

Self-Study Report – Addendum
In response to the CAEP External Review Team – Formative Feedback Report
February 2018

The University of Alaska Anchorage College of Education has experienced changes in leadership (3 deans) and faculty over the last seven years. The impact of this constant state of turnover is evidenced by the limited use of data to inform a culture of continuous improvement within the EPP. In a move to bring stability to the EPP, the institution appointed an interim dean in spring 2015, thus providing leadership to institute policies and procedures that support data-informed continuous improvement cycles that contribute to quality assurance.

The EPP has engaged for several years in developing assessments based on Specialty Professional Association standards. The void in leadership during this time led to a narrow vision relative to data collection and usage, which was primarily for compliance purposes. Further, the EPP's quality assurance system PeTAL, built by one programmer for the NCATE accreditation cycle in 2013 was inadequately maintained leading to questionable data reporting over the most recent three-year data cycle. Moreover, the use of Taskstream to collect student work samples to be evaluated using Special Professional Association Key Assessments was not implemented across initial licensure programs consistently and coherently.

Also, influencing the EPP's improvement efforts has been the move by the UA Board of Regents, at the recommendation of the university president, to create a single Alaska College of Education to be administered by the University of Alaska Southeast (UAS).

As part of the UA Strategic Pathways process ... [the plan was to] consolidate all UA teacher preparation and educational leadership programs (currently at UAF, UAA and UAS) in one streamlined academic unit. (see 5.1.1 FFR Presidents AKCOE Charge.pdf; <http://bit.ly/2GAQYDf>)

In October 2017, the UA President put forth an adjustment to the consolidation recommendation. (see 5.1.1 FFR Presidents AKCOE Charge) The instability created by the conversation surrounding consolidation during the last two years negatively affected the work-loads and program review process within the EPP. However, the self-study process opened a window into the quality assurance systems and continuous improvement actions with the organization. The EPP learned a great many things about institutional practices that needed to be changed, implemented or dropped altogether.

The Formative Feedback Report raised critical questions that the EPP has already begun to address this academic year. Generally, anecdotal evidence and general perceptions inform current EPP faculty about program quality. Thus, the EPP is in essence at the beginning phases of building a quality assurance system that is informed by reliable and valid data. Data are used to examine candidates before, during and after the program. The responses to the Formative Feedback Report are presented below.

Standard 1.1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Candidate Skills, Knowledge, and Professional Dispositions

The EPP initial licensure programs have assessed candidate performance using InTASC Standards indirectly by overlaying them on the current assessments built around SPA standards. (see 1.1.6, 1.1.12, 1.1.13, 1.1.14 FFR) Faculty are currently developing assessments that are directly aligned with InTASC Standards. The target date for the use of these assessments is Fall 2017/Spring 2018 completers. Assessment #4 (Clinical Experience) is currently being piloted with Elementary Education interns.

The EPP currently uses five assessments with published scores for validity and reliability

- The NeXT Alumni Survey, and the NeXT Employer Survey
- The PRAXIS I test
- The PRAXES II test
- ND Common Metrics-Student Teacher Observation Tool (STOT)

Until 2017 we used the EPP-developed alumni survey. We did not include this data in the SSR because the numbers were too low to be useful. The Alumni Interview has a process for establishing reliability that uses inter-rater triangulation. Data were collected with this instrument during Fall 2018, but the number of participants was too small for significance.

All other instruments are undergoing revision. EPP faculty are committed to ensuring the designs include specific methods for establishing validity and reliability, and these values will be continually reviewed for accuracy.

Claims about quality in the SSR were, in some cases, extrapolated from data collected in previous years which could not be used to substantiate those claims directly. This extrapolation of data was primarily due to records' being incomplete and data recorded in forms that were incompatible with the questions being asked or the outcomes being measured. Using the new data EPP faculty collected before submitting the SSR, they correlated those findings with patterns from previous years, and reported analyses that indicated trends or consistent results, often stated with qualifiers referencing the lack of data.

Provider Responsibilities

Candidate competencies in the areas of using research to understand the role of teaching and the use of K-12 student data are currently assessed through the Alumni Interview and the NeXT Alumni Survey (see 4.0.12 FFR, 4.1.5 FFR, 4.2.5 FFR, 4.4.5 FFR). Neither of these assessments involves a rubric. Data are reported and analyzed with graphs that compare the numbers of responses in categories. For the open-ended prompts/questions, faculty look for patterns that indicate whether the respondent meets the standard, i.e., does she or he use research to understand the role of teaching in student development. As explained above, the NeXT Alumni Survey is a published instrument with established reliability and validity. For the EPP-created

Alumni Interview, faculty piloted a process for establishing reliability through inter-rater triangulation.

As a result of the self-study, the EPP faculty recognize a need to engage in a review of Course Content Guides to determine how candidates acquire competencies in the areas of using research to understand the role of teaching and the use of K-12 student data.

The Elementary Education program and Secondary Education programs in mathematics, science, social studies, and world languages do not currently have recognition status by their respective Specialty Professional Associations (SPA). EPP faculty are addressing input provided in the most recent feedback reports. The Music and Physical Education pursue recognition through their respective SPAs and faculty in different colleges. Their status is unknown at this time.

