UAA Academic Affairs
UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508-4614
907.786.1050

REPORT ON AY2022-2023 ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT

Submission date: 11/15/2023

Assessment Plan covered in the report: Language & Literacy Education GC

College: School of Education

Campuses where the program(s) is delivered: ☒Anchorage ☐KOD ☐KPC ☐MSC ☐PWSC

Submitted by: Cathy Coulter, Program Lead, Language and Literacy Education

After responding to the questions below, the program should email this form to the dean, with a copy to the appropriate community campus director(s) if the program is delivered on a community campus.

1. **Please list and number the Program Student Learning Outcomes your program assessed in AY23. For each outcome, indicate one of the following: Exceeded faculty expectations, Met faculty expectations, or Did not meet faculty expectations.**

   Example: 1. Communicate effectively in a variety of contexts and formats – Exceeded faculty expectations.

   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). (Met faculty expectations)
   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). (Exceeded faculty expectations)
   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). Met faculty expectations.

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). Met faculty expectations.

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). Met faculty expectations.

2. Describe your assessment process in AY23 for these Program Student Learning Outcomes, including the collection of data, analysis of data, and faculty (and other, e.g., advisory board) conversations around the findings. *(1000 words or less)*

In AY23, the Language and Literacy Education program collected multiple sources of data for the above student learning outcomes. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are aligned with standards required by our accrediting bodies, Specialized Program Accreditor TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) and CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation). SLOs are also cross-referenced with International Literacy Association (ILA) standards. Data include six Program Key Assessments (PKAs) that are collected and evaluated according to standards-based rubrics. In addition, we are currently in the process of collecting data from Employers' and Alumni surveys. Observations of student conversations and assignments are shared and discussed with Program Faculty on a weekly basis and courses are refined accordingly. Assignments include video analysis, which gives instructors a close look at teacher classroom practices and the ways in which candidates are implementing course objectives. All quantitative and qualitative data are discussed annually with Program Faculty and discussed with the Language and Literacy Education Advisory Board as well as the Project LEAF (Literacy Equity for Alaskan Families) External Evaluator (evaluator for the Department of Education grant that supports the program.) Additional data include entry, midpoint, and exit data including a writing assessment, GPAs (entry and exit), and individual and cumulative scores on Program Key Assessments.

3. What are the findings and what do they tell the faculty about student learning in your program? *(1000 words or less)*

Program Key Assessments (PKAs) 1-6 indicate that 100% of the 2022-2023 candidates met expectations on TESOL, CAEP, and ILA Standards. Moreover, a qualitative analysis of data (including video analysis) show shifts in candidate practice in the following areas: 1) Growth in their sense of agency as professionals (revaluing self as teachers); 2) Shifts in how they view students and their linguistic and cultural identities; 3) Shifts in their perceptions of curricular materials (and their

professional autonomy as decision makers); 4) Shifts in their understanding of the complexities and tensions surrounding their classroom practice (Richardson & Coulter, in process). Due to the collaborative nature of the program as well as intensive faculty support, scores on PKAs remain high, with all candidates meeting expectations for TESOL, CAEP and ILA Standards. Moreover, the continuous improvement cycle the program engages in results in ongoing and immediate course and program changes that positively impact student learning.

4. **Based on the findings, did the faculty make any recommendations for changes to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes?** Yes

   i. **Please describe the recommended action(s), what improvements in student learning the program hopes to see, the proposed timeline, and how the program will know if the change(s) has worked. If no recommendations for changes were made, please explain that decision.** *(1000 words or less)*

   As a part of our continuous cycle of improvement, a few refinements were made to courses. These refinements did not constitute any broad programmatic changes, but instead included curricular and pedagogic changes within courses. As noted above, our weekly meetings and discussions allow us to make immediate shifts in instruction in response to insights from data. We note changes below:

