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I. EPP Overview

a. Context and Unique Characteristics

The University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) is the state's largest post-secondary institution. It is a Major Administrative Unit (MAU) within the University of Alaska statewide system that includes the Anchorage Campus located in the heart of Alaska's largest city and community campuses located in the Kenai Peninsula Borough, the Matanuska-Susitna Valley, on Kodiak Island, and within the City of Valdez.

The mission of the University of Alaska Anchorage is to discover and disseminate knowledge through teaching, research, engagement and creative expression. Located in Anchorage and on community campuses in Southcentral Alaska, UAA is committed to serving the higher education needs of the state, its communities, and its diverse peoples. UAA is an open-access university with academic programs leading to occupational endorsements; undergraduate and graduate certificates; and associate, baccalaureate and graduate degrees in a rich, diverse and inclusive environment.

The UAA mission recognizes the university’s commitment to instruction at a number of academic levels, the success of all students regardless of their higher education goals, and service to the diverse peoples and communities of the state. It honors the community college and the baccalaureate, graduate and research roots of the institution.

Five core themes for UAA further define the mission and align with the five priorities of the UAA Strategic Plan 2017. These core themes are:

- Teaching and Learning
- Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity
- Student Success
- UAA Community
- Public Square

UAA is fully accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. Additionally, many of the academic programs are individually accredited through professional licensure organizations. The University of Alaska Anchorage is an open-access public university committed to serving students and the state of Alaska.

b. Description of Organizational Structure

Over the past several years, the College of Education (EPP) has experienced a great deal of administrative and faculty turnover, and reduction. Additionally, in 2013, departments within the EPP were functionally dissolved through the removal of department chair positions. In the following years, the EPP was in a constant state of restructuring. In April 2015, the EPP experienced a Dean change with the intent to bring stability to the organization. Over the next two years policies, procedures, and processes have been reviewed, revised and implemented that have brought cohesiveness, coherence, congruence, clarity, and connectedness. The EPP has reinstated a department structure for Initial Programs and Advanced Programs [See 5.3.2]. In addition, the Standard Rules and Practices Committee engaged in an
extensive review and revision of the EPP Governance Handbook, bringing further alignment between the structure and function of the organization.

The EPP Academic Leadership Council (ALC) is the conduit for addressing internal and external factors that impact the EPP. The ALC consists of:

Dean
Fiscal Manager
Director of Accreditation and Assessment
Chair - Department of Teaching and Learning, Program Lead - Elementary Education
Chair - Department of Graduate Studies in Education and Leadership
Field Placement Coordinator
Professional Programs Coordinator
Program Lead - Speech Language Pathology
Program Lead - Early Childhood Education
Program Lead - Secondary Education
Office of Indigenous Education - Faculty Member

c. Vision, Mission, and Goals

MOTTO
Preparing Educators to Transform Lives

MISSION

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.

VISION

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:

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, in order 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 in order to address the wide spectrum of human abilities in compassionate and innovative ways;

prepare educators with 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.

d. EPP's Shared Values and Beliefs for Educator Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTELLECTUAL VITALITY: Professional educators examine diverse perspectives, engage in research and scholarship, contribute to knowledge and practice, and apply innovations in technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLABORATIVE SPIRIT: Professional educators generate, welcome, and support the collaborative relationships and partnerships that enrich peoples' lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Is the EPP regionally or institutionally accredited?
   - Yes
   - No. the EPP is ineligible for regional/institutional accreditation or such accreditation is not available
EPP is regionally or institutionally accredited

a. If your institution/EPP is regionally accredited, please upload a PDF copy of the award of regional accreditation here. If your institution/EPP is NOT regional accredited, please move to the next page.

Verification of Institutional Accreditation

See Attachment panel below.
a. Complete this table of program characteristics by entering the information requested for every program or
program option offered by the EPP. Cross check the list with the programs listed in the EPP’s academic catalog,
if any, as well as the list of state-approved registered programs, if applicable. Site Visitors will reference this list
in AIMS during the accreditation review process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program/specialty area</th>
<th>Enrollment in current fall cycle</th>
<th>Enrollment in last fall cycle</th>
<th>Degree, certificate or licensure level</th>
<th>Method of Delivery</th>
<th>State(s) which program is approved</th>
<th>Date of state approval(s)</th>
<th>Program Review Option (National Recognition, state-only, or Program Review with Feedback)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education- Post-Bac</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Initial Licensure</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>09/16/2005</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education- Baccalaureate</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Initial Licensure</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>01/07/2003</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood - Special Education (MED)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Initial Licensure</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>09/16/2005</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education - Post-Bac</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Initial Licensure</td>
<td>Face-to-Face and Distance</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>09/16/2005</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education - Baccalaureate</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Initial Licensure</td>
<td>Face-to-Face and Distance</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>08/23/2001</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education - Graduate Certificate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Initial Licensure</td>
<td>Face-to-Face and Distance</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>09/25/2006</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education - English/Language Arts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Initial Licensure</td>
<td>Face-to-Face and Distance</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>10/19/1967</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education - General Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Initial Licensure</td>
<td>Face-to-Face and Distance</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>10/19/1967</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education - Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initial Licensure</td>
<td>Face-to-Face and Distance</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>10/19/1967</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education - Music Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Initial Licensure</td>
<td>Face-to-Face and Distance</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>10/19/1967</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education - Physical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initial Licensure</td>
<td>Face-to-Face and Distance</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>10/19/1967</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education - Social Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Initial Licensure</td>
<td>Face-to-Face and Distance</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>10/19/1967</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education - World Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Initial Licensure</td>
<td>Face-to-Face and Distance</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>10/19/1967</td>
<td>National Recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. EPP Characteristics

Complete a table of EPP characteristics in AIMS to provide an expanded profile by which the accreditation process is managed by CAEP staff. EPP characteristics are also used by CAEP staff in compiling CAEP’s Annual Report to the public and used as a series of filters for dashboard comparison by the EPP itself. The AIMS version of this table, in which the data are actually entered, has drop-down menus by which characteristics are selected and the table is completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control of Institution</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Body</td>
<td>Coed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Class</td>
<td>Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Preparation Levels</td>
<td>Currently offering initial teacher preparation programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Currently offering advanced educator preparation programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP Type</td>
<td>Institution of Higher Education: State/Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliations</td>
<td>Undenominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Instruction</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Accreditation (Affiliations)</td>
<td>Northwestern Association of Schools and Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Clinical Educator Qualification Table

a. The clinical educator (EPP faculty & supervisors) qualifications table is completed by providing information for each of the EPP-based clinical educators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Highest degree earned</th>
<th>Field or specialty area of highest degree</th>
<th>Program Assignment (s)</th>
<th>Program Assignment or role within the program(s)</th>
<th>Teaching assignment or role within the program(s)</th>
<th>P-12 certificates or licenses held</th>
<th>P-12 experiences including teaching or administration dates of engagement in these roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Leah</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Term Assistant Professor</td>
<td>TX- Standard Educator Certificate-Principal, EC-12 Secondary Science Composite, 6-12 ESL Supplemental, 6-12</td>
<td>Assistant Principal April 2009-January 2014 Secondary Science Teacher 2002-2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunsen, Teresa</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>TX-Teacher Initial</td>
<td>Special Education Teacher 1983-1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huff, Gregory</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>MAT-Secondary Education</td>
<td>Adjunct Instructor</td>
<td>AK-Professional Teacher Certificate Secondary Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinavey, Erin</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>Early Childhood Special Education</td>
<td>Special Education/Early Childhood Special Education</td>
<td>Term Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Teacher-Initial</td>
<td>Early Childhood Department Director 2003-2005 Disabilities/Behavioral Health Coordinator 2000-2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Certification/Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mueller, Michael</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Science Education and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>MAT-Secondary Education, Professor, Post-Bacc Initial Teacher Certificate-AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohle, Kathryn</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Early Childhood, Intervention and Literacy</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education, Assistant Professor, Early Childhood Education Pre-K-2, Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>Certificate- MA Elementary Education Teacher Certificate K to 6-NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Childhood/Elementary Education Pre-K-2, Teacher Certificate- MA Elementary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Certificate K to 6-NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Childhood/Elementary Education Pre-K-2, Teacher Certificate- MA Elementary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Marc</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Early Childhood/Elementary Education, Assistant Professor, Type A- AK Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Certificate, Elementary Ed. K-8 Type B- AK Administrative Certificate K-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1996-1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roth, Karen</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>Adult Education/Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education, Term Assistant Professor, AK- Professional Teacher Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA-K-8 Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kindergarten Teacher 1995-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow, Peter</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>Early Childhood/Elementary Education-Kenai Campus, Term Assistant Professor, NM-Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary Teacher 1997-1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeney, Christopher</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Secondary-Music</td>
<td>MAT-Secondary Education, Professor, NM, FL-Teacher Certification&amp; Licensure, AK-Special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education Teacher Certificate HI-Special Education Teaching Certificate NJ-Teacher of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blind and Visually Impaired Teaching Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Band Director High School/Elementary 1990-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, Cynthia</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Special Education, Assistant Professor, Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education Teacher 2004-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upload the clinical educator qualifications table, if not provided in the previous table.
Table 5. The Parity Table

*a. The parity table of curricular, fiscal, facility, and administrative and support capacity for quality is used to satisfy requirements of the U.S. Department of Education and is completed by providing data relevant for the EPP and making a comparison to an EPP-determined comparative entity. The comparative entity might be another clinical EPP within a university structure, a national organization, the college or university as a whole or another entity identified as a benchmark by the EPP. Again, this chart offers an example of how the chart might be completed.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Dimension</th>
<th>EPP description of metric(s)</th>
<th>EPP data</th>
<th>Comparative entity data</th>
<th>Title and description of supplemental evidence/documentation of quality for each dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Number of dedicated areas</td>
<td>FY 16 Unrestricted Auth Budget $5,865,426; less FY16 Non-General Fund $3,272,980 = FY16 General Fund Auth Budget $2,592,446</td>
<td>Three (3) videoconference classrooms, two (2) classrooms, one (1) computer lab, thirty-one (31) faculty and staff offices</td>
<td>UAA campus map; PSB Building Map (location on campus where the EPP is located)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY17 Adjustments ($252,299) = FY17 General Fund Auth Budget $2,340,147</td>
<td>Total FY17 Unrestricted Budget $5,690,897</td>
<td>UAF campus map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Support</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>FY Initial Unrestricted (F16) budget (initial GF + FY17 revenue projections) : $3,668,900</td>
<td>Overview of Budgets for UAA College of Education (EPP) and UAF School of Education</td>
<td>See 5.0.1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>Organizational Chart</td>
<td>Dean, Assistant to the Dean, Fiscal Officer, Administrative Assistant (3), Grant Coordinator, Director of Accreditation and Assessment, Instructional Designer (1), Department Chairs (2), Program Leads (8),</td>
<td>Dean, Assistant to the Dean, Fiscal Officer, Administrative Assistant, Program Chairs, Faculty</td>
<td>Organizational Chart for EPP and UAF School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate support services</td>
<td>Student Services Office and Faculty Advisors</td>
<td>Academic Success Coordinators (3), Placement &amp; Certification Coordinator (1), Graduate Student Advisors (2)</td>
<td>Program Advisors - 4 Certification Specialists- 2 Internship Coordinator- 1 Placement coordinator- 2 Post-bac coordinator- 1 IT Technician-1</td>
<td>Table of Student Services for EPP and UAF School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate feedback, formal and informal</td>
<td>University and EPP surveys/evaluations/interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>UAF course evaluations, completer surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| UAA course evaluation (IDEA), Completer Surveys (EPP development and NExT Survey) | Course Evaluations of for EPP are completed the IDEA. [https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/academics/faculty-services/idea](https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/academics/faculty-services/idea) Aggregated data is not provided  

Course evaluations for UAF School of Education are completed through eXplorance Blue. [https://uaf.edu/provost/blue/](https://uaf.edu/provost/blue/) Aggregated data is not provided  

Formal complaints are handled through the Dean of Students for the EPP and through the Provost Office for UAF School of Education.[https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/students/dean-of-students/student-complaint-dispute/academic-dispute-resolution-processes.cshtml](https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/students/dean-of-students/student-complaint-dispute/academic-dispute-resolution-processes.cshtml)  

[https://www.uaf.edu/provost/academic-appeals](https://www.uaf.edu/provost/academic-appeals)  

Complete Surveys for EPP are described in Standards 4 and 5 |
### Table 6. Accreditation Plan

a. The Accreditation Plan is an educator preparation provider's (EPP's) identification of the sites outside of the main campus or administrative headquarters and the programs offered at each site that will be included in the EPP's accreditation review. This information, in combination with the table of program characteristics, is used by CAEP staff and site visit team leads to plan the site visit, including the sites that will be visited by site team members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Site(s) administered by the EPP</th>
<th>Program offered at each site</th>
<th>Is the program to be included in accreditation review? (Y or N)</th>
<th>Is the program approved by state in which program is offered? (Y or N or approval not required)</th>
<th>Notes/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. EPP Assessments

Please list proprietary assessments used by the EPP (no more than 7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proprietary Assessment No.</th>
<th>Title of Assessment</th>
<th>Validity &amp; Reliability information if available &amp; applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.1</td>
<td>NExT Survey</td>
<td>TTS 2017 Validity and Reliability for Report Supervisor Survey Validity and Reliability 2017 Exit Survey validity reliability for report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.2</td>
<td>PRAXIS</td>
<td>ETS How and Why Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.3</td>
<td>Alumni and Employer Surveys (UAA Institute of Social and Economic Research)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please map above proprietary assessments to the appropriate CAEP Standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proprietary Assessment No.</th>
<th>CAEP Standard 1</th>
<th>CAEP Standard 2</th>
<th>CAEP Standard 3</th>
<th>CAEP Standard 4</th>
<th>CAEP Standard 5</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.2</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.4</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.5</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.6</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Assessment No.7</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. CAEP Standards and Evidence

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard and answer the following questions for each item.)

1. EPP Student Learning Outcomes.pdf
   1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
   1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress

2. InTASC Standards Matrix Align with Other Standard.pdf
   1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
   1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
   1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge

   1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
   1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
   1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge

4. EPP Table InTASC Standards and Representative Samples of 23 Course Syllabi.pdf
   1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
   1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
   1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
   1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.

5. InTASC Candidate Performance LL SPA Assessments
   1.1.6 InTASC Candidate Performance LL SPA Assessmentst.pdf
   1.1.6a InTASC 1 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf
   1.1.6b InTASC 2 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf
   1.1.6c InTASC 3 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf
   1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
   1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
   1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
   1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.

   1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards

7. InTASC Candidate Performance Content Knowledge SPA Assessments
   1.1.12 InTASC Candidate Performance CK SPA Assessments.pdf
   1.1.12a InTASC 4 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf
   1.1.12b InTASC 5 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf
   1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
   1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
   1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
   1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.