SPA Status & Review Feedback			
Program	SPA	Final Decision	Next Submission Date
Early Childhood Education (BA)	NAEYC	Recognized	03/15/22
Early Childhood Education (Post-BA)	NAEYC	Recognized	03/15/22
Early Childhood – Special Education	CEC	Recognized	03/15/22
Elementary Education (BA)	ACEI	Not Recognized <i>-Standards alignment</i> <i>-Additional analysis needed</i>	03/15/22
Elementary Education (Post-BA)	ACEI	Not Recognized <i>-Standards alignment</i> <i>-Additional analysis needed</i>	03/15/22
Secondary Education - English	NCTE	Recognized	03/15/22
Secondary Education – Social Studies	NCSS	Further Development Needed <i>-Standards alignment</i> <i>-Data need to be disaggregated</i> <i>-SPA directions need to be followed</i> <i>-Analysis needed</i>	09/15/17 <i>Not submitted</i>

Secondary Education - Mathematics	NCTM	Not Recognized <i>-Standards alignment</i> <i>-SPA directions need to be followed</i> <i>-Standards need to be disaggregated within rubric</i>	03/15/22
Secondary Education - Science	NSTA	Not Recognized <i>-Standards alignment</i> <i>-Standards need to be disaggregated within rubric</i> <i>-Data need to be disaggregated</i>	03/15/22
Secondary Education – World Languages	ACTFL	Recognized w/Conditions <i>-Standards alignment</i>	09/15/17 <i>Not submitted</i>
Special Education – Graduate Certification	CEC	Recognized	03/15/22

According to the College and Career Readiness Center of the American Institutes for Research, Alaska has not adopted or made available a definition of college and career readiness. It should be noted that Alaska did not adopt the Common Core State Standards. Alaskan stakeholders found previous standards to be lower in rigor than other states' standards and to lack clarity in terms of what students should know and be able to do; therefore, the Alaska State Department of Education and Early Development is working to increase state standards' rigor so that Alaska's high school graduates are better prepared for college education, technical training, and careers after high school. To ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards, candidates across all initial licensure programs create curriculum unit plans that must be based on the state student learning standards, the state cultural standards, and the Common Core or GLEs for the district where they are interning. Throughout their program, EPP faculty use the Internship Evaluation rubric to assess candidates on their development toward defined outcomes based on the Alaska Beginning Teacher Standards cross-referenced to SPA Standards, all of which provides evidence they are eligible for an Institutional Recommendation for Alaska Teacher Certification. (see 1.1.6, 1.1.12, 1.1.13, 1.1.14 from SSR 08/30/17)

Data in the Self-Study Report (SSR) was provided by program specialty but not by specific degree area. The lack of further disaggregation is due to the small numbers within each specialty program and the consistent expectation of core learnings and application of skills and knowledge through field experiences across degree and certificate programs within each specialty (i.e., Early Childhood BA & Early Childhood Post-Baccalaureate Certificate).

EPP has not created an assessment for measuring ISTE standards in many forms and applications. However, as EPP faculty continue to design assessments in the coming months

based on InTASC standards, they will intentionally include ISTE standards to facilitate collecting reliable and valid data to measure candidates' ability to model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.

EPP faculty discuss placements in conjunction with the Student Services Field Placement Coordinator and school district officials. Placements are primarily determined by the school district and can be limited by availability. Candidates often have few options. The EPP is endeavoring to establish partnership agreements with the five districts which are closest in proximity and account for 64% of the total Alaska student population. A goal for these agreements is greater collaboration for choosing placements and school-based clinical faculty (cooperating teachers). Further, the EPP is developing and implementing training courses for school-based clinical faculty and adjunct university clinical faculty to ensure greater inter-rater reliability across all individuals involved in assessing candidates' skills, knowledge, and dispositions during the clinical experience.

The Student Services Field Placement Coordinator maintains the candidate placement data and responds to requests from programs for information at a general level, e.g., how many candidates have been placed in a particular district this year compared to previous. Currently, the EPP does not evaluate data on candidate placement to use for program improvement. It is anticipated that the formalizing of district partnerships will support the EPP in more active involvement in selecting placements. Formal partnerships will lead to the EPP developing an outcomes-based assessment designed to assure the highest-quality candidate placements.

EPP clinical supervisors assess candidates with the Internship Evaluation form. (See ND STOT) To date, only the data from EPP clinical supervisors can be analyzed and used for program improvement. Issues with the feedback tool and historical EPP practices related to the role of school-based clinical faculty in the evaluation of candidates have prevented us from accessing other data on candidates once they are placed in their internships.

Data is available from EPP-based clinical faculty for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education programs. It is housed in Blackboard or previously through TaskStream or Digication (will be made available during external review). The Secondary Education program does not formally record data. At this time, no evaluation data is collected from school-based clinical educators. This practice is currently being explored by EPP faculty. The implementation of Via by Watermark as the data collection tool will further the conversation with partner districts about including school-based clinical educators in the formal process of collecting evaluation data to ensure candidate readiness and program improvement. Moreover, the ND STOT document beginning piloted by the elementary education program will be expanded and used by all initial licensure programs beginning Fall 2018. Data will be collected through the Via by Watermark platform.

Further, EPP faculty have developed a standard handbook, which provides a standardized guide for all who are involved in a candidate's internship experience. At the end of each academic year, faculty review the handbook and processes both informally with the school-based clinical

educators and EPP clinical supervisors, and formally with feedback from the Advisory Committee. For future training, the EPP is engaged in work on creating a handbook with policies and procedures that are consistent across the Department of Teaching and Learning.

