice through supervised teaching (TESOL 5). | Assessment:  #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment  #2: Content Knowledge  #4: Student Teaching |

## Process

The GCLL Program has earned National Recognition by the professional association Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) until 2027 and is accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) until 2026. The Program’s process of assessment includes Key Assessment data collected in a management system for analysis (Watermark) and analyzed for candidate ability to meet expectations on standards set out by TESOL. Key Assessment data is triangulated internally with formative (beginning and middle of program) and summative data (end of program), with Employer and Alumni surveys, and in stakeholder meetings. Additional data is provided by the SOE/CAEP processes of continuous improvement, e.g. learning outcomes that are cross-aligned with CAEP measures and additional standards brought forth by the State of Alaska [Alaska Educator Content and Performance Standards (AECPS) and Alaska Cultural Standards for Educators (ACSE)] as well as the Graduate Studies in Education and Leadership Standards (GSEL), and the International Society for Technology in Education Standards (ISTE). Additional cross-cutting themes for which we collect data include diversity and technology.

Key Assessments 1-6 each undergo a rigorous process of review for content validity, in which at least three reviewers provide feedback on the instructions, cross-alignment of standards, and rubrics (which must meet CAEP-sufficiency standards). In addition, ongoing technical studies are conducted to gather stakeholder perceptions of validity, reliability, and fairness (VRF) of the Key Assessments. VRF studies are written for purposes of accreditation reporting.

Faculty in the program, including adjunct faculty, engage in Interrater Reliability (IRR) studies for every Key Assessment, in which exact and adjacent agreement scores are compiled, analyzed, and subsequently used to inform calibration training on scoring as well as possible revisions to Key Assessment instructions and/or rubrics. IRR studies are written for purposes of accreditation reporting.

Annual Employer and Alumni surveys are conducted in order to understand the perceptions of our program alumni and their employers on the effectiveness of our programs on completer practice. Surveys undergo content and VRF studies and are piloted before use.

The program faculty meet at least once a year to review the collected data and engage in analysis. This meeting results in recommendations for program changes designed to enhance performance related to the program’s outcomes. Data and recommendations are presented at annual stakeholder meetings to verify findings and engage in discussion about proposed revision to the program. The results of the data collection and analysis, including a discussion of the results, and a listing of the recommended program changes are then forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs by September 15th each year. A plan for implementing the recommended changes, including advertising the changes to all the program’s stakeholders, is also completed at this meeting.

## Formulation of Recommendations for Program Improvement

The proposed program changes may be any action or change in policy that the faculty deem necessary to improve performance relative to program outcomes. Recommended changes should consider workload (faculty, staff, and students), budgetary, facilities, and other relevant constraints. A few examples of changes made by programs at UAA include:

* Changes in course content, materials, scheduling, sequencing, prerequisites, delivery methods, and assessments
* Changes in faculty/staff allocations and assignments
* Changes in advising methods and requirements
* Procurement of grant funds to support student tuition.