8. InTASC Performance of Candidates Instructional Practice SPA Assessments

9. InTASC Performance of Candidates Instructional Practice SPA Assessments
   1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
   1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
   1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
   1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Application of content and pedagogical knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Model and apply technology standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>InTASC Performance of Candidates Professional Responsibility SPA Assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Application of content and pedagogical knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Model and apply technology standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1.15 Grade Distribution of Candidates in Teacher Education.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.1.16 Completers Selected BA Education Courses Performance Ay1415 AY1617.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2.1 Key Assessment 3 to 5 data.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3.1 SPA Status Initial Programs.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Application of content and pedagogical knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Praxis II Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>Praxis II Alaska Requirements.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2a</td>
<td>Praxis II Pass Rates by Year.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Praxis II Pass Rates.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3.3 Praxis II Alaska Requirements.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Praxis II Pass Rates.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.3.2 Praxis II Pass Rates.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Understanding of InTASC Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.4.1 Summative Clinical Data.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

18 2.1.1 Effective Partnership LEAs.pdf
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
19 2.2.4 Internship Orientation Agenda AY1516.pdf
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
20 2.3.1 Program Progression Tables of EPP 2014-2016.pdf
1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
21 2.3.5 Coherence of Clinical Experiences EC EL.pdf
1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
22 GPA Data (Admitted, Enrolled, Completed)
   3.2.2 GPA Admitted Enrolled Completed.pdf
   3.2.2a GPA Admitted Enrolled Completed.pdf
   3.2.2b GPA Admitted Enrolled Completed.pdf
   3.2.2c GPA Admitted Enrolled Completed.pdf
   3.2.2d GPA Admitted Enrolled Completed.pdf
1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
1.5 Model and apply technology standards
A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities

23 3.3.2 Decision Points of EPP for Initial Programs.pdf
1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
24 Alumni Survey #2
   4.0.8 Alumni Survey #2.pdf
   4.0.8a Alumni Survery #2 Response Rates .pdf
1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
25 Employer Survey #1
   4.0.9 Employer Survey #1 .pdf
   4.0.9a Employer Survey #1 Response Rates.pdf
1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
CAEP Standard 1.1
Understanding of InTASC Standards

Overview
The appointment of an interim Dean in April 2015 served to provide stability to the EPP. Beginning the work of bringing together disjointed programs in a cohesive, coherence, and congruent manner. Thus, the EPP retroactively addressed CAEP and InTASC standards within the data individually collected by programs to address SPA requirements. To address the InTASC standards, SPA assessments were analyzed from each licensure area in order to align the assessment rubrics to the InTASC standards (See 1.1.6a, 1.1.6b, 1.1.6c). The data collected were organized based on InTASC standard alignment, program area, and academic year. Due to low enrollment in individual licensure areas in secondary education, the data collected from this program are grouped together.

Data Sources
The linked files below address the alignment of InTASC standards to the data collected by the EPP in SPA assessments. To achieve this alignment, each standard was broken down into it corresponding elements and aspects or, in some cases, entire assessments were aligned to the elements. Each standard was informed by many data points.

Area 1: Learner & Learning Data Analysis
Within InTASC Area 1, candidates scored the highest in Learner Development, followed by Learning Environment. Scores on the identified indicators remained consistent within programs through the three cycles of data. While the scores for Special Education do appear to be significantly lower than the scores in the other programs, closer analysis indicates this is not a reflection of the candidates. Instead, this is a result of a complete turnover in faculty in the last two years. Further, it suggests that all faculty across initial programs do not have a shared interpretation of the scoring levels.

Area 2: Content Data Analysis
The content area GPAs of candidates in the Early Childhood and Elementary programs were consistently higher than those of non-candidates in areas of art, literacy, science, and social studies. In the content areas of physical education and
mathematics, the program candidates' GPAs were similar to non-candidates'.

Aside from a minimal number of exceptions, all completers scored at or above the state-required level on their appropriate Praxis II test. Through the past three years, 51.80% scored at or above the national median, and 23.74% scored in the third quartile. Based on the data analyzed, candidates in the Early Childhood program score significantly higher on Praxis II tests than candidates in the EPP’s other licensure areas. However, in general, the percent of candidates passing the Praxis II has declined. The Student Services Center has implemented practice sessions to support candidate success with the Praxis II exam.

Area 3: Instructional Practice Data Analysis
An analysis of candidates' instructional practices solely using data from SPA Assessment 4 would be difficult, primarily due to a lack of consistency among faculty in their approach to evaluating candidates in student teaching/internship. Additionally, issues were discovered in data reporting: due to some confusion, the secondary education program didn’t record SPA Assessment 4 data based on the 0-3 rubric scale being used for all other EPP assessments. Instead, candidates were scored as simply having met or not met the expectation. Considering the indicators identified using multiple assessments, a more comprehensive perspective is possible. The most significant strength among candidates in their instructional practice is their design and use of assessments. As addressed in CAEP Standard 1.2, the data suggest that the EPP’s candidates are competent and comfortable with assessments of their instruction.

Area 4: Professional Responsibility Data Analysis
Data collected and analyzed suggest that the EPP’s candidates are prepared for the professional practices and leadership associated with being an educator. A particular point of strength in this area is centered around the importance of cultural and community connections. This is a topic emphasized across the EPP and university.

Data Analysis Summary

Looking across all InTASC areas, the EPP found that candidates were scored the highest in the area of Learner & Learning. Within programs, scoring was generally consistent; however, between programs, the data show large disparities in faculty approaches to evaluation. This has resulted in inconsistencies across programs in data reporting and evaluation, identifying those inconsistencies across programs as a reflection of candidate performance is difficult.

Currently, the EPP does not have an established mechanism for pulling data addressing the InTASC standards. All of the data used for this report was obtained and manually sorted from SPA Key Assessments. To address this issue, faculty will be developing key assessments that are aligned to the InTASC standards and are used by all specialty areas that make up the EPP Initial Licensure Program.

Currently, the EPP is revising the SPA Key Assessments to align with the InTASC standards and these will be used by all specialty areas that make up the EPP Initial Licensure Program. This will establish a mechanism for pulling data across specialty areas and programs that address the InTASC standards and provide a basis for comparison of candidate performance across programs and specialty areas. The EPP
is presently developing a two phase program to address reliability and validity of their
SPA Key Assessments. First, the faculty will meet each semester to review candidate
key assessment projects at different levels (low, middle, high projects) to score,
compare and discuss the results of their scoring. Second, the EPP will bring together
internal and external stakeholders to review and evaluate candidates' portfolios
based on program key assessments aligned to InTASC Standards. This process will
lead to better inter-rater reliability within and across the programs. It is expected the
two phase approach will be completed by Fall 2018.

CAEP Standard 1.2
Use of Research & Data

While directly comparing assessment data across programs and, in some cases,
cohorts was difficult taken as a whole, the data as a whole demonstrates a level of
high performance of all candidates. Mean scores of SPA Assessment 3: Planning for
Instruction and SPA Assessment 5: Impact on PK-12 Student Learning in all
programs are at or above the minimum level of "Meets Expectations" with a score
greater than 2.00 on a 3 point scale. The aggregate mean scores for both
assessments were just over 2.7.

The data sources used to address CAEP Standard 1.2 on candidates' use of research
and data to inform instruction come from individual programs' SPA Assessment 3:
Planning for Instruction, which is completed during candidates' methods course(s),
and SPA Assessment 5: Impact on PK-12 Student Learning, which is completed
during advanced practicum or student teaching/internship. SPA Assessment 3:
Planning for Instruction was created to address candidates' instructional planning and
SPA Assessment 5: Impact on PK-12 Student Learning was used to address
candidates' ability to collect, interpret, and use data about their students' learning.
Additionally, faculty applied the alignment of rubric criteria to specific elements of
InTASC Area 3: Instructional Practices [See 1.1.13] to identify areas of strengths and
areas for growth in candidate performance.

Based on the evaluation of assessment components associated with InTASC Area 3:
Instructional Practices, the EPP candidates scored highest on Standard 6:
Assessment. Two particular areas of strength were identified within the instrument
items associated with InTASC 6: Balances the use of formative and summative
assessment as appropriate to support, verify, and document learning; and
understands the range of types and multiple purposes of assessment and how to
design, adapt, or select appropriate assessments to address specific learning goals
and individual differences, and to minimize sources of bias. The most pertinent
instrument item associated with data literacy is as follows: Knows how to analyze
assessment data to understand patterns and gaps in learning, to guide planning and
instruction, and to provide meaningful feedback to all learners. On this item, annual
EPP scores ranged from 2.66-2.83.

Based on the data available, no clear indication of any point of notable weakness in
the performance of the candidates was identified. While the scores across programs
do look very different, they tend to follow similar fluctuating patterns across
programs; scores in particular areas tend to follow a similar trajectory. [See 1.1.6,
1.1.12, 1.1.13, 1.1.14] This does provide evidence of consistency of instruction
across individual programs and suggests that the assessments being used within
Each program are valid and reliable.

Both Early Childhood and Secondary Education candidates scored consistently higher in planning (SPA Assessment 3) than they did in assessing their impact on students (SPA Assessment 5). The opposite was true for Special Education candidates, while the Elementary Education candidates' scores on the two assessments were similar.

The data that were collected indicated that candidates are able to design assessments, collect data, and use data for instruction. However, two key items need to be addressed to improve the EPP's ability to identify and evaluate candidates' ability to generate and make use of data. First, the EPP must clearly define and consistently apply score-level expectations across programs and develop more reliability in the evaluation of the assessments. Second, the EPP needs to standardized assessments for Initial Programs in order to better compare candidates' skills and knowledge across the EPP rather than just within individual programs.

CAEP Standard 1.3
Application of Content & Pedagogical Knowledge

The EPP has spent a great deal of time over the last three years refining key assessments that align to specialty profession standards. Most feedback received on SPA reports has been directed at the rubric development of key assessments and the subsequent data reported. The most consistent feedback received on SPA reports was the need for more explicit standards alignment. In nearly all cases, this recommendation was in connection with SPA Assessment 4: Assessment of Student Teaching/Internship Performance. EPP faculty used the Alaska Beginning Teacher Standards (ABTS) as the evaluation tool for student teaching/internship. The SPA Status & Review Feedback [See 1.3.1] identifies key reviewer concerns and final decisions in response to SPA reports from each of the EPP's programs. The EPP's SPA programs report that 18% received national recognition; 45% were recognized with conditions. While only two programs (18%) received national recognition without conditions, the EPP is in a position to have 63% of programs nationally recognized pending review of submissions from September 2017. The following sections identify areas for improvement based on feedback on the SPA reports.

Within the Secondary Education program, a common condition was that the assessments needed to disaggregate data collected on standards within rubrics. This is an issue directly related to the small size of some programs. For example, in the past three years, the number of completers from all secondary content areas has ranged from 14-32; within individual content areas, the number of completers has ranged from 0-8. As a result of these low numbers, several assessments were designed to be general enough to share across content areas. This resulted in poor alignment to SPA standards since the assessments often grouped several standards within individual rubric items. Within the Early Childhood programs, a request was made by the SPA Report reviewers for more clarity to distinguish the leveling of rubric items as well as focusing the report only on completers.

All specialty programs have revised or are revising their rubrics with implementation planned to begin a consistent three-year data cycle in 2017-18. [See 5.3 Continuous Improvement]
CAEP Standard 1.4
Instructional Practices

The EPP's current SPA Assessment 4: Clinical Practice is explicitly based on the Alaska Beginning Teacher Standards (ABTS) and designed to address Specialized Professional Association standards. Candidates are assessed on whether they meet expectations in all areas of the evaluation. Mean scores of SPA Assessment 4 in all programs were at or above the minimum level of "Meets Expectations" with a score greater than 2.00. The aggregate mean score is 2.73 on a 3-point scale with a range of 2.70-2.75.

The data sources used to address CAEP Standard 1.4 on candidates' ability to provide high-quality instruction come from individual programs' SPA Assessment 4, which is completed during a candidate's student teaching/internship. Additionally, faculty used the alignment of rubric criteria with specific elements of InTASC Area 1: Learner & Learning and InTASC Area 3: Instructional Practices [See 1.1.6] to identify areas of strengths and areas for growth in candidate performance.

The area of Learner & Learning is a particularly high scoring area in the EPP candidates' evaluations. In particular, InTASC Standard 1: Learner Development is a notably high-scoring area for candidates. Candidates also earn high marks on instrument items dealing with differentiation, application of knowledge and thinking skills, cross-disciplinary instruction, and collaboration and communication. While indicators in all five areas were well above the expectation of 2.00 on a 3-point scale, the evaluation scores for differentiation are noticeably lower than the other areas.

Based on the data available, no clear indication of any notable weakness in the performance of the candidates was identified. However, the data show an identifiable limitation in the EPP's evaluation process. Based on the cohort scores reported, evidence indicated a significant variance in how programs/instructors are approaching evaluation. For instance, on some assessments, a program's cohort mean score is 2.00 while another's is 3.00. This is evidence that evaluators do not have a shared understanding and definition of how the four scoring levels are being interpreted. Additionally, inconsistencies in how data were reported were evident. Due to some confusion, the Secondary Education program did not record SPA Assessment 4 data based on the 0-3 rubric scale being used for all other EPP assessments. Instead, candidates were scored as simply having met or not met the expectation.

Aside from the 2013-2014 academic year in the Elementary Education SPA Assessment 4 data, candidate student teaching evaluations across programs have been very consistent [See 1.1.6].

As was noted in previous sections, the data available for analysis suggest that the candidates are performing well in their student teaching/internships and in their ability to deliver high-quality instruction. However, the reliability and validity of the SPA Key Assessment data used cannot be determined because of inconsistent scoring and reporting of data. To address this issue, faculty will develop a common set of assessments and clinical documents aligned to InTASC Standards that can be used across programs [See 1.1.3].
CAEP Standard 1.5
Technology Use

Technology is a critical aspect of all programs offered by the EPP; each initial licensure program includes a course addressing technology integration and usage in classroom teaching and management. All candidates complete a digital portfolio of key assessments and/or standards based assessments. As previously addressed, these digital portfolios are in the process of being systematized across all programs provided by the EPP.

Data provided for Standard Element 1.5 document the key courses addressing technology provided and required by the EPP for initial licensure. Information provided about these courses includes the program(s) requiring the course, the course title, course description, and the associated student learning outcomes as documented in the course content guides and course grade distributions. Candidates minoring in Special Education, and thus receiving initial certification in this area, are also enrolled in the Early Childhood or Elementary program and therefore would take that program's course addressing technology.

Candidates are demonstrating knowledge, skills, and abilities to design and employ technological tools in meaningful ways (above the minimum expectation) from an examination of the grade distributions for both technology classes. While the two courses offered to candidates take different approaches to addressing technology, both to centralize student learning in the employment of technology as well as in the larger scope of educational practices.

A review of 15 Course Content Guides and 23 Syllabi, which serve as a representative sample, for the cross-cutting themes of technology, diversity and social justice indicates that three additional courses have Student Learning Outcomes specific to skills and knowledge of technology use for teaching and learning (accessing databases, digital media, and/or electronic sources). Grade distribution in these courses also indicates that candidates are demonstrating a high level of mastery.

A robust assessment addressing both the ISTE Student Standards and the ISTE Teacher Standards is needed in order to evaluate candidates' ability to design and facilitate digital learning and to track and share student performance data digitally. These skills sets are acknowledged within the clinical experience; however, data are not specifically collected in this area. Therefore, EPP faculty have committed to researching, designing and implementing a new assessment to evaluate candidates' professional technology usage based on the ISTE Standards. This assessment will be designed and piloted in the 2017-2018 academic year.

The narrative for Standard 1 demonstrates an EPP in transition. The appointment of an interim dean with a proven record of successful leadership has served to bring the desired stability to the EPP. The CAEP Self-Study process corresponded with the actions which have brought cohesiveness, coherence, congruence, clarity, and connectedness to the structure and function of the EPP. Findings from the internal review of initial teacher preparation programs are driving a new commitment to
formalized continuous improvement cycle that will collect data from multiple sources (internal and external), analyze all data sources, and make the data-informed decisions necessary for the implementation of new innovations in preparing educators across all programs (initial and advanced). The narratives found in other standards also serve as the framework for the EPP's engagement in continuous improvement.
Specialty Licensure Area Data

Program Review Option (per state partnership agreement)

☑ CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)
☐ CAEP Program Review with Feedback (State-selected standards)
☐ State Program Review (State-selected standards)

Answer the following prompts for programs reviewed for National Recognition (SPA) and Program Review with Feedback. Upload state reports for state reviewed programs.

1. Based on the analysis of the disaggregated data, how have the results of specialty licensure area or SPA evidence been used to inform decision making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes?

The last several years have been turbulent for UAA EPP with faculty and administrative turnover and reductions and campus wide restructuring. Program improvement has focused on data collected through Speciality Professional Association (SPA) Key Assessments designed and implemented by each licensure program. With the emphasis the last few years on each licensure program to get SPA approval, the focus this year is to provide consistency in evaluation, documentation, and reporting of key assessment data across programs.