The newly-developed Assessment 5 for initial licensure programs is designed to address this area of need. It became apparent during the self-study process that the Early Childhood program is not systematically measured at this time. Within the Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Special Education programs, impact on student learning is assessed with their respective SPA Assessment 5. The primary focus of this assessment is for the candidate to critically reflect on the measured levels of learning observed in their students based on the lesson/unit delivered during the internship residency. In the development of new assessments, the primary work of the EPP is first to define the expected outcomes. Conversations on these expectations are currently taking place with the Department of Teaching and Learning.

Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectively

Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs

The University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) is an open enrollment system that has the following requirements for admission:

- High school graduation or GED
- Minimum High School GPA of 2.5
- Students with a 2.0-2.5 GPA may be admitted to certain baccalaureate programs with academic advising as a requirement.

Accuplacer is UAA's computerized placement test to assess skills in Writing. Alternatively, students may be placed into writing courses based upon an ACT or SAT score, or through assessment of a writing sample. Standardized test scores are not used in the admission decision; however, they are used for math and writing course level placement.

The University fosters an inclusive, welcoming and respectful campus community that promotes diversity, civility, inclusion, and an appreciation for each unique member of our academic community. As a functioning college within the larger university, the EPP's recruitment plan reflects the goals outlined by the UAA diversity statement (<https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/diversity/>).

Since the formal recruitment plan for the EPP is newly established, no evidence is available to determine how the plan has influenced enrollment in high-need teaching fields. The EPP has begun work with the larger institution to track data relative to recruitment activities. Further, the EPP is tracking the impact of participation in various community events. Recruitment events include:

- UA Scholars Event
- School district partnerships
- Rural health and community fairs (focus on Special Education)
- Community agency partnerships (focus on Special Education)

- Statewide conferences
- Career Fairs
- Kids to College (hosted by Alaska Commission on Higher Education)

Placement of interns, who serve as role models, in rural settings further supports recruitment efforts of diverse candidates. Additionally, the EPP is engaged with the other two statewide educator preparation programs (University of Alaska Fairbanks and University of Alaska Southeast) in the development of an NSF Robert Noyce Capacity Building Grant Proposal (due August 2018). (see 3.1.1a FFR, 3.1.1b FFR, 3.1.1c FFR)

The project goal is to establish the infrastructure and partnerships for implementing a Robert Noyce Scholarship Program Track 1 (tentative 2017- 2018) to increase the number and diversity of math and science teachers who are prepared to integrate crosscutting STEM concepts in the curriculum to engage student learning in high-needs LEAs.

Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement

Grade point average (GPA) data is used by the elementary education program as part of reporting data in the SPA report; however, the EPP faculty has not formally analyzed GPA data to make program adjustments. GPA is also used as selection criteria for admittance into each initial licensure program. (see 3.2.1 FFR) For example, students seeking initial teacher certification via the Special Education Graduate Certificate program must complete up to 15 credits of prerequisite courses with a minimum grade of "B." Students who do not meet this requirement are not permitted to enroll in the graduate courses in special education that leads to initial certification. For Secondary Education, GPA data is analyzed as an element of candidates' applications. In addition to being able to satisfy content reviews, faculty expects that applying candidates hold a minimum GPA of 3.0. Occasionally, a holistic view of candidates allows admission to the program with a GPA below 3.0. Faculty are in the process of developing a robust procedure for analysis of program applicants' qualifications.

The rationale for allowing candidates in the Early Childhood Special Education and Special Education programs to be admitted with a 3.0 GPA in the most recent 20 credits rather than overall GPA is based on faculty experience. Often when individuals who have completed their undergraduate degree many years ago (some 20+), they may not have achieved a 3.0 at the time. Applicant life situations might have changed since their initial degree program. Thus, other indicators of qualities are used in the selection process that includes a review of their most recent 30 credits of coursework.

Praxis Core (see 1.3.3 FFR) is the nationally normed assessments of mathematical, reading and writing achievement used by the EPP for official admittance to a specific initial licensure program. Historically, the EPP has not engaged in analysis of the Praxis Core II data for purposes of SPA reporting. Furthermore, systematic analysis for program improvement has been absent. Passing scores on the Praxis Core are required for admission to the major. The EPP has aligned admission requirements relative to passing the Praxis Core II between all initial licensure programs as a requirement to begin the internship experience starting with AY 2018-2019. This

alignment will provide for the consistent use of the data for program admittance and analysis for cohorts of candidates.

Additional Selectively Factors

The EPP uses a formal application process to officially admit students to the major. The application seeks to address academic and non-academic factors. The EPP is aligning the application process across all initial licensure areas.

The EPP is engaged in conversations that address:

- The establishment of validity and reliability
- Reporting data that shows academic and non-academic factors that predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching
- How instruments will be used to monitor individual candidates
- The effect on a candidate's status who receives a low score on instruments

The EPP has made no progress in developing and implementing the piloted dispositions assessment. Work on identifying dispositions and developing an appropriate assessment will begin in summer 2018. The lack of progress in this area is attributed to a shift in priorities. The EPP has actively engaged in the development of a single set of assessments to be used across specific programs. These assessments are aligned to InTASC Standards and cross-walked with each Specialty Professional Association's standards. The EPP has adopted a clinical observation document that is being piloted by the elementary education program to provide data by the end Spring 2018. Additionally, the assessments presently under development will be used to assess completer artifacts for the academic year 2017-2018. This evaluation will bring together EPP faculty, school-based clinical faculty, and site administrators to collaboratively assess completers' evidence of learning. Subsequently, the data will be examined by the full faculty at the annual fall retreat. This analysis and the feedback from the evaluation teams will be used by faculty to make appropriate program adjustments, including revisions to assessments currently under development.