   1. As a result of data collected, including candidate feedback, we focused less on some topics of the EDRL 674 course (the 2nd course in the sequence) and more on others. Candidates noted that one text, in particular, was very helpful (required in the 3rd course in the sequence), and they recommended that we require it sooner in coursework. Faculty decided to require the first three chapters of the text in EDRL 674 to support candidates in their Case Study assignment but to keep the required text in place. The rereading of the first three chapters of the text helps support candidates in their knowledge of reading process with multilingual learners.
   2. In EDRL 674, we focused less on topics around the deep history of language and literacy instruction in favor of an increased focus on socio-cultural approaches to teaching and learning, which allows us to focus more on culturally sustaining approaches that meet TESOL standards.
   3. As a result of the Alaska Reads Act, we included additional readings on the Science of Reading throughout coursework. In addition, we included discussions and reflections on the implications for culturally responsive classroom practice. These refinements are included in each course and include implications for instruction through collaborative inquiry around video analysis.

   Ongoing data collection and analysis will inform our understanding of the results of these changes. In particular we hope to see increased shifts in practice in subsequent courses (EDRL 675 and EDRL 680), particularly within video analyses and reflections on practice.

5. **In the past academic year, how did your program use the results of previous assessment cycles to make changes intended to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Please check all that apply.**

☒ Course curriculum changes
☐ Course prerequisite changes
☐ Changes in teaching methods
☐ Changes in advising
☐ Degree requirement changes
☐ Degree course sequencing
☐ Course enrollment changes (e.g., course capacity, grading structure [pass/fail, A-F])
☐ Changes in program policies/procedures
☐ Changes to Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)
☐ College-wide initiatives (e.g., High-Impact Practices)
☐ Faculty, staff, student development
☐ Other
☐ No changes were implemented in AY23. *(If no options above were selected)*

If you checked "Other" above, please describe. *(100 words or less)*

6. **Do you have any information about how well these or other past improvements are working? Are they achieving their intended goals? Please include any data or assessment results that help you demonstrate this. *(1000 words or less)***

In addition to data we collect and analyze for continuous program improvement, we are currently in the process of conducting research on the impact of the program on candidate classroom practice. This research is funded by Project LEAF (Literacy Equity for Alaskan Families) and includes several qualitative studies that will be submitted to academic journals [and that have been accepted for presentation at national conferences including the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and the American Education Research Association (AERA)]. In addition, the external evaluator is collecting data on the impact of the program for candidates and K-12 students in their classrooms (data forthcoming pending agreement with DEED). All of this data will help program faculty see the impact of programmatic changes.

DEAN SECTION (Due to the program on January 15)

After completing the Dean Section and signing it, the dean should email this form to the program, and copy uaa_oaa@alaska.edu for posting. If the program is delivered on one or more community campus,

the dean should consult with the appropriate community campus director(s) on the response and copy the appropriate community campus director(s) when emailing the response to the program.

1. **Based on the program's responses above, what guidance and support do you have for the program moving forward?** *(200 words or less)*

   The Language & Literacy Education program uses a combination of standardized learner assessments and research data to assess learner performance. Additionally, the faculty takes student comments into consideration, adding a multidimensional depth to the assessment analysis process. This strategic approach lends itself to a systematic and iterative review and integration of theory and practice. The post-modern approach sets the program up for success but will require careful attention to instructional capacity constraints and adding new faculty to the program to support the existing assessment culture.

2. **Discuss what the program is doing particularly well in terms of its processes for the assessment and improvement of student learning, for example, the use of a common rubric or prompt, a signature assignment, etc.** *(200 words or less)*

   The use of mixed and integrated data sources coupled with investigating broader impacts represents a high-quality and high-fidelity approach to assessment. Key assessments create a valid baseline measure that is then interpreted against qualitative data to provide added value and clarity in terms of academic outcomes and impacts. For example, data from video analysis assignments creates a rich opportunity to confirm UAA learner performance and the compounding effect of their instruction on K-12 learners developing English language skills.

Dean's signature:

DocuSigned by:

Tonia A. Dousay

845105C7D9E64AA...

Date: 1/12/24