In looking at the trends in disaggregated data from the years 2013-2015 in the Early Childhood Education program, it was evident that greater than 90% of candidates were exceeding expectations, suggesting that evaluation rubrics were not sensitive enough to differentiate student performance. Additionally, feedback from the SPA report suggested that standards based assessment rubrics were misaligned to the NAEYC standards and that the assessments were "assessing" too many standards. Thus faculty used this data and information to inform the revision of Key Assessments and rubrics to improve clarification in the assignments, to increase the sensitivity in differentiating between candidate performance (so that the data is not skewed), and to more clearly reflect the standards. Additionally, the Early Childhood Education faculty will have multiple faculty members evaluate the candidate work linked to Key Assessments to increase reliability in the data being reported.

The Elementary Education program data has shown that candidates must integrate technology into their teaching with multiple ways. Therefore, the Elementary Education faculty decided to use EDFN A302 Foundations of Educational Technology as a foundation to guide candidates in the integration of technology into their curriculum design and implementation. These include 1) using technology as teaching resources for class preparations; 2) applying adequate technological tools to make teaching and learning more effectively; 3) equipping candidates and their students' capacity on technological communication, so they can make efficient communication (e.g. presentation, writing..) with modern technology; 4) recording candidates and their students' learning progress by establishing e-portfolio.

The Secondary Education program has collected and analyzed disaggregated data by individual licensure areas. The data has been used to address course content in a holistic manner to inform instruction and candidate learning outcomes.

The constant state of assessment revision in response to SPA feedback has occurred within individual programs. While this has allowed programs to address the specific needs and requirements of SPA feedback reports, it has resulted in the fragmentation of assessment and evaluation processes across the EPP, and data were not regularly collected or discussed across programs. All data for key assessments within
programs are collected and analyzed solely by the instructor(s) of the course in which the individual assessments are situated. Data from individual assessments are used by that faculty member course improvement, data have not been linked to improvements that address Initial Programs as a whole. The faculty have not established a common set of expectations (or assessments) and approaches to scoring candidate work. Therefore, there is no established process by faculty for documenting decision making that leads to improved instruction and candidate learning outcomes.

A data retreat is planned during two monthly ALL COE meetings with individual program data analysis, across program data analysis and data based decisions about improving instruction and candidate learning during the fall and spring of 2017-2018. This cycle will be an ongoing process each semester.

2. Based on the analysis of specialty licensure area data, how have individual licensure areas used data for change?

All data for key assessments within programs are collected and analyzed solely by the instructor(s) of the course in which the individual assessments are situated. While individual faculty use data for specialty program and/or course improvement, data have not been linked to improvements that address Initial Programs as a whole. As significant issues with the EPP's candidate data have become clear, systems are being developed and put into place to address these shortcomings.

The early childhood program has used data from the standards based assessments to inform a change in practice. Additionally in the 2016-2017 school year, the early childhood program began to examine alumni survey data for the purposes of guiding improvement in the program and/or courses offered. As one example, it was reported from our alumni survey data that one course was consistently rated poorly in regards to understanding the assignments, knowing the instructor goals or student learning outcomes, and overall organization. This lead the program faculty to evaluate how the course is being instructed along with a critical review of the course content. Additionally, as previously noted, student data reported from our standards based assessments helped to inform revision of the assessments and rubrics.

The Elementary Education program, use data for decision-making by 1) displaying the results of data analysis in the program meeting in the beginning of the year; 2) program faculty engage in discussion based on issues raised through an evaluation of the data; 3) program faculty develop and implement an action plan for addressing the issues.

The Secondary Education program has collected and analyzed data from candidate assessments to identify specific areas of strength and weakness. This has resulted in the creation of a new assessment course. This has also informed areas of emphasis needed within our existing coursework.

To improve coordination and reduce fragmentation, department chair positions were reinstated and departments were reestablished in the 2016-2017 academic year. Conversations have begun to improve coordination among licensure programs as well as to reestablish protocols and systems for programmatic oversight.

The EPP participation in the self-study process has promoted conversations across specialty programs. Further, the faculty are engaged in researching, developing and
implementing a systematic and systemic process for continuous improvement. A new administrative position has also been created to ensure that the EPP has stable and knowledgeable guidance and oversight in the continuous improvement processes.

The Director of Accreditation and Assessment works with faculty toward an enhanced level of data literacy and continuous improvement in the preparation of high-quality educators. Just as the EPP prepares educators to transform lives, faculty are compelled to reach a higher level of data literacy and consistency, as well as enhanced efforts to ensure that data-informed decisions will improve initial and advanced educators' preparation programs. In addition to providing stable and informed guidance to the Assessment and Accreditation Committee, the Director has assumed administrative assignments dealing with policy and assessment and function as the EPP representative at the university level. The creation of this position reflects the commitment of the EPP and university to the continuous improvement model established by CAEP.

Coordination of Assessments. An initial task of the Assessment and Accreditation Committee will be to address the coordination of programmatic assessments. This faculty committee will create common assessments to be used in all licensure programs. These will be explicitly aligned with InTASC standards to allow for direct comparison across program areas.

Consolidation of Reporting. The EPP is currently in a phased transition to a new digital portfolio system--Digication--to be completed in the 2017-2018 academic year. This move will consolidate the submission, evaluation, and reporting of key assessments across the EPP. This will reduce redundancies and increase oversight and coordination of candidate data.

Reliability. In the 2017-2018 academic year, protocols will be developed to establish the reliability of key assessments used by the EPP. In addition to course instructors' evaluating candidates' work, a panel of internal and external stakeholders will review and evaluate candidate portfolios. This will allow the EPP to establish inter-rater reliability on key assessments.

Addressing these issues will allow specialty licensure areas to more efficiently use of candidate data in structured ways and inform the larger conversation in the EPP regarding data usage, candidate achievement, and program improvement.

3. For Program Review with Feedback only: How does the specialty licensure area data align with and provide evidence for meeting the state-selected standards?

4. For National Recognition only: How are SPA reports that are not Nationally Recognized being addressed?

Faculty within each specialty program that is not currently Nationally Recognized have developed a plan of action based on the feedback report.

All Programs
Through meetings with students, school partners and faculty, a major curriculum update was conducted in the Early Childhood Education and Secondary Education in academic year 2013/2014. The student learning impact of those changes will be evident beginning with completers in 2017. Data analysis will be gathered through course data, Praxis data, clinical observations documents, school-based supervisor and student survey results.
Early Childhood
Based on feedback from the Specialized Association Report, performance rubrics, aligned to Specialized Association Standards, have been revised to provide a clear distinction between performance levels.

Elementary Education
Based on feedback from the Specialized Association Report, the program is revising rubric to capture performance levels in ways that reflect the standards, and clearly demonstrate performance levels based on the specificity of individual ACEI Standards.

Mathematics
Based on feedback from the Specialized Association Report, revising rubrics to capture performance levels in ways that reflect the standards; and clearly demonstrate performance levels based on the specificity of individual NCTM Standards. Develop assessments that target the NCTM CAEP Standards 2012

Social Studies
Based on feedback from the Specialized Association Report, revising rubrics to capture performance levels in ways that reflect the standards. Clearly demonstrate performance levels based on the specificity of individual Social Studies Standards

World Language
Based on feedback from the Specialized Association Report, working with World Language faculty to revise rubrics to capture performance levels in ways that reflect the standards. Clearly demonstrate performance levels based on the specificity of individual ACTFL Standards. Developing assessments that target the World Language Content aligned with ACTFL Standards

English Language Arts
Based on feedback from the Specialized Association Report, revising assessments to allow for measurement of specific standard elements. Rubric revision to capture performance levels in ways that reflect the NCTE standards. Developing specificity to the performance descriptions to address the NCTE requirements of the standard(s) it is measuring. Engaging in a more thorough analysis and interpretation of the data to provide more details concerning candidates proficiency in the NCTE standards and the elements of each assessment.

Science
Based on feedback from the Specialized Association Report, ensure assessment alignment to one criterion for each NSTA element for data disaggregation, revise assessments to ensure the data collection the is science-specific for each NSTA element.
**Standard 2: Clinical Partnership and Practice**

1. **Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)**
   - 1.1.5 EPP Table InTASC Standards and Representative Samples of 23 Course Syllabi.pdf
   - InTASC Candidate Performance LL SPA Assessments
     - 1.1.6 InTASC Candidate Performance LL SPA Assessmentst.pdf
     - 1.1.6a InTASC 1 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf
     - 1.1.6b InTASC 2 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf
     - 1.1.6c InTASC 3 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf

2. **Partners design high-quality clinical experiences**
   - 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
   - 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
   - 1.2.1 Key Assessment 3 to 5 data.pdf
   - 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
   - 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

3. **Summative Clinical Data.pdf**
   - 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

4. **EPP Advisory Council**
   - 2.1.2 EPP Advisory Council.pdf
   - 2.1.2a EPP Partner Mtg Minutes Oct 16.pdf
   - 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
   - 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

5. **Partnership Agreement Blank.pdf**
   - 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
   - 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

6. **Internship Orientation Agenda AY1516.pdf**
   - 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
   - 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

7. **PACE Mentor Course for School-Based Clinical Faculty.pdf**
   - 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
   - 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences

---

(Confidential) Page 27
2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

The EPP has developed and maintains mutually informed and beneficial partnerships with Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to support effective teacher preparation. The service area where candidates are placed for clinical experiences is vast and includes both urban and rural school districts. These districts include the Anchorage School District (ASD), Matanuska-Susitna Borough School District (MSBSD), Lake and Peninsula School District (LPSD), Bristol Bay Borough School District (BBBSD), and various other rural districts. Both P-12 schools and this EPP benefit from the partnerships as evidenced by the hiring of our graduates into districts.

In recognition of the varied and specific needs of each school district, the EPP has established collaborative partnerships locally in the College of Education Advisory Board (CAB) and remotely via various technology-based applications such as Blackboard Collaborate, Skype, or Google Hangouts. The College of Education Advisory Board was active through January 2015. It consisted of the Dean, Associate Dean, Commissioner of Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, Vice Provost of Research and Graduate Studies, Vice President of Academic Affairs UA System, Director of Future Educators of Alaska, Executive Director of the Alaska Association of Secondary School Principals, two university faculty, three superintendents of partnering school districts, and two community members. The Board addressed issues related to the overall operations of the College of Education and also to the EPP's program development, clinical experiences, and rural placements [See 2.1.2]. The EPP and the key district partners have experienced changes in leadership so with the coming academic year we are expecting an active, vibrant new life energy to this important stakeholder group. The 2017-2018 academic year will bring new life to this important stakeholder group. The Dean's Community Council has been reconfigured to support dialogue with stakeholders actively involved in the partnership between the LEAs and the EPP [See: 2.1.2].

The EPP and the district partners have maintained quality and effective collaboration through operational partnerships between and among the EPP's field placement coordinator, program leads, clinical faculty, and district representatives including superintendents, coordinators, principals, and teachers. These collaborations have included internship placement meetings, student teacher orientation meetings [See 2.2.4], and informal dialogues throughout the clinical placement experiences. Additionally, the EPP held a stakeholder's meeting via Blackboard Collaborate in
October 2016 to discuss feedback and concerns regarding internship placements. This meeting included representatives from our two urban partners, ASD and MSBSD, and one of our rural school districts, Kashunamiut School District [See 2.1.2a]. However, the systematic and formal advisory group will again be meeting regularly each fall and spring beginning the 2017-2018 academic year.

In collaboration with our partners, the EPP delineates the expectations for clinical experiences for all stakeholders through signed Partnership Agreements. The EPP is updating its records of signed Partnership Agreements from each of the school districts in which candidates are placed. Currently, each partner school district has either a completed, signed agreement in place or one is in progress [See 2.1.1 & 2.1.3].

The EPP's Internship handbooks outline the roles and responsibilities of the clinical faculty and host teachers for the clinical experience including instruments and procedures for the evaluation of candidates [See 2.2.5]. The EPP is producing a single internship handbook for Initial Programs to communicate consistent and congruent information to all stakeholders involved with the candidate's clinical experience(s). This new handbook is currently under development with feedback from our partner school districts. The feedback was collected from surveys completed by the Anchorage School District and through a meeting with host teachers held at the end of the spring 2017 semester in the Matanuska Susitna Borough School District. These two school districts represent the majority of the placements made by the EPP.

The EPP also received input on candidate preparation and program development (i.e., evaluation instruments, curriculum development, field work experiences) from host teachers via the survey mentioned above administered by the EPP's largest district partner, Anchorage School District. The district administers a Host Teacher Reflection survey at the end of each clinical experience, and the results are shared with the EPP. Host teachers were asked to respond to the open-ended questions; In what specific ways did you feel your student teacher needed more preparation before beginning the internship? And In what specific ways did you feel your student teacher was well-prepared for the internship?

The following is a summary of responses gathered from the host teachers to these questions:

Well-prepared, Needed Preparation, Reflective, Academic plans, Engaging instructional strategies, Common core standards, Previous classroom experience, Classroom Management, Professionalism, Child development, Curricular knowledge, Content knowledge, Lesson plans, Lesson planning, Small group work, Lesson pacing, Positive discipline methods, Initiative, Content knowledge, Content area applications, Organized, Positive relationships, Relationships with kids

Additionally, host teachers were asked to submit comments to the question, "In what ways could either the district or the university provide the support to address the Student Teacher needs?"

Following is a summary of the responses:
Strategies for classroom management
Student engagement techniques
How to apply for certification
How to begin and close out the year
More hours spent in different grade levels
More explicit communication of student teacher expectations
Do not have students take additional classes during internship
Review expectations for the host teacher evaluation
Review school district policies
Strategies for meeting the needs of all learners
More meetings with university supervisor
Longer teaching experience

The responses from this survey provide the EPP with general feedback from the school-based clinical educators on the level of preparation of candidates. They are shared with the EPP's Chair of the Department of Teaching and Learning, individual Program Leads, and faculty. They are used in collaborations with the school district and EPP efforts toward continuous improvement.

Our EPP and LEA partners recognize the benefit of the partnership and together are currently in the co-creation phase of a shared responsibility model. Collaborative structures currently exist, but the coherence of the structures needs to be addressed, most importantly these policies and procedures need to be consistent across the partner districts. Our action plan includes revitalizing the College of Education Advisory Board (Dean's Community Council) to engage in a shared responsibility model that will include involvement in program decision-making and curriculum development.

Recognizing that the Anchorage School District's Host Teacher Reflection survey has been a general source of feedback on candidate preparation and program development, the EPP will work with ASD and other collaborating districts to develop and administer surveys to host teachers in all partner districts. These surveys will be disaggregated by program and will include more comprehensive questions to help inform the EPP of program effectiveness.

2.2 High-Quality Clinical Educators

In the selection of school-based clinical educators, the EPP and partnering school districts follow the State of Alaska Department of Education and Early Development requirements for the supervision of student teachers. The EPP relies on the school district, through recommendations from school principals, to provide high-quality school-based clinical educators who meet minimum requirements related to licensure, experience and documented performance.

As summarized from the Alaska Administrative Code, 4 AAC 30.020. Student teachers and 4 AAC 04.200. Professional content and performance standards, the qualifications of a school-based clinical educator include the following:
holds a valid teaching certificate issued under 4 AAC 12;
have at least one year of teaching experience in the district where the student teacher is serving;
have at least three years of total teaching experience;
and, meets or exceeds the Standards for Alaska's Teachers described in 4 AAC 04.200 as verified by the district where the student teacher is serving.

In recognition of the commitment required for supervising a candidate, and to retain high-quality school-based, clinical educators, the Anchorage School District in collaboration with the EPP ensures that school-based clinical educators receive only one candidate per academic year. Through the EPP's honorarium survey, the EPP collects and maintains data from school-based clinical educators on their term(s) of service, years of experience, current content and grade level, and recency of mentor training. To cross track the number of times, each clinical educator has hosted a student teacher; the EPP plans to include a question eliciting a report on the number of candidates that she or he has hosted.

The EPP employs university-based clinical educators (Clinical Faculty) who are tenure track, term, and adjunct faculty. The selection of university clinical faculty is based on the EPP's established minimum qualifications of:
Type T Professional or Master Teacher Certificate
Three years of experience at the grade level of licensure (i.e., elementary)
Master's Degree

Many of the university-based clinical faculty exceed minimum qualifications. Sixty percent have a terminal degree, 69% have greater than three years of experience at the grade level of licensure, and each has additional experiences, service, publications, presentations and has made other relevant and significant contributions to the field.