Selectivity During Preparation

Multiple factors have contributed to a disjointed process that monitors candidates' advancement through completion. Specialty programs have collected and assessed student evidence and analyzed the data to respond to feedback on SPA reports. Many programs have engaged in multiple years of responses to conditions (or probation) on SPA feedback reports. Further, turnover of faculty and leadership have contributed to a lack of assessments to monitor individual candidates and use the resulting data to inform continuous improvement. While the Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education programs do not yet systematically monitor individual candidates progress, EPP faculty, in conjunction with Student Services, do routine checks on candidate preparedness via the applications for advanced practicum and internship

experiences. In the Secondary Education program, all assessment analysis has been done based on completers at the time of their completion. Therefore, candidates have not been systematically monitored as they progress through the program beyond their passing of courses. Furthermore, at the end of every academic year, faculty in each program compile the Key Assessment data and analyze it to complete the year-end report for the university. Faculty are asked to provide a summary of the data, the lessons learned, and changes planned to the application process, curriculum, clinical experiences, assessments, instruction, and program as a result of those findings. (see 5.2.2 FFR [various reports])

In response to the questions regarding clarification on the meaning of a NB grade. A no basis (NB) grade may be used when the student has not attended, or there is insufficient student progress and attendance for evaluation to occur. No credit is awarded, nor is NB calculated in the GPA. However, this grade may be used to determine satisfactory academic progress for purposes of federal financial aid. No credit is a permanent grade and may not be used to substitute for the incomplete grade. It cannot be removed later by completing outstanding work. Earning an NB grade in a retaken course will not replace the grade previously earned. Faculty must submit a last date of attendance in conjunction with this grade.

Selection at Completion

SPA reports submitted on September 15, 2017, have been reviewed. Early Childhood (2 programs) and Secondary Education-English received National Recognized designations. (January 20, 2018)

Program Name	Degree	Draft	SPA	Option	Form View	Deadline	Last Update	Program Report		Final Report		Final Decision
								Previous	Current	Previous	Current	
Educational Leadership (M. Ed. - principal) (Revised)	MA	1	ELCC	A	1	8/16/2017 11:50:49 PM EDT	06/15/2017 EST	1	03/15/2017	1	03/15/2017	Recognized w/ condition
Educational Leadership: Principal (post-graduate certificate) (Revised)	SP	1	ELCC	A	1	8/16/2017 11:50:49 PM EDT	06/15/2017 EST	1	03/15/2017	1	03/15/2017	Recognized w/ condition
Early Childhood Education (baccalaureate) (Response to Conditions)	BA	1	NAEYC	A	1	8/16/2017 11:50:49 PM EDT	06/15/2017 EST	1	03/15/2017	1	03/15/2017	Recognized
Early Childhood Education - Post Baccalaureate (Response to Conditions)	PB	1	NAEYC	A	1	8/16/2017 11:50:49 PM EDT	06/15/2017 EST	1	03/15/2017	1	03/15/2017	Recognized
English/Language Arts (MAT - secondary) (Response to Conditions)	MA	1	NCTE	A	1	8/16/2017 11:50:49 PM EDT	06/15/2017 EST	1	03/15/2017	1	03/15/2017	Recognized

SPA Status & Review Feedback			
Program	SPA	Final Decision	Next Submission Date
Early Childhood Education (BA)	NAEYC	Recognized	03/15/22

Early Childhood Education (Post-BA)	NAEYC	Recognized	03/15/22
Early Childhood – Special Education	CEC	Recognized	03/15/22
Elementary Education (BA)	ACEI	Not Recognized <i>-Standards alignment</i> <i>-Additional analysis needed</i>	03/15/22
Elementary Education (Post-BA)	ACEI	Not Recognized <i>-Standards alignment</i> <i>-Additional analysis needed</i>	03/15/22
Secondary Education - English	NCTE	Recognized	03/15/22
Secondary Education – Social Studies	NCSS	Further Development Needed <i>-Standards alignment</i> <i>-Data need to be disaggregated</i> <i>-SPA directions need to be followed</i> <i>-Analysis needed</i>	09/15/17 <i>Not submitted</i>
Secondary Education - Mathematics	NCTM	Not Recognized <i>-Standards alignment</i> <i>-SPA directions need to be followed</i> <i>-Standards need to be disaggregated within rubric</i>	03/15/22
Secondary Education - Science	NSTA	Not Recognized <i>-Standards alignment</i> <i>-Standards need to be disaggregated within rubric</i> <i>-Data need to be disaggregated</i>	03/15/22
Secondary Education – World Languages	ACTFL	Recognized w/Conditions <i>-Standards alignment</i>	09/15/17 <i>Not submitted</i>
Special Education – Graduate Certification	CEC	Recognized	03/15/22

Before the EPP recommends completing candidates for licensure or certification, the following is documented to demonstrate that candidates have reached a high standard of content knowledge in their respective field of study:

- Praxis II scores document candidates' content knowledge.
- In analyzing aggregated data, each program uses the Key Assessment from SPA standards to determine how candidates met or exceeded expectations. Program data suggests that candidates are well prepared in their understanding and application of content knowledge.
 - The Early Childhood program, in reviewing data from 2015-2016, observed that the majority of candidates were exceeding expectations across the three assessments; therefore, this was the impetus for comprehensive revision to the assessments and differentiation between levels of expectations. As with most programs, information has been collected and reported for SPA reports; however, the EPP does not have a systematic way in which programs regularly analyze and make decisions about the data.
 - Expectations of the profession, including code of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies are addressed through each program of study. Candidates in the Early Childhood program sign a contract that states expectations, codes of ethics, and professional behavior throughout the program before each field placement. No formal measures assess dispositions or current understandings of professional behavior, although EC students demonstrate knowledge in several program-level Key Assessments, including #6, the Professional Action Plan.
 - In order to receive a passing grade in Advanced Internship, candidates in the Special Education program must demonstrate that they have met at least 90% of the competencies based on the CEC Standards. Data collected on these competencies are: intern self-assessments and reflections (including dispositions and Alaska Cultural Standards), mentor teacher evaluations (including dispositions), university supervisor evaluations (including dispositions), Key Assessments, and internship assignments that are all scored with a rubric aligned with the CEC and InTASC Standards (ISTE soon to come) and uploaded to the student's ePortfolio. After completion of the program, students are asked to complete an alumni survey that looks at how well the EPP program prepared them for their position. Data from SPA assessments is analyzed at the conclusion of each academic year. When preparing the SSR, EPP faculty noted that previous approaches to the scoring of assessments limited the conclusions that could be made from analysis of available data.

Program Impact

Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development

The EPP collected district teacher evaluation plans from five focus districts with enrollment representing 64% of the Alaska student population to help inform understanding of how our completers might be evaluated in the future. Use of these plans to assess completers' impact on

student development was limited because EPP faculty were not involved in developing any of the districts' plans, data collection, or analysis. Their access to the data was indirect when district personnel responded to surveys.

Of the plans collected, three were based on Danielson Framework for Teaching, one on Marzano Teaching Framework and one on the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model with a mix of the Danielson and Marzano frameworks. EPP faculty analyzed the plans to see which approaches had been adopted, to note how data was collected, and to consider whether candidates' introduction to these approaches might be supported by EPP programs. EPP faculty also considered whether the processes internal to their respective programs and the DTL supported candidates' development as reflective practitioners who can use whatever system their district requires for teacher evaluation and assessment of a teacher's impact on student development.

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

The EPP collects data on completer effectiveness throughout a cycle, which is defined as an academic year, i.e., a summer session, and a fall and spring semester. Data are compared between cycles and among EPP licensure programs, which provides trend data and triangulation across cycles. The EPP has collected data on completer effectiveness in applying the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that their professional preparation experiences were designed to achieve through four assessments as follows.

Throughout their programs, candidates are observed by their mentor teachers and by their university supervisors using assessment instruments based on the Alaska Beginning Teacher Standards, the Alaska Cultural Standards, and relevant SPA standards. These instruments are program-specific and have not undergone reliability or validity checks. Data from these assessments are included in the EPP faculty's decision about whether the candidate will be awarded the Institutional Recommendation for Alaska Teacher Certification. The criteria for success are descriptors that are arranged by level from 1 for lack of achievement to 5 for achievement that exceeds expectations. (Observation Documents) [1.1.12] EPP faculty designed these instruments, and they continually review them as well as the assessment process to improve their usefulness. One goal is to develop a rigorous process for establishing the validity and reliability of the observation instruments. See SSR-Addendum Standard 5 for the use of observation tools.

In the interview, Alumni were asked first about how they measured student growth (see Results from 4.1) and how they used that data. Second, they were given the prompt, "Tell us how you measure your level of effectiveness as a teacher." The responses came from a total of 10 participants that graduated in 2013, 2014, or 2015, were in their 2nd, 3rd, or 4th year teaching and came from one of the four programs. Respondents included 1 Early Childhood, 0 Elementary, 7 Secondary, and 2 SPED alumni; because the participation numbers were so low, results were not separated out by programs. Six were in their 2nd year of teaching, 2 in their 3rd year of teaching, and 2 in their 4th year of teaching.

The first question we analyzed for this standard was around how alumni used student growth data. While all alumni grasped the concept of data-informed instruction, only some seemed to understand this was a fundamental requirement for professional practice, commenting on using the data to make instructional decisions (i.e., if they needed to re-teach or re-visit a concept, if they could move on, etc.) and inform lesson planning "to help every child meet their potential" (interview response, x/x/17). One respondent gave a single use of the data: grading. Other responses to this question included using the data for everything from looking at student progress to making small groups to deciding which interventions might need to be put into place. The SpEd teachers in particular mentioned needing the data for IEPs. Three spoke of using the data to interact with and inform parents.

The question around how one measures her or his level of effectiveness elicited varied responses. Several alumni initially commented off-the-cuff that if their students were making progress (on the standards) and showing growth, they must be doing something right, making an explicit connection between student success and teacher effectiveness. Others mentioned looking at social, emotional growth and student attitudes, such as if the students were working hard, coming to class, were engaged during instruction, were comfortable asking questions, or were proud of their work, it is evident "they are doing something right" (interview response, x/x/17). Alumni also described looking for feedback from multiple sources; they found it in weekly assignments that showed where students were confused vs. proficient; during discussions with parents (the more communication they saw, the better things seemed to be going); during team meetings with colleagues; and informal observations completed by administrators, as in the Danielson Framework. In one exemplary case, an alumnus said he does everything from keeping a notebook that he consults to see what worked and what didn't work that year before, to speaking with parents and the students' counselors to getting feedback from his students, to paying attention to information from his district-wide evaluation system. (See 4.0.12)

The EPP collected data on completers' effectiveness by administering a NEXT Survey. This instrument has published values for validity and reliability. With this Survey, Alumni were prompted, "Tell us how you measure your level of effectiveness as a teacher." The responses came from a total of 54 participants, who were alumni that graduated either in 2014 or 2016 from one of the four programs. Responses included 10 Early Childhood alumni from 2014 and 15 from 2016; 7 Elementary alumni from 2014 and three from 2016; 10 Secondary alumni from 2014 and eight from 2016; and 1 SPED alumnus from 2014 and 0 from 2016.