The EPP and partnering school districts collaborate to prepare and support high-quality clinical educators who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development.

At Student Teacher Orientation meetings held by the local school districts at the beginning of each semester [See 2.2.4], school-based clinical educators receive necessary resources for the clinical experience including the internship handbook, timeline, and evaluation forms. The EPP's internship handbooks provide comprehensive information regarding EPP and school-based clinical educator qualifications, expectations, and responsibilities, internship timelines, and internship policies and procedures [See 2.2.5]. Throughout the clinical experience, school-based clinical educators are informally supported by the university-based clinical educators through frequent electronic communication and on-site visits. Technology applications such as Skype, Google Hangouts, and Blackboard Learn are available and utilized for virtual meetings with school-based clinical faculty in rural placements. The meetings are recorded and are shared with partners who were not able to attend.

Supervisory resources by specialty program, such as the internship handbooks and evaluation instruments, are available online for access to all clinical educators. To ensure consistency and integrity of application across all programs, the EPP is currently revising these resources into a comprehensive (single) handbook for university-based clinical faculty, school-based clinical faculty, and pre-service teacher candidates.

Additional professional development opportunities are available to all school-based
clinical educators through the honorarium awarded by the EPP. The honorarium provides for the choice of either a monetary stipend or a tuition voucher that may be applied to a UAA College of Education course or a professional development course through the UAA COE Professional and Continuing Education (PACE) department. Of those school-based clinical educators who accepted the honorarium, 54% chose the tuition voucher from spring 2016, 30% from fall 2016, and 90% from spring 2017. Additionally, the Anchorage School District and the EPP have partnered in offering to their school-based clinical educators a one-credit course, Mentoring Communication Skills, during the semester of the clinical experience [See 2.2.9].

The EPP and partnering school districts collaborate to evaluate high-quality clinical educators who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development.

School-based clinical educators evaluate EPP-based clinical educators in the EPP's largest district partner, Anchorage School District. The district administers a Host Teacher Reflection survey at the end of each clinical experience, and the results are shared with the EPP. School-based clinical educators provide feedback in the areas of communication and support provided by the university-based clinical educators. While the survey data does not disaggregate by licensure program, it does provide the EPP with feedback regarding the overall performance of the EPP-based clinical educators. Specifically, school-based clinical educators are asked to rate the communication with the clinical supervisor on a range of 1 (inadequate) to 5 (highly valuable). In Spring 2016, 47% of school-based clinical educators working with candidates from the EPP responded to the survey and gave an overall score of 4.1 for communication with the clinical supervisor. Fall 2016 had a 58% response rate with an overall score of 4.1, and Spring 2017 had a 37% response rate with an average score of 3.3.

All school-based clinical educators complete formative and summative assessments of the candidates at the midpoint and end of the clinical experience respectively. These assessments were developed to show candidates' growth and proficiency in the respective Specialized Professional Association standards and the Alaska Beginning Teacher Standards. The results are shared with the EPP-based clinical educators and the candidates in the formative and summative assessment meetings. [See Standard 1.3 for a description and analysis of these assessments.]

Candidates are given the opportunity to evaluate both school-based and EPP-based clinical educators via a survey that was developed and administered in May 2017. The survey sampled completers from the fall 2016 and spring 2017 semesters. In evaluating their school-based clinical educator, candidates were asked to respond using the scale: Agree, Tend to Agree, Tend to Disagree, Disagree, or No Reply. The questions on the survey relating to the school-based clinical educator included the following:

My cooperating teacher/co-teacher
helped me with classroom management
made me feel welcome
gave me constructive feedback on my teaching
let me experiment with my own teaching ideas
included me in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings, and other professional
In reviewing the candidates' responses for each program, we found that 80%-100% of candidates scored Agree or Tend to Agree for each question. There were no questions in any program in which less than 80% of candidates agreed or tended to agree. The questions which had the highest and lowest level of satisfaction varied among programs. For example, the question with the highest satisfaction in the early childhood education program was, My cooperating/co-teacher provided adequate opportunities for me to observe the classroom (100%), while the question with the lowest satisfaction was My cooperating teacher/co-teacher let me experiment with my own ideas (80%). In the secondary education program, the latter question had 100% of the candidates agreeing or tending to agree, while the question that had the lowest satisfaction was My cooperating/co-teacher helped me plan differentiated instruction for a variety of needs.

In evaluating their EPP-based clinical educator, candidates were asked to provide the same responses, Agree, Tend to Agree, Tend to Disagree, Disagree, or No Reply, to the following questions:

Candidates were then asked to answer the following additional questions with the indicated unique response choices:

The responses to the first set of questions showed that 80%-100% of candidates scored Agree or Tend to Agree on each question except for the question, "My university supervisor acted as a liaison between the school and me." This question had the lowest percentage of candidates agreeing or tending to agree with 81% in early childhood education, 70% in elementary education, and 89% in secondary education.

In reviewing the responses to the next set of questions, we found a great variety in the results for both of the questions, "To the best of your knowledge how many times...
did your university or college supervisor visit your student teaching classroom when you were actively teaching?" And "To the best of your knowledge, how many times did you discuss your student teaching in face-to-face conferences with your university or college supervisor?" This variation may be clarified by understanding that each candidate has unique strengths and areas of need and that clinical educators strive to accommodate to meet the individual needs of their candidates.

The responses from both the school-based clinical educator survey and candidate exit survey provide overall feedback regarding the quality of the school-based and EPP-based clinical educators regarding meeting the needs of the candidates. The Chair of the Department of Teaching and Learning, individual Program Leads, and faculty have access to the survey data. They will be used in the EPP's continuous improvement actions for Academic Year 2017-2018.

EPP-based clinical educators continually discuss the performance of school-based clinical educators regarding how candidates can align the requirements of the clinical experiences with the host teacher's style and classroom culture. Faculty, principals, and placement personnel communicate regularly throughout the clinical experience regarding the candidate and host teacher partnership. Individual characteristics of school-based clinical educators are considered in placing candidates for the internship experience.

In analyzing the current data and practices relating to the co-selection, preparation, support, and retention of high-quality clinical faculty, both EPP and school-based, the EPP has identified the following areas to address in our continuous improvement:

The EPP notes a need for a wider partnership between school districts to make clinical educator training and professional development available online, particularly to ensure access for rural school-based clinical educators. Recognizing that the Anchorage School District's Host Teacher Reflection survey has been a general source of feedback on university-based clinical educators, the EPP will work with the ASD and partnering districts to develop and administer surveys for school-based clinical educators to evaluate and provide feedback on the university-based clinical educators. These surveys will be disaggregated by program and will include more comprehensive questions related to the level of support and effectiveness of the EPP-based clinical educators.

2.3 High-Quality Clinical Practice

The EPP collaborates with district partners to ensure that field experiences are of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration. This collaboration is designed to develop candidates' necessary skills and proficiencies to meet the academic and developmental needs of all P-12 students.

Field placements are a central component of the EPP's initial licensure programs and are embedded in the majority of the required courses throughout each program. Required field experience hours, descriptions and assessments are written into the Course Content Guides (CCGs) to provide clear expectations and consistency among instructors. The EPP has designed the clinical experiences for each initial licensure program to follow a purposeful sequence that supports the development of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions [See 2.3.1]. Specifically, candidates
begin with field placements that require observations, then move into field placements with increasing levels of participation leading up to the student teaching internship. The duration of each clinical experience follows a corresponding progression with an increasing number of required hours. Clinical experiences consisting primarily of observations require up to 30 hours in a classroom; practica and advanced practica experiences require up to 50 hours and 80 hours respectively, and internship requires a minimum of 500 hours. Each of the program handbooks includes an overview of the sequence of field experiences including a summary of the candidate's participation expectations and the number of required hours [See 2.3.1].

In collaboration with school principals, the Field Placement Coordinator from the EPP's Student Services office coordinates the field placements, ensuring that candidates participate in a variety of clinical experiences that include different grade levels and diverse school settings. Field placements are recorded in the EPP's Quality Assurance System, (PeTAL) which allows for a simple search to provide a list of each candidate's past placements. In determining the internship placement, each candidate's past field placements are reviewed for a variety of school experiences and grade levels. The Field Placement Coordinator then ensures that each candidate receives a placement in at least one Title One school and, for the early childhood program, at least one Head Start school. The Clinical Field Placements chart [See 2.3.3] documents candidates' clinical experiences by placement type, location, and grade level for the candidates who had active placements in fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016 academic semesters. In reviewing the data, it is clear that throughout their clinical experiences, candidates have received a variety of placements in diverse school settings and at different grade levels. It is noted that there is some missing information regarding placement location and grade level for a small number of candidates. In the most recent semesters, work has been done to ensure that the data for each field placement is complete.

Together with the Alaska School Demographics chart [See 2.3.4], which provides the student demographic information for each school in the state, the Field Placement Coordinator can track candidate placements and plan for future placements that ensure a depth, breadth, and diversity of clinical experiences throughout their program. When planning for internship placements, the Field Placement Coordinator meets with a representative from the school district and a clinical faculty member from the EPP program for which placements are being made. Candidates who live in rural districts are placed in a school in the community in which they are located. The Field Placement Coordinator works with the principals and day care providers in those districts to ensure a diversity of grade level placements for those candidates.

Clinical experiences are designed with focused, purposeful, and varied goals that support a developmental sequence in candidates' acquisition of pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Clinical experiences are assessed using a variety of performance-based instruments allowing candidates to demonstrate their increasing proficiencies. The Depth, Breadth, and Diversity of Clinical Experiences table [See 2.3.1] demonstrate the developmental sequence of clinical experiences, including the corresponding performance assessments. Similarly, the Initial Licensure Key Assessments table lists the performance assessments used by each program for data collection and the corresponding analysis that supports each programs' SPA requirements. Candidates submit each Key Assessment into an online portfolio (TaskStream or Digication) Additionally, candidates are assessed throughout their
programs to monitor for increasing levels of competency [See 1.1.4].

As discussed above, the EPP has designed a purposeful sequence of clinical experiences for each initial licensure program to support the development of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. This progression in the candidate's expected participation is supported with performance assessments that require candidates to plan, implement, analyze, evaluate, and reflect both on their performance and on the connection of the course content to their practical experiences. Field experiences that are designed primarily for observation require assignments that align and connect course content with observations. Subsequent practicum placements require candidates, to begin with one-on-one student case studies, conduct small-group instruction followed by large group co-teaching, and eventually move to solo teaching of individual lessons. Candidates are then prepared to enter the student teaching internship with the understanding that they will assume complete management of the field placement classroom for a time requirement specified by each program.

The EPP ensures a coherence of clinical placements that sufficiently develops each candidate's effectiveness in positively impacting all students' development and learning. The Coherence of Clinical Placements chart (2.3.5) maps the learning outcomes for the pre-internship clinical experiences across the learning outcomes for the internship for the Early Childhood and Elementary Education programs. This chart demonstrates the alignment and sequential development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions for each of the learning outcomes in the internship. As an example, in Elementary Education (ELED), for learning objective 2 apply knowledge of how K-6 students learn and develop, each of the pre-internship clinical experiences has one or more learning outcomes that support candidates' performance in this area. In tracing the knowledge and skill development of this learning outcome through their clinical experiences, candidates begin with examining the role of the classroom teacher in EDFN A101 and move to demonstrating and describing developmentally appropriate practice, the creative process, and the role of play as assignments in EDEC A106. Candidates then describe, analyze, and apply their knowledge of student language acquisition and literacy development in EDFN A301, and engaged learning in social studies, math, and science in EDEL A395 and EDEL A495A. The coherence of the learning outcomes between the pre-internship clinical experiences and the internship experience supports candidates' readiness to enter the internship with sufficient knowledge and skills needed for a successful residency.

The EPP notes the need to maintain complete and accurate data regarding the depth, breadth, and diversity of clinical placements. Throughout the past two semesters, the Field Placement Coordinator has reviewed the procedures for entering and tracking field placement data and has over the past two semesters established an improved process to assure consistency. The Field Placement Coordinator is developing a policies and procedures manual for the data collection system which will be completed by Spring 2018.
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3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability

ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met

3.1 Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs

University of Alaska Anchorage: Evidence and Analysis of the EPP's Recruitment for Academic Ability and Diversity for Continuous Improvement.
In agreement with the University of Alaska Anchorage Diversity Statement, the EPP seeks to: "create an inclusive, respectful campus community that promotes and embraces our differences," and "unite [us] in our belief that diversity includes understanding and respecting differences in ideas." Moreover, the EPP serves to "increase the cultural, social and intellectual diversity of UAA students, staff and faculty. With an increase in diversity on our campuses, we are enhancing and promoting a deeper understanding of local, national and global communities and fully embracing our core values of diversity and inclusion." (Tom Case, UAA Chancellor, Retired)

The UAA Office of Student Affairs (OSA) provides leadership to the EPP for efforts to attract, admit, enroll, retain, and graduate candidates representative of a diverse, well-qualified student body. The OSA consists of three (3) divisions (Enrollment Services, Student Outreach and Transition, Dean of Students), with sixteen (16) departments including: Admissions, Career Exploration and Services, Department of Residence Life, Disability Support Services, Native Student Services, Military and Veteran Support Services, Multicultural Center, New Student Recruitment, Office of the Registrar, Student Financial Assistance, Student Conduct and Ethical Development, Student Health and Counseling Services, Student Information Services, Student Life and Leadership, Student Transition, TRIO Support Services.

Working with the EPP, the departments within these divisions are actively engaged in implementing the institution's Strategic Plan 2020. The Plan was created to advance
a culture of institutional excellence that inspires and enables student, faculty and staff success, to support students' persisting and completing their educational goals, and to graduate more students to fill Alaska's needs. Given the steady increase in the EPP enrollment over the last two years, the Student Services Center has been invited by the institution to participate in a pilot program to address recruitment and enrollment. Working with Ruffalo Noel-Levitz, this partnership will support the EPP with "innovative solutions for recruitment, search, multi-channel marketing, web strategy, and financial aid, with a focus on helping organizations achieve their missions." Further, working with Ruffalo Noel-Levitz will help the EPP (and the institution) "accomplish their goals for access, diversity, student preparedness, persistence, retention, and college completion/graduation."

The EPP is a committed to its mission. "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." Aligned with our mission to prepare educators who are confident, skilled, and reflective professionals, the recruitment plan seeks to attract and to monitor high-quality candidates with academic ability representing diversity. We also strive to connect our completers with employment opportunities that correlate to EPP experience with statewide needs and expected employment trends [See 3.1.1a].

The EPP, through its networks of professionals, continually seeks to know and address community, state, national, regional, and local needs for hard-to-staff schools and high-need content areas, such as STEM, English language learning, and students with disabilities. For Alaska as a whole, one of the greatest needs is in hard-to-staff small, rural schools.

As stated in the Alaska Teacher Turnover, Supply, and Demand: 2013 Highlights article [See 3.1.2], the vast majority of teachers in Alaska are white. The EPP meets annually with the Future Educators of Alaska to talk to high school students from rural communities about enrolling at UAA in the College of Education (COE). Advisers in the College of Education (EPP) work closely with students in rural areas to help reduce barriers so that they can complete their programs. UAA encourages candidates to enrich their experiences by accepting placement in a rural Alaska village for their Internship semester. Many of the school districts provide travel to and from the village as well as a place to live. The EPP has strong relationships with many rural districts, such as Lake and Peninsula School District and the Kashunamiut School District. The EPP continues to build relationships with the rural districts to build partnerships and think of creative ways to encourage urban-based candidates to opt for opportunities to expand their professional practice with placements in Alaska's rural school districts. The EPP also places many candidates in local schools, and the Secondary Education initial licensure program partners with those districts each semester to bring secondary candidates to the local schools to work with the students.