As a whole, alumni indicated that they use self-reflection (reviewing lesson plans, teaching methods and notes about what worked or could use improvement), feedback from their principals, student feedback (surveys, exit slip questions, and evaluating student growth and engagement), test scores, rates of parental involvement, and SBARs. They also reflected on their relationships with students, classroom management skills, and examined their growth across the year.

Alumni were prompted, "Tell us how you measure your level of effectiveness as a teacher." The responses came from a total of 54 participants, who were alumni that graduated either in 2014 or 2016 from one of the four programs. This included 10 Early Childhood alumni from 2014 and 15

from 2016; 7 Elementary alumni from 2014 and three from 2016; 10 Secondary alumni from 2014 and eight from 2016; and 1 SPED alumnus from 2014 and 0 from 2016.

As a whole, alumni indicated that they use self-reflection (reviewing lesson plans, teaching methods and notes about what worked or could use improvement), feedback from their principals, student feedback (like on surveys, exit slip questions and by evaluating student growth and engagement), test scores, rates of parental involvement, and SBARs. They also reflected on their relationships with students, classroom management skills, and examined their growth across the year.

The fourth instrument for collecting data on completers' effectiveness was the NEXT Employer Survey. It is also an instrument with published values for reliability and validity. Employers were asked, "Do you feel your EPP graduates effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions of a high-quality teacher? How so or why not?" The responses came from a total of 44 participants. Those employers were principals of EPP graduates from 2014 and 2016, across four programs, including 15 Early Childhood graduates from 2014 and seven from 2016; 10 Elementary graduates from 2014 and one from 2016; 7 Secondary graduates from 2014 and three from 2016; and 1 SPED graduate from 2014 and 0 from 2016.

As a whole, principals indicated by and large that in most cases, completers were effectively applying the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of an effective or quality teacher. They cited evidence of this by commenting on their level of professionalism, ability to reflect and seek out assistance when needed, and ability to keep track of learning targets and display effective classroom management. They were enthusiastic and positive. As one shared, "Yes, and the fact that 7 of 9 elementary schools are XXX grades is because they have professional attitudes, they are motivated to be here, and they offer diversity at our small school, which requires greater responsibility than a traditional school." (survey response)

Some agreed but issued caveats. For example, one commented, "I think the XXX graduates have foundational skills and if they are really into teaching they are of a high caliber teacher" (survey response). Another commented that the completer had the potential to be strong but did not seek help. In some cases, principals commented that completers were not effective because they could not handle the number of responsibilities their classroom demanded or they were wrapped up in their issues. One stated that the completer was not ready to be an effective public school teacher but that, "I truly believe that it was the student and not the teaching program at XXX" (survey response).

The EPP will link the success criteria for completers' effective application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions to the development of preservice candidates and the documents used to determine, through academic and non-academic factors, their readiness to enter the profession.

To ensure our completers are effective teachers, we need to start by making sure that as an EPP, we are helping them become reflective practitioners who know what it means to act professionally, create relationships with students, use instructional techniques that are engaging, and assess and document student learning. These areas need to be infused in our coursework and

modeled in our teaching. We also need to explicitly ask completers, "How are you going to solicit feedback from students and families around your effectiveness?" Further, we must work with completers to use the Via Watermark system to document their ongoing learning once they enter the profession.

To be responsive, we must also continuously seek out feedback from our stakeholders. To do that, we will first continue to keep up our databases that track our completers and where they work so that we have a comprehensive sample. We will work with districts to find out how our completers are doing, administering the NExT survey to employers of completers one and three years out. Given that the survey has undergone rigorous validity and reliability testing by common metrics, we believe this is an appropriate measure.

Additionally, we plan to continue using the NExT survey with alumni one and three years after graduation. To further help develop reflective practitioner skills, we plan to adjust and deploy the Beginning Teacher's Views of Self Questionnaire (BTVoS Questionnaire), developed by Gerald Mager.

Currently, state and local officials are unable to provide disaggregated student assessment data to the EPP. This lack of a basis for correlating completers' professional practice with student development is the result of privacy concerns and absence of an articulated system through which students' levels of growth might be measured in a fashion that would allow results to be compared across EPP completers and licensure areas.

The EPP is unable to provide valid and reliable data on employment milestones such as promotion and retention. According to Alaska Statute 14.20.149(h) (which describes employee evaluation), teachers', administrators', and special service providers' evaluations are not and will not be public record. However, EPP faculty have found that employers can talk anecdotally about their employees and complete outside evaluations.

The process for the award of tenure is detailed in Alaska Statute 14.20.150 (see 4.3.1). Teachers are awarded this after three years + 1 day of continuous employment in a district, assuming they have a valid teaching certificate and have met district standards. This information is not publicly accessible at this time. Data on promotion, retention, and dismissal of specific teachers are also not publicly accessible at this time. However, one can look teachers up to see if they are continually employed, as well as whether they have initial, professional, and administrative licenses.

While the State of Alaska is reluctant to release employment information, the EPP collected its data by going directly to principals, who serve as the primary supervisors for our completers. The employment survey that was previously administered was discontinued as of 2012. However, a survey was sent out in 2016 (Employer Survey #1), which used a three-point scale (very well, somewhat, not at all) to evaluate items such as whether completers maintained professional and ethical attitudes, responded positively to cultural differences, created learning communities that included all voices, and the like. Employers also answered two open-ended questions about areas that were overlooked or recommendations for improvement, as well as two

questions that documented how often they observed their completers and how they gathered information. (see 4.0.9)

Additionally, data were collected through the administration of a more reliable and comprehensive survey, which was sent out in May-June of 2017 (NExT Employer Survey). This survey focused on instructional practices, professionalism, diverse learners, learning environments, and overall satisfaction. (see 4.0.6.5)

We did not choose to look at rates of tenure, which are often seen as markers of satisfied employers since the majority of our target audience were pre-tenure (one is eligible only after starting the fourth year). Because of confidentiality laws, we also were not privy to information on those who were not re-hired and why, which could have signaled a less-than-satisfied employer.

To make sure employers are satisfied with our completers, we must continue to systematically engage in data collection and conversation with our district partners and principals. While the NExT Employer Survey received a good response rate and provided an abundance of data on a variety of items, and will continue to be administered similarly as this year, our understanding of how our completers are doing would be strengthened by triangulating the data using a second collection approach. To accomplish this, EPP faculty created a semi-structured interview protocol that was piloted in Fall 2016 and is ready to be implemented with principals of completers in their second and fourth years of teaching (see document #). This approach should allow for more follow-up questions to be asked, will appeal to those who prefer quick conversations over written surveys, and will capture the performance of those not being evaluated through the survey. Developing a more comprehensive Memorandum Of Agreement with the five focus districts which enroll 64% of the state's students should help ensure this is done successfully.

We also need to make sure we share the results with EPP faculty at the program and college levels. It's important to recognize the areas we are doing well in, particularly those that reflect what we value. For example, the items "The graduate responds positively to cultural differences" and "Acts as an advocate for all students" are two areas we as an EPP feel strongly about, and it is satisfying to see that those values are visible to their employers.

Standard 5 Program Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

Quality and Strategic Evaluation

The College of Education recognizes that the quality assurance system has struggled with producing valid and reliable data that leads to comprehensive program improvement. The self-study revealed a need to address the data collection, assessment and analysis method of candidate and completer work samples. During the 2007 NCATE Accreditation Review, the EPP developed a data collection and report platform referred to as PeTAL. This platform pulled data from a variety of other data warehouses and provided a place for data collection and document storage. Over time, the self-assessment revealed that the data contained with the

PeTAL system was neither reliable nor valid, prompting us to explore newer and more robust systems. Further, TaskStream, the web-based platform used to collect each program's Key Assessment data, was abandoned for the ePortfolio Digication. In January 2018, the EPP signed an agreement with Via by Watermark (formally, LiveText) to provide data collection, storage, and analytics for the EPP's on-going program improvement. The EPP and Watermark will work during Spring 2018 to build and implement the assessment platform.

Each program prepared its SPA report from the data housed in PeTAL, TaskStream and the ePortfolio (Digication). Academic Year 2017-2018 has the EPP taking on two new systems for Quality Assurance. First, Watermark is the new brand developed through the merger of TaskStream, TK20, and LiveText. Second, the EPP has signed a formal MOU with the University's Institutional Research Department for gathering and reporting data beyond program course work (i.e., Praxis, Alaska State Department of Education and Early Development, grades, demographics, etc.). Furthermore, the EPP has contracted with ISER (Institute for Social and Economic Research) to conduct alumni and employer satisfaction assessment using the NeXT Survey Tool. As noted in Standard 4, the NeXT Survey Tool has published reliability and validity scores.

Each program prepares an Annual Assessment Report that is submitted to the Dean and Office of Academic Affairs through a SharePoint site hosted by the university's Institutional Research Department. The programs respond to the following questions:

- Did the program implement any changes this year based on past assessment results? If so, what were they and why were they made?
- Do you have any new information about how well past improvements have worked?
- Please list the Program Student Learning Outcomes your program assessed this academic year.
- Describe the process, including the collection of data, analysis of data, and faculty conversations around the findings.
- What are the findings and what do they tell the faculty about student learning in your program?
- Based on the findings, did the faculty make any recommendations for program improvement? Please describe.
- What would you like to highlight about your assessment process?
- Please describe any challenges with the assessment process.

The EPP's Conceptual Framework includes four elements: ground in the EPP's our Motto, our Mission Statement, four Core Values, and a Vision Statement, are all stated on the web site, Home Page. Our Motto is "Preparing Educators to Transform Lives," and the Mission Statement elaborates on that, clearly establishing our unique context: "We prepare educators and support the lifelong learning of professionals to embrace diversity and to be intellectually and ethically strong, resilient, and passionate in their work with Alaska's learners, families, and communities."