A 2014 Anchorage article, "Solutions scarce for the special education teacher shortage," demonstrates the need for special education teachers in ASD, the state's largest district. The Mat-Su Borough School District, Alaska's second most populous district, have also expressed a need for teachers with a special education certification. To meet the need, the Anchorage School District has the GETS program
in which they hire individuals as special education teachers concurrent with their earning certification. The EPP has many of these teachers in the Special Education certification program. Courses are offered online and in the summer to work with the candidate's teaching schedule. In addition to the initial certification program, the EPP has special education minors. The minors allow candidates to add a Special Education endorsement in either Early Childhood Special Education or Elementary Special Education.

The leadership of COE and the personnel within the Student Services department has led to a system of congruent and cohesive business procedures and policies. Addressing the systemic and systematic policies and procedures relative to recruitment selectivity and admissions has provided greater focus on a formalized recruitment plan. Attention is also directed to recruitment and selection of diverse candidates and consideration of criteria beyond academic ability.

A recent change in organizational structure for two departments (Department of Teaching and Learning or Initial Programs and Graduate Studies in Education and Leadership or Advanced Programs) requires the EPP to examine practices across programs. Currently, for example, the EPP has identified two areas needing attention: aligning admission criteria into programs and the requirements before beginning an internship [See 3.2.1], and a greater emphasis on recruiting and retaining diversity candidates from who reside within the state of Alaska.

The EPP recruitment plan [See 3.1.1, 3.1.2] includes a focused action plan to attract, recruit, and develop diverse and high-quality candidates to accomplish the mission. The EPP has designed a three-step approach for its diversity action plan. For the first focus, the EPP identified the problem of recruiting, supporting, and monitoring the completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations. Alaska is a state with a spectrum of cultures and languages in the P-12 student populations. The diversity presents real challenges for the EPP in providing teacher education to complement the demographics of the student populations we serve. For example, the Anchorage School District is home to two of the most diverse high schools in the nation. Additionally, six of the district's elementary schools rank in the top ten for diversity. Relocated refugee students with a range of dialects and cultures from troubled areas around the world have inundated the district. The EPP is committed to extending outreach to potential candidates through recruitment efforts and striving to match the growing diverse student population in Alaska's public schools with diverse teacher candidates. The Recruitment Plan is designed to go beyond traditional approaches to recruitment through simple advertising by increasing EPP efforts through creativity and innovation.

A second focus is assessing the current recruitment plan to update, adjust and refine. For example, in addressing the issue of hard-to-fill positions, beginning in Spring 2018 the EPP in partnership with Alaska Teacher Placement (ATP) will host an evening meet and greet the night before the ATP job fair, held each spring annually in Anchorage. Special invitations will be extended to representatives from small, rural schools to be the first to meet with the EPP's graduating candidates, who are eager to enter the teaching field. Lead Education Authority [LEA] superintendents, principals, technology directors, and other representatives from their districts will have opportunities to have individual conversations with EPP candidates to talk with them and to tell them about the advantages of teaching in that district's particular schools.
School personnel will answer any questions that EPP candidates may have about their districts and distribute literature, brochures, and collectibles to our candidates.

The third focus is the restructuring of the College of Education Student Service Center. Student Success Coordinators and Field Placement Coordinator responds to phone calls, emails, and walk-in contacts from a diverse group of prospective and incoming students representing a large variety of cultural, socioeconomic, and ethnic backgrounds. The team answers questions, send out materials and disperse information. Additionally, they are a visible presence at many of the professional conferences, events, and job fairs held annually in Anchorage. These include:

Professional Conferences
- Alaska Annual Principals' Conference
- Alaska Statewide Special Education Conference
- Alaska Teacher Placement Conference
- Anchorage Association for the Education of Young Children
- Response to Intervention Conference

UAA Events
- Future Educators of Alaska Academy
- Tour groups throughout the school year (drop ins)
- Howl Days Orientation (each semester)
- Kids to College
- King Career Center Career Days
- Meet and Greet in Residence Halls
- Q&A Session for Early Childhood Visiting Students Step into UAA
- Step into UAA
- UAA Scholars Reception
- UAA Preview Days/Student Engagement Fair

Other
- Anchorage Alaska College and Career Fair
- Candidates placed in the schools are a recruitment tool. (Example: UAA Graduates and Students Teachers have UAA lanyards to wear.)

When students enter the EPP, retention is a major priority. Each student is assigned a faculty advisor, who can provide guidance and support in program specific areas. The Student Services team is central to the EPP's retention efforts. The team provides general support, engages in problem-solving, and offers academic advising, testing support, and outreach.

General Support
- Encourage students from rural areas to make use of campus support resources (AHAINA, Native Student Services), as well as access the COE Student Services Office.
- Ensure that the Student Services Office is a warm, welcoming, and safe space.
- Identify and respond sensitively to cultural issues (e.g., eye contact, pauses in conversations, an apparent unwillingness to be direct).
- Present advising information in EDFN A101: Introduction to Education
- Provide snacks in Student Services to encourage students to drop in.
- Provide support to current students by providing workshops, assisting with student
paperwork, providing information about UAA and COE policies and procedures.
- Work with students of all ages and backgrounds to support them in their academic, professional, and personal goals.
- Serve as a liaison to other UAA services and support; provide information about campus and community resources.

Academic Advising
- Advise on-site at residence halls and through distance delivery.
- Assist with academic petitions.
- Be available for flexible meeting times and meeting options (appointments, walk-in hours, face-to-face, phone, web)
- Encourage students to check in with us when they need help.
- Initiate Program Applications when students have met requirements.
- Participate in Chevak School Distance Meeting (providing support)
- Promote early and appropriate registration.
- Provide accurate referrals.
- Provide general support to distance students
- Suggest ways to resolve academic difficulties (e.g. how to raise GPA, get off probation)

Testing Support
- Assist with forms for extended test time (e.g., if English is not their first language).
- Provide PRAXIS workshops and free practice exams.

Outreach
- Celebrate major events
- Contact students when they have not enrolled in classes.
- Host the Education Club - Faculty Advisor
- Host a chapter of Kappa Delta Kappa - Faculty Advisor
- Keep students on track by sending reminder emails:
  - Classes
  - Scholarships
  - Registration dates and deadlines
  - Volunteer opportunities

Events related to education/for educators
- Maintain continuous information outreach through Facebook and other social media.
- Monitor progress and reach out to students who need assistance (based on grades, general academic progress, referrals from faculty).
- Promote job announcements
- Promote scholarship opportunities
- Promote student successes.
- Provide outreach to students at risk of losing their financial aid.
- Recognize and support student efforts through COE Student Showcase.
- Make referrals to Care Team and Learning Center as needed.
- Guide students to outreach based on faculty referrals.

Applicants seeking admission to the program beginning with 2017 will provide the data to examine and validate the impact of the EPP's newly-revised and documented recruitment plan. Data presented below provide a picture of those enrolled by race/ethnicity. Tables below show a comparison of candidates enrolled in Initial
Teacher Preparation programs compared to other populations within the college and the university [See 3.1.3].

The EPP has seen a rise in the number of diverse candidates over the last decade. Of concern is that the number of American Indian or Alaska Native students enrolled in UAA institution-wide has decreased by 823 students during this period. EPP data also reflect the impact of this drop in enrollment by a significant population in Alaska. The percent of American Indian or Alaska Native teacher candidates has remained stable compared to the enrollment of all students in this sub-group within the institution. The EPP recruitment plan must stay focused on broadening the diversity of candidates, with special attention given to the Alaska Native population.

3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement

The EPP demonstrates high expectations for incoming candidates. While the overall GPA criteria used 2.75 for many specialty programs, candidates must have a 3.0 GPA in their program major before they can begin their internship. In addition to academic criteria, the EPP requires a personal essay, which is evaluated with a rubric, references from specific sources, and the candidate's resumé when determining admittance into the fieldwork experiences. The fieldwork provides the opportunity for admitted candidates to apply the skills and knowledge gained through content courses in 100-300 level courses.

3.3 Additional Selectivity Factors

For many decades, the EPP has created and maintained preservice teacher preparation programs that assess the quality of candidates' attributes and dispositions. From the time they apply for admission to an EPP program, candidates provide evidence that their sense of themselves as a professional educator includes awareness of the ethical and moral responsibilities they are required to assume and embody in their daily lives, both public and private. [See 3.2.1 Table 1] As they progress through their program, the EPP continually assesses candidates for attributes and dispositions using a variety of performance-based instruments, enabling candidates to demonstrate their increasing proficiencies. The Depth, Breadth, and Diversity of Clinical Experiences table [See 2.3.1 Table 3] demonstrates the developmental sequence of clinical experiences, including the corresponding performance assessments. The Initial Licensure Key Assessments table [See 1.1.4] lists the performance assessments used by each program for data collection. These correlate with Alaska Beginning Teacher Standards and others such as those for Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs), all of which require candidates to demonstrate increasing levels of competency in attributes and dispositions.

The EPP has continually collected data on candidates' attributes and dispositions with the clinical observation and key assessment documents [Standard 1.1.14] and these data are used in predicting an individual's suitability for advancement in a program and into the profession. Dispositional data, except those collected by Early Childhood Special Education, are not disaggregated and analyzed separately for program improvement. Furthermore, the various instruments lack aligned across programs, nor has the reliability or validity of any assessment been established. Another limitation is that the consequences for a less-than positive evaluation tend to be situational and, again, not correlated with a college-wide norm or set of expectations.
Recognizing this, the EPP spent the summer of 2017 developing a common document that will be piloted by Elementary Education (university faculty and school-based faculty) in the fall. The EPP will include stakeholders in co-creating a final document.

The Early Childhood Special Education has selected criteria and applied them to measure their candidates' development. Data from 2015 include assessment of the candidates by university-based clinical faculty, school-based clinical faculty (mentors), and the candidates themselves. EPP has some data from the initial stages of candidates' internship (3), the mid-term (1), and the final (2). Mean scores ranged from 2.74 (Connects with professional organizations and sources of information relevant to the field of learning disabilities) to 3.43 (Uses research findings and theories to guide practice).

The EPP will build on the success of this program as an element of the plan for moving forward on this standard. EPP has also made significant progress on designing a college-wide assessment instrument that incorporates elements from cultural resources provided by its diverse population. One notable source for developing this college-wide assessment is the Alaska Standards for Cultural Education, which provides a conceptual framework and descriptors for attitudes and dispositions appropriate to the multicultural classrooms the EPP completers will enter. Dispositional qualities are an important focus for assessing candidate performance since evaluation throughout their program must show how EPP completers' performance in non-academic areas is reflected in their students' achievement.

The EPP plans to have all elements of a process for assessing candidates' attributes and dispositions in place and fully-implemented for all pre-service teachers beginning Spring 2018. Before continuing work on the college-wide assessment form, EPP faculty will begin in Fall 2017 by convening a series of focus groups to answer four questions: What is the purpose of this assessment? What are our expectations? How will we measure a candidate's suitability for moving forward? And What are the consequences ascribed to the established data points? One product of these groups will be a rubric to establish a score for each time a candidate is evaluated with the form. Also, as part of this development process, the focus groups will build into the design the method for establishing the reliability and validity of any instrument to be used and of the process. The groups will bring their proposals to the Accreditation and Assessment Committee for review, followed by a review and adoption by the college faculty.

After the questions mentioned above are answered, and the assessment process has is adopted, the EPP will finalize the college-wide form and any others, if needed, and establish a standardized procedure for using them to collect data. The EPP will pilot the instruments and data analysis in Spring 2018, using the summer to revise, as needed.

3.4 Selectivity During Preparation

The EPP has established and monitored candidate progression and advancement from admission through completion. The EPP has selected and established Student Learning Outcomes as the criteria for assessing candidates and as measures of candidate progress and candidate performance throughout the program. Through a renewed commitment to ongoing improvement through the process of analyzing and
evaluating multiple sources of evidence, the EPP ensures the continuous preparation of high-quality candidates who understand content, pedagogical, and dispositional knowledge in standards, research, and evidence-based program, and who are certified to teach ensuing generations of P-12 students. The EPP mission is to prepare educators as confident, skilled, and reflective professionals who are critical, creative thinkers, effective communicators, advocates for diverse learners, users of technology, life-long learners, and stewards of the profession. As evidenced in Standard 1, the EPP strives to develop content, pedagogical and professional and ethical dispositions within candidates. The collection of evidence demonstrates that the EPP programs have met state legal requirements, are aligned with current research, and meet rigorous national, professional, state, and local standards.

3.5 & 3.6 Selection At Completion

The EPP ensures the quality of its candidates by employing rigorous exit criteria for continuous improvement at completion. For selection at completion, candidates meet the exacting exit criteria before the EPP recommends them for certification as effective teachers who will have a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. Evidence presented by the EPP demonstrates that candidates have reached a high standard for content and pedagogical knowledge in the fields where they are seeking certification by successfully passing the Praxis II Core Content exam before being admitted to clinical teaching. Through coursework, field and clinical experiences, and assessments that culminate in their student/clinical teaching, candidates successfully demonstrate that they can teach effectively with a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. After candidates successfully meet all exit criteria, the EPP provides an Institutional Recommendation to the State of Alaska for certification as an effective teacher who will impact P-12 student learning and development [See 1.1.15, 1.2.1, 1.3.2].

High Exit Criteria/Standards

Criterion #1: Candidates must pass both the appropriate Praxis I and Praxis II examinations.

Criterion #2: Candidates demonstrate the application and skill of their knowledge through performance assessments in both field and clinical experiences by program faculty, their cooperating teachers, and the Director of Teacher Preparation and Advising.

Criterion #3: Candidates have achieved and maintained a C or higher in all course work and a 3.0 GPA in all course work within the major.

Criterion #4: Candidates must successfully complete their field and clinical experience as evidenced by assessments completed by the cooperating teacher, university field supervisor, along with candidate self-assessments and reflective writings.

Criterion #5: Candidates must have a conferred Bachelor's degree.

THE UAA/COE Placement Coordinator certifies all Institutional Recommendations after verifying that all the above criteria have been met.
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* ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met

4.1 Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development

Tracking EPP completer impact on P-12 student learning is an important practice for the EPP continuous improvement process. As outlined above the EPP frequently encounters obstacles to obtaining student data from the state and school districts, but these are not an insurmountable. The comprehensive findings and planning outlined in this report across all standards will absolutely strengthen the EPP’s partnerships throughout the state thus enhancing the ability of the EPP to monitor the impact of completers on P-12 student learning and subsequently contribute to the data-informed decision-making for initial and advanced program improvement.

In Standard Four, the emphasis is on the provider's (EPP) demonstrating the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation. In order to fulfill this standard, data were collected on initial licensure areas, including the bachelors and post-baccalaureate programs in Early Childhood Education, the bachelors, and post-baccalaureate programs in Elementary Education, the Master of Arts in Teaching in Secondary Education, and
the graduate certificates in Early Childhood Special Education and Special Education.

In determining which completers to focus on for Standard Four, the following criteria were established:

Completers work in a P-12 public school classroom in Alaska, as this allows the Alaska Department of Labor to track their employment. Completers work in one of five districts, including the Anchorage, Matanuska-Susitna, Kodiak, Kenai, or Lower Kuskokwim School Districts, as these represent both urban and rural areas where the representation of completers is significant enough that confidentiality issues will not be a problem. These districts also encompass the areas where the EPP has regional satellite campuses that offer education courses. Finally, the student populations present in these five districts alone constitute 64% of the total student population in Alaska, allowing for a fair representation of the statewide impact.

Completers are fully certified and teaching in the subject/area for which they were prepared to teach, as those teaching in other than their certified areas will encounter issues outside the purview and control of their program preparation.

Completers are in their second, third, or fourth year teaching, which helps dilute the decisions made when in "survival mode" during the first year of teaching or the impact of the district itself on teaching that cannot be controlled for once teachers are out of the induction years.