With the Core Values, we affirm that we are a community of educators dedicated to improving the quality of education and preparing educators to transform lives. Through innovative teaching, research, service, and leadership, we strive for and model:

- **Intellectual Vitality:** Professional educators examine diverse perspectives, engage in research and scholarship, contribute to knowledge and practice, and apply innovations in technology.
- **Collaborative Spirit:** Professional educators generate, welcome, and support the collaborative relationships and partnerships that enrich peoples' lives.
- **Inclusiveness and Equity:** Professional educators create and advocate for learning communities that advance knowledge and ensure the development, support, and inclusion of peoples' abilities, values, ideas, languages, and expressions.
- **Leadership:** Professional educators are committed to the highest standards of ethical behavior in their roles, using professional expertise to improve the communities in which they live and work, and demonstrating the ability to translate theories and principles into transformative educational practice.

Our Vision for the EPP describes our aspirations for the future and elaborates on how we plan to meet them.

Provide direction that inspires learning, informs the state's educational policy and research agendas, and addresses the challenges of Alaska; call upon diverse cultural knowledge, values, and ways of learning and viewing the world, especially those of Alaska Natives, to promote the intellectual, creative, social, emotional, and physical development of educators, learners, families, and communities; contribute to educators' understanding of development and learning from childhood through maturity and respond to the challenges of providing learning across the lifespan; transform the beliefs and practices of educators, families, and communities to address the wide spectrum of human abilities in compassionate and innovative ways; prepare educators with the appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the judicious use of technology to enhance learning; focus relentlessly on student learning; and engage in dynamic partnerships with the university, community groups, and urban and rural educators to improve the quality of education in Alaska.

While outcomes are not formally measured against the Conceptual Framework, we are continually guided by it and make decisions that support designing programs that reflect it. A clear example is the current work described above to adopt a system for collection and analysis of data that is more user-friendly and enables us to maintain a connection with completers several years into their professional practice.

Special Education is the only program that currently measures professional dispositions. The EPP is engaged in reviewing and developing a tool to measure the development of professional dispositions in candidates. The EPP has adopted the ND Common Metrics-Student Teacher Observation Tool (STOT) from the North Dakota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Elementary Education is currently piloting the use of the tool. This assessment is

based on the ten national standards of effective practice for new teachers (InTASC). Standards 1-3 address The Learner and Learning. Standards 4-5 address Content Knowledge. Standards 6-8 address Instructional Practice. Standards 9-10 address Professional Responsibility. The ND Common Metrics-Student Teacher Observation Tool (STOT) was chosen as a common assessment across initial programs because it was aligned to the InTASC standards and it has an accompanying reliability and validity study. The EPP also considered the fact that UAF has adopted the instrument for use.

Formally, only university clinical faculty use the formal observation documents (program - developed and the STOT [piloting]) as a formative and summative assessment. The STOT tool being piloted is shared with the school-based clinical faculty, and they are asked for feedback on each criterion. Interns also fill one out informally as a self-evaluation. University clinical faculty compile the feedback from the self-evaluations and the school-based clinical faculty and compare it to the university clinical faculty observations to complete the formal evaluation. There are differences of opinion among faculty whether school-based clinical faculty should use formal observation documents to provide feedback on intern progress or to even formally evaluate interns at all. This topic is scheduled to be addressed by the Department of Teaching and Learning (initial programs) shortly.

Summative Clinical Data (1.1.12, 1.1.12a) – The summative clinical data is from the internship summative evaluations (SPA Assessment #4). This data reflects the specific instrument used by each program. The data was retroactively cross-walked with the InTASC Standards (Matrix 1.1.12a). The Elementary Education program instrument is aligned to the ACEI and Alaska Beginning Teacher Standards. The Early Childhood Education program summative data comes from the summative three-way conference -- the candidate, school-based clinical faculty, and the university clinical faculty -- and is aligned to the NAEYC and the Alaska Beginning Teacher Standards. The Secondary Education program clinical evaluation summative data is aligned to specific Specialty Professional Association (SPA) standards and the Alaska Beginning Teacher Standards. Special Education is aligned to CEC and Alaska Beginning Teacher Standards

Continuous Improvement

Interim Dean Initiatives

The EPP has a clear structure and process for engaging in the work of continuous improvement. The Director of Accreditation and Assessment (DAA) position serves to coordinate the quality assurance system, the development of ongoing and new partnerships, data management, and a resource to faculty as they engage in program improvement. The Accreditation and Assessment Committee further supports the work of the DAA to ensure the EPP actively participates in a formal and regular continuous improvement cycle that uses data to inform program improvement.

The newly-formed Community Advisory Council will meet twice yearly to provide input on teacher preparation programs. The Community Advisory Council consists of site- and district-

based educational leaders, lead teachers, and community partners. The EPP is also forming stakeholder groups that will engage in an ongoing review of processes, procedures and data analysis to support program improvement. The EPP previously solicited feedback from candidates, completers, and employers through an Alumni and Employer Satisfaction survey developed by EPP faculty for the NCATE accreditation visit in 2007.

WebCrawl is a three-part initiative focused on updating EPP website and handbooks. Several staff members attended training to develop their skills and knowledge in the maintenance and enhancement of the EPP website. Staff members working with EPP leadership and faculty will work together to provide relevant and current content for the website.

Massive Update Project (MUP) is a multi-step project to update all internal handbooks, flyers and website information.

Systemizing All Business (SAB) is a multi-step project to systemize the policies and procedures within the EPP. Over the past three years, the EPP Dean's office has created a document that provides step by step instructions on all EPP processes, policies and business. EPP leadership, faculty and staff will use this document to make consistent decisions.