The following actions were taken in regards to data collection:

List of completers was created: To identify the target sample, initially, the EPP created a list of all recent graduates from 2013 to 2015 who received their initial teaching licensure from one of the four programs in Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Special Education. Secondarily, the Office of Institutional Research pulled information from the Alaska Department of Labor's page, which listed all EPP graduates who are employed in Alaska's public schools. These lists were cross-referenced to create a list of completers who work in a P-12 public school classroom in Alaska; work in one of five identified districts, including the Anchorage, Matanuska, Kodiak, Kenai, or Lower Kuskokwim School Districts; whose initial certification is from EPP; who are teaching in the subject/area for which they are prepared to teach; and who are in their second, third, or fourth year teaching. EPP faculty reviewed this list for accuracy. Finally, a staff member searched all five district websites to help verify current employment within one of the above-listed districts. This two-step process addressed a large number of discrepancies between the lists. These discrepancies are due to a) incomplete lists from the Department of Labor, b) an inability to automatically determine if completers are teaching in the field they are qualified for (e.g., if an early childhood completer is teaching fifth grade, this excluded that person from the pool for the purposes of this CAEP standard), c) an inability to easily match when a completer graduated with how many years he or she had taught given the number of completers who did not start teaching in a public P-12 school immediately after graduation. Once these steps were accomplished, a list was finalized, and professional email addresses were compiled. This resulted in: 34 potential Early Childhood completers, 29 potential Elementary completers, 56 potential Secondary completers, and 15 potential Special Education
completers.

Additionally, once the list of completers was created, a second list was compiled to identify the schools where completers taught to aid in distributing the employer surveys. This resulted in: 54 schools in Anchorage, six schools in Kenai, 15 in the Mat-Su, two in Kodiak, and zero in LKSD.

Interview protocols were established and used with completers: A team of four faculty representing four different programs established an interview protocol to be used with recent completers to help address the components of CAEP Standard 4: Impact on P K-12 Student Learning. The protocol included a list of criteria the completers must meet to participate [see above], a script for the interviewer, a recording sheet, a short survey that accompanied the interview as a way to gather demographic information, and scripts for the recruitment and follow-ups, both for phone and email solicitations. Each faculty member then field-tested the survey twice, bringing back observations and reflections for the group to consider before finalizing the protocols. The final protocol was then field-tested again by Faculty A with a completer. That test case was recorded, and Faculty A then brought the recording and reflective memo to the team for their review and discussion. The interviewers were not faculty members, nor did they know the participants, which helped prevent bias.

Participants were first recruited via email; follow-up phone calls were used with those who did not respond to the initial email. The interviewers sent the survey to collect demographic data and then conducted each interview using the established script, which was audio-recorded with the permission of the participant. This resulted in the following response rates: 1/34 Early Childhood, 0/29 Elementary, 7/56 Secondary, and 2/15 SPED for a total response rate of 10/134 or 7.5%. One of the interviewers and Faculty A each wrote up reflective memos after listening to the ten interviews; the memos were then compared by the team of four to ensure reliability.

One of the interviewers and Faculty A then analyzed the reflective memos, drawing upon qualitative measures, using the following selective codes: measuring student growth, using student growth data, measuring your level of effectiveness as a teacher, ways the academic program prepared you, ways the academic program did not prepare you, and other. Those results were discussed in detail with the entire group, which led to the themes' being solidified and summarized.

Interview protocols were established to be used with employers in the future: A team of four faculty representing four different programs established an interview protocol to be used with employers to help address the components of Standard Four. The protocol included a list of completers at that school for the employer to consider a script for the interviewer, a recording sheet and scripts for the recruitment and follow-ups, both for phone and email solicitations.

Surveys were administered to alumni and employers: In March 2017, deans across the University of Alaska System collected data for program improvement with the NExT Common Metrics system. This system administers an exit survey, a Transition to Teaching (i.e., alumni) survey, and a Supervisor (i.e., employer) survey. The alumni and employer surveys were used to evaluate CAEP Standard 4. The findings also inform CAEP Standard 1 and CAEP Standard 2. The system used previously and
primarily by universities in Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, specializes in
gathering data from multiple perspectives and allows institutions to collaborate and
identify similar strengths and areas for improvement. Its instruments are field tested
for reliability and validity and are aligned with InTASC standards. [See 4.0.6]

While the NExT surveys provided a standard set of questions, the EPP did chose to
add several questions to the Transition to Teaching and Supervisor surveys.
The Transition to Teaching survey now includes these questions: Tell us how you
measure student growth and how you use the data. Tell us how you measure your
own level of effectiveness as a teacher. In what ways did your academic program
prepare or not prepare you for the responsibilities, you encounter on the job. The
Supervisor survey now includes these questions: How do you measure the EPP
graduates' students' growth? Are EPP graduates' students showing growth as a whole
or in comparison to other teachers' students? Do you feel your EPP graduates
effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions of a high-quality
teacher? How so or why not? Overall, are you satisfied with the preparation of your
teachers who are EPP graduates? Why or why not? Please provide any additional
comments in the space below.

The exit surveys were sent to both fall 2016 and spring 2017 graduates from the four
initial licensure programs. Each graduate received an invitation through her or his UA
email address to contribute in April of 2017 using a unique identifier, along with three
follow-up emails. Additionally, faculty from the graduates' programs also sent
reminders in May of 2017, resulting in the following completion rates: 21/32 Early
Childhood, 10/23 Elementary, 18/30 Secondary, and 2/10 for SpEd and 51/87 Total,
for an overall response rate of 58.6% [See 4.0.6a]. While these surveys are not
being included in the analysis for Standard Four, they are available for comparison of
satisfaction rates to NExT Alumni Surveys in future years.

The Transition to Teaching surveys (referred to as NExT Alumni Surveys), was sent to
all alumni who had graduated in fall 2013/spring 2014 and fall 2015/spring 2016.
Contact information was pulled from the Institutional Research database and
compared to information obtained through the UA Alumni Association. This sample
did not delineate between those who were teaching within the areas they had been
prepared to teach and those who had taken positions in other areas they were
considered "highly qualified" for but not certified to teach. The survey did not focus
on those teaching within the five target districts; it did not focus on those in their
second, third, or fourth year teaching, although the 2014 group might have fit these
criteria; and it did not take into account only those teaching in P-12 public schools
within Alaska. Instead, all graduates from those years were contacted. Thus the
number of graduates who received it was higher than those who were solicited for
interviews by the completers in March. Given these qualifiers, the intent of
considering these data is that the larger sample size will reflect the diversity in
students and in placements. Alumni were contacted first via email, received two
follow-up emails, and then received a follow-up phone reminder. This resulted in the
following response rates for Alumni 2014: 9/35 Early Childhood, 0/9 SPED, 3/25
Elementary, 7/34 Secondary, and 19/103 Total for an overall response rate of
18.4%. The response rate for Alumni 2016 included: 14/37 Early Childhood, 0/3
SPED, 2/30 Elementary, 8/16 Secondary, and 25/86 Total, for an overall response
rate of 29.1% [See 4.0.6a].
The Supervisor Surveys (referred to as NExT Employer Surveys), were sent to employers of alumni who graduated in fall 2013/spring 2014 and fall 2015/spring 2016. The list of graduates for the alumni surveys was compared to the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development Certified Staff Employee Database, which identified those alumni from the specified years who were teaching in Alaska public schools as teachers in the fall of 2016. Their school assignments were noted and those principals were then contacted. They received one email request, one reminder, and then were contacted by phone once. This resulted in the following response rates for Employers of Alumni from 2014: 15/19 for Early Childhood, 1/6 for SPED, 8/17 for Elementary, 7/27 for Secondary, and 31/69 Total for an overall response rate of 43%. The response rate for Employers of Alumni from 2016 included: 7/16 for Early Childhood, 0/0 for SPED, 1/10 for Elementary, 3/5 for Secondary, and 11/31, for a Total response rate of 35.5% [See 4.0.6a].

In addition to the NExT survey tool, surveys developed by a committee within the EPP during the last accreditation cycle have been administered from 2008-2016. The measures included exit surveys administered to new graduates between 2008-2016; alumni surveys administered between 2008-2016 to those ones (1), three (3), and five (5) years out; a different alumni survey administered in spring 2016; and an employer survey administered in fall of 2016.

The first alumni survey [See 4.0.7] was administered to all those who had graduated in 2008 through 2016. They were administered to those who had graduated in one, three, or five previous academic years using email addresses gathered through BANNER, Raiser's Edge database, and the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development employee directory. They reflected large participation rates, including those from Early Childhood, Elementary, Secondary, and SPED, as well as the other disciplines served within the college (like Ed Leadership, Counseling, and other graduate programs). Disciplines were not previously broken out for analysis because of some small numbers, but overall participation rates were strong, leading to a total response rate (reflecting years 2008-2016) of 20.4% [See 4.0.7a].

The second alumni survey [See 4.0.8] was sent in the spring of 2016 to alumni who graduated between fall 2012 and spring 2015. Alumni were contacted via email and received two reminder emails; those who had not responded were also contacted via phone twice. This survey was different from past surveys in the questions and the fact that only those graduating with an initial teaching license were contacted. Participation rates were: 20/79 Early Childhood, 21/68 Elementary, 24/90 Secondary, and 18/68 SPED, for a Total of 83 responses out of 305 possible or a 27.2% return rate. [See 4.0.8a]

The employer survey [See 4.0.9] was sent in the fall of 2016 to solicit feedback around key program outcomes. To determine who should receive it, a list of graduates who had responded to the spring survey was compiled; next, those graduates who gave permission to contact their employer in that survey were identified; and finally, the list was narrowed to those graduates who worked in a public school in an Alaskan district and whose employers could clearly be identified. The electronic survey was then sent via email; those who didn't respond were called once and allowed to answer verbally. Out of the 305 potential alumni, 83 alumni responded and gave permission for their employers to be contacted. Out of those, 40 of their employers were able to be identified and contacted, and 8 actually completed
the survey for a total response rate of 20.0% [See 4.0.9a].

Focus group was conducted with COE faculty and staff: Since the EPP is asking completers to consider issues around measuring student growth, using data, measuring their own level of effectiveness as a teacher, and considering how their academic programs prepared or did not prepare them for the responsibilities they encounter on the job, EPP faculty felt it was important to consider these issues as well. During a faculty meeting on April 6, 2017, all College of Education faculty and staff worked in focus groups, including those in initial licensure, advanced programs, and in-service professional development. During the first phase faculty organized into six self-selected heterogeneous groups, considered questions around Standard Four, and then reported out to the entire group (see 4.0.10). During the second phase, faculty and staff separated into groups by program (with staff choosing which program they felt most connected to). Once in these groups, they were given data from the previous Alumni Surveys conducted in Summer 2016 to examine (see 4.0.10). This included three charts with data that reflected feedback from four initial licensure programs plus a set of open-ended responses that were program-specific. Participation rates for this meeting were: 6/6 Early Childhood, 2/2 SPED, 2/7 Elementary, 1/2 Secondary, 2/2 Speech and Language Pathology, 3/4 Education Leadership, 0/2 Counseling, 15/16 staff, and 1/1 administrator for a total participation rate of 32/42, or 76.1%.

District evaluation plans were collected: The district teacher evaluation plans were collected from the five focus districts to help inform the EPP’s understanding of how completers might be evaluated in the future. The EPP collected all five district plans, which represented the teachers for 64% of the Alaska student population.

The EPP has identified the following strengths and areas of improvement in the approach of data collection.

Strengths
Strong history of following up with completers using survey data both when exiting the program and within the first five years after graduation
Use of tools across multiple stakeholders, including new graduates, alumni, and employers
Desire to look at holistic measures that cover P-12 student experiences
Faculty motivation to help institute a pilot program (using interviews and NExT surveys) to provide initial data points

Areas of Improvement
Large turnover rate in EPP faculty and in data management, making it difficult to track previously collected data and identify and contact alumni
Insufficient reciprocal relationships established with district and state personnel for data sharing, particularly in sharing teacher evaluation data
Inconsistencies in administration of standardized assessments at the P-12 level that can be linked to classroom teachers
Lack of diversity in participant demographics, making it difficult to examine differences by race, ethnicity, and gender while maintaining confidentiality.

Unavailability of three consecutive cycles of data for each area.
The following actions were taken in regards to data analysis:

Interviews with completers: The reflective memos were analyzed using the following selective codes: measuring student growth, using student growth data, measuring your level of effectiveness as a teacher, ways the academic program prepared you, ways the academic program did not prepare you, and other. Quotes were organized under the selective codes and discussed in detail with a group of four faculty representing four programs, which resulted in the themes' being solidified and summarized.

NExT Alumni Survey and NExT Employer Survey: The survey results were analyzed using descriptive statistics, with a focus on the means. The data were examined at the program level and as a whole, with attention paid to the return rates and averages, both in relation to each other (i.e., why was the return rate for Elementary consistently lower than other programs?) and in terms of the cohorts (i.e., why was the return rate in Early Childhood higher among those from 2016 than from 2014?). For items that were on a four-point scale, with threes and fours indicating a higher level of satisfaction, the averages that fell below that line (scoring between 1-2.9) were highlighted as areas needing improvement. Additionally, open-ended survey questions were examined for patterns and themes.

Employer Survey #1: The survey results were analyzed using quantitative and qualitative measures. Quantitatively, questions that started out, "The graduate...." were averaged, with a (1) representing "very well," a (2) "somewhat," and a (3) "not at all." Open-ended questions that included the prompts, "Based on your experience with this graduate, what areas of preparation do you feel were overlooked in his/her program or needed more emphasis and attention?" "For the areas you identified, what recommendations would you make to improve the program?" "How often during the past year did you observe the graduate in their professional capacity?" and "In addition to observation, what other ways did you use to learn about the graduate's practice?" were examined qualitatively for themes and patterns [See 4.0.14].

Alumni Survey #1: The survey results were analyzed using descriptive statistics, with a focus on the proportion who agreed with certain statements by checking either "somewhat agree," agree," or "strongly agree" (as opposed to "strongly disagree," "disagree," or "somewhat disagree") and the margin of error. Additionally, rates were compared within and across programs for patterns and trends. Open-ended survey questions were examined qualitatively for themes and patterns at the program level [See 4.0.14].

Alumni Survey #2: The survey results were analyzed using descriptive statistics, with a focus on the means at the college level. Attention was paid specifically to the proportion of participants who agreed with certain statements. Open-ended survey questions were examined qualitatively for themes and patterns as a whole and at the program level.[See 4.0.16].

Focus group with faculty and staff: Notes were taken during the report-out from the focus groups; additionally, all handouts and attached notes with feedback and thoughts were collected. These were analyzed and organized by theme using the selective codes: Measuring Student Growth, Using Data, Measuring Own Level of Effectiveness, and Areas that Need Attention.
District evaluation plans: The plans were collected and analyzed to see which approaches had been adopted, to note how data were collected, and to consider how these approaches might be acknowledged and/or supported by EPP programs.

The following actions were taken in regards to data interpretation:

Data were interpreted through the lens of each component, using multiple sources of data to draw conclusions. The following conclusions were made:

4.1 Impact on P-12 learning and development
Growth measures required by the state, teacher-linked student assessments, teacher-conducted action research
No protocols or processes articulated
Interview data, survey data, focus group data from COE, district plans
Standardized test data, student data linked or referenced in teacher evaluations
Director of A&A conversations with district and state officials to the context

4.2 Indicators of teacher effectiveness
Structured classroom observation evaluations, P-12 student surveys
No protocols or processes articulated
Interview data, survey data, focus group data from COE, district plans
District info.
Conversations with district and state officials under the analysis on district evaluation plans

4.3 Satisfaction of employers
Employer satisfaction data such as surveys, focus groups, case studies, employment milestone data
One survey sent to employers in 2016
Survey data
Personal interviews
Interesting topics that arose from the Director of A&A's conversations with principals

4.4 Satisfaction of completers (in-service graduates)
Completer satisfaction data such as surveys focus groups, case studies
Exit surveys and alumni surveys administered since 2008
Interview data, survey data
No new data sources needed
More thorough analyses of the narrative responses from Alumni Survey #1 by program
Document, analysis, evaluation of information provided; interpret data; judge the implications and analyze for improvement of the preparation program

4.1 Impact on P-12 learning and development
Address sources of the data, P-12 students from whom the data come (with proportion of completers represented, degree of attrition, manner by which data are linked with teachers), state's level of disaggregation, criteria used to establish minimum number of completers, decisions as to number of years of performance, disaggregated data for comparison (including ELL, SPED, attendance), learning objectives and metrics specific to schools/districts.
Focus on "virtual case study" that includes reflective journals, blogs, learning communities, and other comparison points.

4.2 Indicators of teacher effectiveness
Address observation instruments that show the application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions corresponding to P-12 learning/teacher effectiveness, representative/purposive sample, survey return rates.

4.3 Satisfaction of employers
Measures that result in valid and reliable data, including promotion and retention, employer satisfaction data, data on promotion, employment trajectory, and employment in high needs schools, and retention

4.4 Satisfaction of completers
Evidence completers perceive preparation as sufficient with a system for gathering data, a response rate of 20%, description of representativeness of samples, multiple comparison points, trends over time.

From a holistic view of the EPP -
Information is provided from several sources, data is analyzed, differences and similarities across licensure areas and demographical data are examined, interpretations and conclusions are reached, trends or patterns are identified, planned or completed actions for change are described.
Standard 5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard.)

1  1.1.1 EPP Student Learning Outcomes.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

2  1.1.7 Praxis II Mea Pass Rates of Completers.pdf

5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

3  InTASC Candidate Performance Content Knowledge SPA Assessments
   1.1.12 InTASC Candidate Performance CK SPA Assessments.pdf
   1.1.12a InTASC 4 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf
   1.1.12b InTASC 5 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

4  InTASC Performance of Candidates Instructional Practice SPA Assessments
   1.1.13 InTASC Performance of Candidates Instructional Practice.pdf
   1.1.13a InTASC 6 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf
   1.1.13b InTASC 7 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf
   1.1.13c InTASC 8 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

5  InTASC Performance of Candidates Professional Responsibility SPA Assessments
   1.1.14 InTASC Performance of Candidates Professional Responsibility.pdf
   1.1.14a InTASC 9 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf
   1.1.14b InTASC 10 Key Assessment Matrix.pdf

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

6  1.1.15 Grade Distribution of Candidates in Teacher Education.pdf

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

7  1.1.16 Completers Selected BA Education Courses Performance Ay1415 AY1617.pdf

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

8  1.3.1 SPA Status Initial Programs.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

9  Praxis II Measures
   1.3.3 Praxis II Alaska Requirements.pdf
   1.3.2a Praxis II Pass Rates by Year.pdf
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making.
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

19 Employer Survey #1
- 4.0.9 Employer Survey #1 .pdf
- 4.0.9a Employer Survey #1 Response Rates.pdf

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

20 4.0.14 Employer Survey #1 Data.pdf

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

21 4.1.2. Alaska Statewide Test Scores .pdf

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

22 4.1.7 Impact on P-12 Student Learning Statement.pdf

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

23 NExT Employer Survey on Satisfaction, Quantitative
- 4.3.7 NExT Employer Survey on Satisfaction, Quantitative).pdf
- 4.3.7a NExT Employer Survey on Satisfaction.pdf

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

24 4.4.5 Alumni Survey #1 Graphs and Tables.pdf

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

25 Parity Table
- 5.0.1a Parity Table Facilities First Floor.pdf
- 5.0.1b Parity Table Facilities Second Floor.pdf
- 5.0.1c Parity Table UAA and UAF Campus Map.pdf
- 5.0.1e Parity Table UAA_UAF Budget Comparison.pdf
- 5.0.1f UAA 2017 Org Chart and UAF Org Chart.pdf
- 5.0.1g Comparison of Student Services.pdf

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

26 5.1.1. Quality Assurance Systems EPP.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

27 Supervisor Survey Validity and Reliability 2017
- 5.1.2 Supervisor Survey Validity and Reliability 2017.pdf
- 5.1.2a Exit Survey validity reliability for report.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures

5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

28 5.1.3 TTS 2017 Validity and Reliability for Report.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

5.1.4 Verification of Accreditation with Levels.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

5.1.5 ETS Why and How.pdf

5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.

5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

5.4.1 Employment Data State Level.pdf

5.4.2 CAEP 8 Annual Measure Employed in Position Trained.pdf

5.4.3 Alumni Public K12_Employment.pdf

* ii. Analysis of evidence (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that makes the case that the standard is met

5.1.1. Quality Assurance System of the EPP.

The EPP's online quality assurance system or PeTAL is composed of multiple measures that provide and monitor regular and comprehensive data on candidate qualifications, progress, and performance as well as completer achievement, program quality, and EPP operational efficacy. Additionally, internal EPP policies require all candidate data from admissions through the recommendation for state certification to be included in individual candidate folders housed within PeTAL. Further, student work samples linked to Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Key Assessment evaluation are stored in a web-based service provider (TaskStream). This three-pronged approach to quality assurance provides formative evaluation, ongoing feedback, and summative decision points for candidates and programs.

In 2015-2106, the institution purchased Digication, an external online provider of ePortfolios. Digication allows for the comprehensive collection, storage, and evaluation of student work samples. The EPP is transitioning from TaskStream to Digication, which is a more transparent and accessible system for monitoring candidate progress and performance. Additionally, the EPP is working with the Office of Institutional Research to transition from the EPP specific PeTAL system to a
Sharepoint site that will serve as a comprehensive system to monitor candidate qualifications, progress, and performance, as well as completer achievement, program quality, and EPP operational efficacy for all three Major Administrative Units (MAUs) within the statewide university system. This AIDE (Alaska Information and Data on Educators) site is currently under construction with full implementation expected in August 2019.

Through the current comprehensive system, the EPP maintains quality assurance with systematic collection and analysis of valid data from multiple measures. Recognizing the need to integrate evidence of completers' positive impacts on P-12 learners, the EPP is actively engaged in integrating this evidence within the AIDE system. The EPP makes the best use possible of the results of all inquiry and data collection to establish specific program priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

PeTAL, TaskStream, Digication, AIDE: Multiple Measures for Operational Effectiveness

In the PeTAL system and the Taskstream service, the EPP uses multiple measures in all programs at all levels for data sets. These serve to balance both the strengths and weaknesses of individual measures that are applied across all programs and support needed changes at the program level. Through an ongoing assessment cycle for course(s) and programmatic changes and improvements, faculty gather and analyze data and develop action steps for improvement for each licensure program. Committees that included department chairs, program leads, program faculty and EPP staff have collected data, course and program reviews, and program effectiveness evaluations. The focus on findings and formalization of improvement plans in the last three years have evaluated and responded to feedback from SPA reports and course and curriculum revisions.

While specific programs have engaged in a consistent assessment cycle aligned to Specialized Professional Assessment reports (SPA), a gap exists in the assessment cycle relative to continuous improvement of the Initial Teacher Preparation program as a whole. The EPP will respond to this need by implementing a comprehensive and coherent assessment cycle (the EPP Quality Assurance System) to enhance program elements and capacity and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development across all initial licensure programs. The EPP now responds the current array of the Student Learning Outcome (SLO) to form a single set of SLOs that addresses all initial teacher preparation programs. Beginning with 2017-2018 completers, all SLO indicators will be evaluated across a three-year cycle. Assessment will also include the attributes and dispositions beyond the academic ability of candidates. Faculty will identify meaningful and manageable instructional and non-instructional outcomes that are visible and measurable; describe what candidates can do or demonstrate as a result of the program, and align with and support the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO).

Other aspects of the cycle will be:

Programs include links to supplemental documents that support their data analyses and provide examples of candidate coursework, assessment rubrics, and additional program-specific standards that may apply.
Programs explain the methods and criteria (at least three) that were used for each outcome that:
. draw from at least two direct data sources, ideally part of coursework;
. describe data sources: course name and number, assignment, or activity; and
. describe the instrument used for scoring or measuring the assignment or activity.

Methods describe how candidates are evaluated. Each method identifies a target or minimum performance standard and the percentage of candidates who achieve it.

Programs answer questions such as: What specifically will we measure? How do we want to use, collect, analyze, interpret, and report the data? What level is acceptable as evidence of improvement or success?

Corresponding outcomes are also included (SLO Outcome)

Assessment results and findings are reported in PeTAL or AIDE each year

Each method provides results and analysis, that includes:
. qualitative or quantitative data in a narrative summary or table; and
. a well-reasoned description of conclusions, significance, impact, and action plans.

Results describe findings, including strengths and weaknesses, and whether programs are achieving the intended results. Programs answer questions, such as: What are the results? Are we meeting the desired level of performance?

Program analyses include designated Areas for Growth based upon the data collected to address the sentence stem: From the data gathered, the program can improve in the following ways; and to answer the question, Were these expectations met?

Currently, programs gather, collect, analyze, monitor, and report evidence in PeTAL and TaskStream on regular assessment cycles established by the EPP. The EPP's Quality Assurance System monitors candidate progress, completer achievements, and operational effectiveness. Annual assessment reports uploaded to the institutional SharePoint site each year for review by the dean provide documentation of a range of different measures that, taken together, comprise a coherent program's performance. The EPP documentation ensures that its quality assurance system supports changes and continual improvements through the disaggregation of data by programs and/or candidate levels in response to inquiries regarding common assessments, program outcomes, instruction/curriculum, and programmatic evaluations.

The EPP's Quality Assurance System demonstrates the EPP's operational effectiveness in all of its teacher preparation programs in ongoing, systematic, and comprehensive ways. Working with the Academic Leadership Council, composed of key faculty and staff, the Dean's office has engaged in a comprehensive review of all operational functions within the EPP. Processes and policies have been systematized in support of faculty efficiencies and effectiveness for student success. The clear need to address the EPP's systemic deficiency is driving a culture shift primed to engage in rigorous reflection for program improvement. The appreciative inquiry model, where by faculty can engage in a process of self-determined change provides the foundation for the
culture shift. In September 2017, three faculty members will be trained as facilitators in the appreciative inquiry model to support the ongoing continuous improvement of the EPP.

The EPP has demonstrated candidate progress with evidence for CAEP Standards 1 and 3. This evidence has been cross-tagged to Standard 5 [See also 1.1.16]. The EPP has demonstrated completer achievements in evidence provided for CAEP Standard 4. This evidence has also been cross-tagged in CAEP Standard 5.

Schedule for Continuous Review.
The EPP will strengthen its annual learning assessment cycle through the use of three phases:

Planning Phase: (September 30) assessment plans are due each year to (1) articulate the EPP mission, (2) identify objectives and learning outcomes, (3) determine methods to gather evidence, and (4) set criteria;

Gathering Evidence Phase: (fall and spring semesters) reports/data dissemination profiles are due by June 15 each year to (5) gather evidence, and (6) review and analyze results;

Action Phase: (August 31 each year) Plans of Action are due to (7) recommend actions, and (8) make changes (documented per program committee).

Program faculty, administrators, and the Director of Accreditation and Assessment (DAA) will work together in their roles and responsibilities of collecting, gathering, analyzing, reporting, uploading, and disseminating data results to EPP faculty through meetings, online availability of reports, and sharing results with stakeholders in EPP department and program meetings, EPP Academic Leadership Council Meetings, Dean's Community Council Meetings, and Focus Group Meetings. The EPP DAA and the Associate Vice Provost: Institutional Research will monitor the quality assurance system operations and data and audit the system regularly.

Evidence presented for each of the five standards demonstrates that the University of Alaska Anchorage College of Education Educator Preparation Program satisfies all CAEP standards.

5.2.1. Quality Assessment Measures of the EPP

The EPP's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent. The quality of assessment measures are evidenced by the EPP's following the CAEP Evidence Guide and striving to adhere to the following principles:

Validity and Reliability. The "consequential validity" (Messick, 1995) of the appropriate use of assessment measures for the EPP is supported by the expert validation of assessment items by program faculty for convergent validity (as experts in their fields); the ability to predict candidate performance on other measures for predictive validity [such as course(s) key assessments assignments, etc.]; with expert validation of candidate performance and/or candidate artifacts/exemplars
through expert judgment by faculty, cooperating teachers, stakeholders, and university field supervisors.

Using multiple measures of evaluation in coursework, field, and clinical experiences, the EPP's assessment measures provide relevance by measuring what they claim to measure for construct validity and importance; have the right balance between what is being measured and the relevant attributes for content validity (i.e., SLOs and Ethical and Dispositions rubrics [where they currently exist]); and have predictive and face validity in providing evidence that EPP graduates are effective teachers in the classroom as predicted by important and related assessments throughout their progression in the EPP. By implementing a system that generates agreements among multiple raters of the same candidate's performance over time with stable and consistent data, the EPP will further ensure the reliability and internal consistency of assessment measures.

Representativeness and Verifiable. Evidence drawn and presented by the EPP as representative or purposeful samples indicates situations in partner school districts that are typical, free of bias, and potentially generalizable. Data records of the EPP are accurate.

Cumulativeness. Data sets presented as triangulated evidence by the EPP are based on at least three administrations of the assessment. The exceptions to this are instances when the feedback from Specialty Program Assessment Reports (SPA) required revision of assessments and/or rubrics.

All aspects of the EPP from recruitment and admissions, through development and completion, to on-the-job performance are informed by multiple assessment measures. Through submitted evidence for CAEP Standards 1 through 5, the EPP documents, monitors, and demonstrates the following:

- the effects of EPP admissions-selection criteria;
- candidate progress;
- completer achievements;
- the EPP's operational effectiveness; and
- that the EPP satisfies all CAEP Standards.

Evidence provided by the EPP for CAEP Standards 1 through 5 are grounded by theory and in a shared vision or conceptual framework that guides its programs. These foundational elements represent, as do these data, "who we are and what we are about." Each piece of evidence generated and provided builds upon this framework and a chain of reasoning to create new understanding.

Fairness, Robustness, and Actionability. The EPP strives to use measures that are free from bias and may be equitably applied by any potential user or observer. The EPP has had varying success in establishing content validity due to the need for continuous adjustment of Key Assessment Rubrics. On the other hand, the evidence provided in this self-study demonstrates the relevance to InTASC and Specialized Professional Associations and is representative, cumulative, and actionable.

5.3.1. Continuous Improvement of the EPP.
Through the use of the EPP's PeTAL system, and the ongoing and regular monitoring of candidates by the Student Services Center, the EPP assesses performance against relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations, and monitors the effects of its selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion. This process enables the EPP to use the results of feedback loops to improve its program elements, processes, and capacity based upon the Selected Improvement Plan [See the EPP's Selected Improvement Plan].

External data from the School District Partnerships Meetings, Principal Employer Surveys, Clinical Teachers' Exit Surveys, academic program evaluations and reviews, and Annual Program Assessment reports are collected, analyzed, and reported through the EPP and the Office of Academic Affairs for continuous improvement. The ongoing evaluation of faculty-level, candidate-level, and unit-level data informs the EPP's efforts to improve the capacity and quality of its preparation through curriculum and instruction, the use of technology, and the quality of candidates and faculty.

As outlined in Standard 1, the EPP has experienced a great deal of administrative and faculty turnover and reduction. And in the past three years, all initial licensure programs, aside from the Special Education program, have been in a constant state of assessment revision in response to Specialized Professional Association (SPA) feedback. This has greatly impacted the EPP's ability to implement a continuous improvement cycle that is comprehensive, cohesive, and wholly congruent with CAEP standards. However, the EPP has taken steps to systematize a continuous improvement cycle such as the appointment of a Director of Accreditation and Assessment, the reinstating of the faculty Accreditation and Assessment Committee, the plan for two data retreats, and the development of key assessments and dispositional evaluation consistent across initial licensure programs.

Assessment data have been documented annually through candidate digital portfolios. Within these portfolios, candidates upload evidence of their learning linked to key assessments and/or SPA required standards-based assessments. Prior to the 2015-2016 academic year, the EPP relied on the Taskstream application for the candidates' digital portfolios and documentation of the evaluation. As the assessments were housed within individual courses, they were often also submitted and evaluated within the Blackboard course management program used by the institution. Additionally, annual assessment reports were created based on SPAs and uploaded to an internal information system created for the EPP, which is currently being phased out. The new systems will provide a broader range of aggregated and disaggregated data for decision-making. In the 2015-2016 academic year, the EPP began a gradual implementation of a new digital portfolio system, Digication. For this report assessment data collected and analyzed reflect academic years 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16.

Regular and Systematic Review of the EPP's PeTAL system

Evidence previously presented in 5.1 that was collected through the EPP's online quality assurance system or PeTAL includes multiple measures that provide and monitor regular and comprehensive data on candidate qualifications, progress, and performance; completer achievements; program quality; and EPP operational efficacy. In addition, all candidate data from admissions through the recommendation for state certification are included in individual candidate files housed in the PeTAL
system.

The findings for the CAEP self-study process revealed gaps in the EPP’s continuous improvement processes. One very significant gap is a lack of coordination for continuous improvement. To address this weakness, the EPP has identified a Director of Accreditation and Assessment (DAA). The DAA will work with program faculty and administrators to improve the systematic and systemic collection, gathering, analyzing, reporting, uploading, and dissemination of data results to education faculty. This will be accomplished through meetings, online availability of reports, and sharing results with stakeholders in School District Partnership Meetings, Educator Preparation Program (EPP) Dean’s Council Meetings, and the Dean, Leadership, and Superintendent Meetings and Focus Groups.

Interim Dean Initiatives

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 the policies and procedures documents within the EPP.

Systemizing All Processes (SAP) is a multi-step project to systemize the policies and procedures within the EPP.

Student Services Initiatives

The Student Services Center, in Fall 2016, implemented workshops for students not yet admitted to the program based on an analysis of PRAXIS CORE pass rates. A data review revealed that candidates struggled with the mathematics and writing portions of the exam. In Spring 2017, Student Services began offering a workshop in Mathematics and Writing based on student requests. Data are not yet available to determine the impact of this innovation.

Faculty Initiatives
Program improvement through curriculum and program review.

Early Childhood Program
2013-2014 completed a comprehensive review and update of 85% of course offering.


Elementary Education
2014-2015 completed a review and update of courses.
2014-2015 developed and implemented a new course in partnership with a rural school district. Participant gains practical experience implementing formative and summative assessments through online tutoring session with district students.
Secondary Education
2013-2014 completed a review and update of courses.
2017-2018 realign program into cohort model with implementation Summer 2018.

Special Education
2015-2017 completed a comprehensive review and update of courses, including the addition of a minor with special education licensure for Early Childhood and Elementary program candidates.

Continuous Improvements of the EPP based on findings from the CAEP Self-Study

All Programs

Clinical Observation Document
Faculty collected and analyzed clinical observation/evaluation documents from other teacher preparation programs. (Summer 2017).
Faculty developed a clinical observation/evaluation document to pilot in the internship in Fall 2017.
Moving into Spring 2018, multiple measures will be used to gather data about the documents for revision and adjustment, and a data collection method will be developed within digication (ePortfolio).
Implement use of the single set of clinical observation/evaluation documents across all Initial Teacher Preparation Programs.

Inconsistency in program expectation for clinical experiences was discovered through an analysis of "Internship Handbooks" for each program. A draft "Field Experiences Handbook" will be presented in August 2017 for feedback from faculty, Dean’s Council, and School District Partners.

Dispositions - While each program consciously addresses dispositional learning throughout candidates' experiences, outside of Special Education, no systemic and systematic method exists to collect data relative to dispositions for EPP candidates. In March 2017 faculty began the process necessary to address this issue by researching processes used at other EPPs for monitoring attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability.

Faculty research other institutions' expected dispositions, the measurement tools and how data are used for decision-making. A draft set of dispositions has been developed by this faculty work group.

Draft dispositions will be presented to the entire faculty in August 2017

The Dean's Council, School District Partners, employers, and alumni will be surveyed for feedback on the proposed dispositions
The instrument will be piloted in Spring 2018, with full implementation in Fall 2018

Student Learning Outcomes - a loose alignment exists across the EPP’s Initial Licensure Programs. In the academic year 2017-2018 faculty will engage in a process to revise the published SLO for each specialty program into a single set of SLOs for all Initial Licensure Programs.
Program Assessments - Speciality programs have developed a set of key assessments aligned to SPA standards. Faculty will work across programs to develop a set of key assessments aligned to InTASC Standards that will be used by the EPP and partners to assess candidate portfolios at the completion of their program. This assessment will evaluate a candidate's readiness for the teaching profession.

As the evidence presented in 3.2 shows, a critical measure of the selectivity criteria of the EPP is that all candidates pass both the PRAXIS CORE and PRAXIS II prior to being admitted to clinical teaching. As with all institutions in the University of Alaska System, UAA is an open enrollment university and does not require candidates to complete the SAT or the ACT to be eligible for admission. State of Alaska protocols directs the EPP's actions in regard to selectivity and admission of candidates. The effects of the EPP's selection criteria and the examples of programmatic changes presented, highlight the commitment to continuous improvement to ensure that EPP candidates are better prepared and highly qualified to complete their clinical experiences, to teach P-12 students, and to make positive impacts on student learning and development.

The EPP Selected Improvement Plan (SIP) and the evidence presented in CAEP Standards 1 through 4 demonstrate the various ways that the EPP tracks and collects data over time from admission, during development, and at completion with Decision Points of candidate quality, satisfaction of employers and completers, complete achievements, and comprehensive operational capacity and effectiveness. While the need for improvement in the use of data is evident through the self-study process, the EPP does make data-informed decisions regarding its programs for continuous improvement to ensure the EPP offers the highest quality teacher preparation possible for regional, state, and national educator needs.

5.4.1 CAEP 8 Annual Measures

The eight (8) annual reporting measures provide information to the public on both program outcome and program impact. This information can be found on the EPP Website. (https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/academics/college-of-education/)

Following is the list of CAEP measures with links to data tables that provide supporting evidence for each measure:

Measures on Program Impact:
Measure 1: Impact that completers' teaching has on P-12 learning and development. Supporting Evidence:
EPP Statement on Impact on P-12 Student Learning [4.1.7]
Alaska Measure of Progress 2015 [4.1.2]

Measure 2: Indicators of teaching effectiveness. Supporting Evidence:
Results of Clinical Experiences [See 1.4.1]
NExT Employer Survey on Satisfaction, Quantitative (See 4.3.7a)

Measure 3: Results of employer surveys, and including retention and employment milestones. Supporting Evidence:
NExT Employer Survey on Satisfaction, Quantitative (See 4.3.7a)
Employment Data for Alaska Schools [See 5.4.1]
Measure 4: Results of completer surveys. Supporting Evidence: Completer Surveys [4.4.5]

Measure 5: Graduation rates from preparation programs. Supporting Evidence: Admitted/Enrolled/Completed by Program and Licensure Area Admitted Cohorts beginning 2008-09 to 2012-2013 (as of October 2013)

Measure 6: Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements. Supporting Evidence: Praxis II Content Test Scores [See 1.3.2]

Measure 7: Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they were prepared. Supporting Evidence: Alaska State Data - UA Alumni in Alaska Public Schools [See 5.4.1] Completers employed in position for which they were trained [See 5.4.2]

Measure 8: Student loan default rates and other consumer information. Supporting Evidence: UAA Student Consumer Information

5.5 Stakeholder Involvement in Program Improvement

The EPP includes appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. Involvement of stakeholders includes the Dean’s Advisory Council [See 2.1.2], Partner Meeting [See 2.1.2a], and Alumni/Employer Surveys [See 4.0.6a, 4.0.7a, 4.0.8a]
III. Cross-cutting themes

a. Statement of integration of diversity

* i. Analysis of evidence that demonstrates diversity integration

The College is cognizant of the need to prepare teachers and other school professionals who are sensitive and responsive to the contextually-based learning needs of children and youth from Alaska Native populations and other racial and ethnic groups who reside in the state and nation. Faculty members integrate topics of cultural heritage as well as intellectual abilities and disabilities, socioeconomic and gender differences, and sexual orientation across initial teacher preparation and advanced programs, courses, and internships. Candidates in initial and advanced programs study educational equity and experience diverse cultural perspectives in field experiences, where they gain an understanding of and acquire skills to assess and address the educational needs of all students. Course syllabi and curriculum vitae (CV) include examples of faculty members' respect for and incorporation of diversity in instruction. Standards 1 and 4 contain detailed information about the integration of diversity issues across the curriculum.

Fifteen (15) Course Content Guides and Syllabi were reviewed for evidence of the cross-cutting themes of diversity, technology, and social justice. Social justice was included in the analysis of evidence in the cross-cutting theme of diversity for its connection to the EPPs Core Value Inclusive and Equity. Course descriptions or Student Learning Outcomes in 8 of the 15 (53%) courses reviewed had identifiable concepts related to diversity. References to social justice were found in 2 of the 15 (13%) Course and Curriculum Guides.

Schools in Alaska are some of the most diverse in the nation. Faculty in partnership with the Placement and Certification Coordinator and school districts give attention to skill and knowledge development through field experiences that are diverse in type and population. [See 2.3.1 Table 4, 2.3.3 & 2.3.4]. Field experiences include observations in a variety of settings, community engagement projects, place-based learning in rural districts, language-based assessment, and working with small groups of children, all leading up to the internship experience.

All candidates take EDFN A478 Issues in Alaska Native Education K-12. This course is a critical piece of providing candidates with a "history of Alaska education and current education policy with a focus on issues in Alaska Native education. It includes the study of the Alaska environment as well as the social, economic and political history of Alaska from the perspective of both Alaska Native people and immigrant residents (CCG Course Description)." Further, this course meets the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development Alaska Studies requirement for state certification.

The EPP is home to the Center for Alaska Native Education (CRANE). In AY 2016-2017 the EPP structured workloads of two Alaska Native faculty members to facilitate access to their skills and knowledge across a variety of courses. These two faculty members are invited into pre-service classes to deepen the teaching and learning around issues of education in a culturally diverse state. In AY 2017-2018 the organizational structure reflects the transition of the CRANE program to an Indigenous Studies program to expand the teaching and learning relative to Alaska Native students within the EPP and in P-12 schools.
Finally, the EPP's commitment to diversity as a cross-cutting theme is evident in the published syllabi for all courses, which state,

"Students enrolled in the course will develop:
- Knowledge regarding (a) historical and cultural traditions of Alaska's cultural and ethnic groups, (b) the impact of socio-cultural influences on education, (c) trends in education special learning populations, (d) state and federal education legislations, and (e) culturally competent pedagogical practices.
- Skills in using culturally sensitive and responsive instructional and assessment strategies and materials that (a) promote multiculturalism, (b) identify, analyze, and minimize bias regarding race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, low socioeconomic levels, religion, geographic regions, and sexual orientation; (c) promote academic achievement and educational equity for Alaska's diverse students; (d) develop appropriate cross-cultural communication skills that promote positive partnerships with parents and families.
- Dispositions that relate to (a) realizing personal and professional growth through self-evaluation and reflection; (b) examining personal beliefs toward people from different ethnic and socioeconomic communities and genders; (c) demonstrating sensitivity toward people from diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds; (d) appreciating cultural diversity and its applications to teaching multicultural populations; (e) understanding the impact of legislation on education processes for student with disabilities and others at risk of educational failure; and (f) recognizing the effects of family involvement of students' achievement."

b. Statement of integration of technology
   * i. Analysis of evidence that demonstrates technology integration

Alaska's geography, lack of a highway system to remote communities, and immature infrastructure make reliance on technology for the development and delivery of educational programs more critical than in other regions of the United States. As such, the College of Education relies heavily on the application of technology in instructional settings, and has invested in hardware, professional development for faculty members, and candidate learning to that end. CVs illustrate the faculty members' commitment to professional development in technology, and both course syllabi and CVs include examples of faculty members' commitment to incorporating technology into instruction. In addition, the COE Assessment Handbook illustrates the College's reliance on technology for its assessment system.

Fifteen (15) Course Content Guides and Syllabi were reviewed for evidence of the cross cutting themes of technology. While none of the Course and Curriculum Guides and matching syllabi addressed technology as a student learning outcome, the integration of technology as both a learning tool and a teaching tool is prevalent through the EPP. All four classrooms used by the EPP are designated SMART Classrooms. Both faculty and candidates are users of the technology. Further, the EPP employs a variety of educational models (face-to-face, hybrid, synchronous and asynchronous distance courses).
Candidates in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, and Special Education take EDFN A302: Foundations of Educational Technology. The course presents skills and strategies needed to integrate technology into teaching and learning. They can provide an overview of issues, pedagogies, tools and skills needed to guide the effective use of technology with children, and supports appropriate use of technology in education. The Student Learning Outcomes are 1) Design learning experiences using technology that advance children’s learning, creativity, and innovation. 2) Present and explain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes identified in the ISTE Standards and Alaska Technology Standards. 3) Exhibit knowledge and skills representative of a professional educator in a global and digital society. 4) Discuss local, global, societal, and ethical issues related to technology in education. 5) Exhibit leadership by promoting the effective use of digital tools and resources.

Candidates in Secondary Education take EDSY A648 Developing Literacies in the 21st Century Classroom. The course provides an analysis and evaluation of current learning theories, models and best practices for developing multiple forms of 21st century literacies in the secondary classroom. Student Learning Outcomes are: 1) Assess the positioning of traditional literacy skills in secondary schools and integrate traditional literacy skill into content-specific instructional plans in ways that address the needs of adolescent learners. 2) Evaluate how the sociocultural turn has potential to shift the ways literacy is addressed in schools and society. 3) Develop ways to integrate new literacies practices into content-specific classroom settings to address the needs of adolescent learners. 4) Critically evaluate ways that literacies are changing and predict possible implications these changes will have on classroom practice with adolescent learners. 5) Integrate 21st century technologies into content-specific instruction in ways that address the needs of adolescent learners.

The EPP strives to model the use of tools and techniques available through computers, the Internet, telecommunications, and multimedia that are used by educators for instruction. Moreover, candidates must be able to demonstrate that they use technology to work effectively with students to support student learning. The EPPs commitment to technology as a cross-cutting theme is evident in the published syllabi for all courses which state "College of Education students are expected to (a) demonstrate sound understanding of technology operations and concepts; (b) plan and design effective learning environments and experiences supported by technology; (c) implement curriculum plans that include technology applications in methods and strategies to maximize student learning; (d) use technology to facilitate a variety of effective assessment and evaluation strategies; (e) use technology to enhance productivity and professional practice; and (f) understand the social, ethical, and human issues surrounding use of technology in PreK-12 schools and apply those principles in practice."
IV. Areas for Improvement (AFIs) from previous accreditation decisions, if any

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Statement of progress in support of removing the AFI(s)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Overview of evidence in support of removing the AFI(s)</td>
<td>No Evidence found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Holistic summary statement (through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc.) that provides a narrative explication for how the evidence collection, taken as a whole, demonstrates that area(s) for improvement are corrected.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. Provide a description of the selected area for improvement and a rationale for selection.

**AREA FOR IMPROVEMENT**

The EPP faculty are choosing to focus on the following area for improvement: Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

**RATIONALE FOR SELECTION**

Attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admission and during the program could be more clearly defined by the EPP.

The criteria for attributes and dispositions, where they are found, are not consistent across the EPP's Initial Licensure Programs.

The EPP collects, analyzes and makes decisions based on limited data sources within each specialty licensure program. However, the EPP lacks clear measures that allow for coherent data collection, data analysis, or data-informed decision making for program improvement across initial licensure programs as a whole.

The EPP lacks the ability to provide evidence of reliability and validity for the current EPP developed assessment and measures it is using to monitor candidates attributes and dispositions.

Tackling this area of improvement will have the greatest overall impact on the EPP. Establishing and monitoring attributes and dispositions is not isolated to CAEP Standard 3. Using measurement tools and reporting data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidates performance in the program and effective teaching also requires attending to significant gaps found across all standards. These areas include:

Development of assessments that allow for data collection and analysis between all initial licensure programs. (CAEP Standard 1, CAEP Standard 2)

Time to establish reliability and validity on programmatic key assessments which have been a continuous state of revision. (CAEP Standard 1, CAEP Standard 5)

Development of a common set of co-created clinical observation and feedback documents for use by university-based and school-based clinical faculty. (CAEP Standard 1, CAEP Standard 2)

Development and implementation of a systemic and systematic procedure for engaging stakeholders as partners in the collection, analysis and data-informed decision-making process critical for program improvement throughout the college. (CAEP Standard 1, CAEP Standard 2, CAEP Standard 3, CAEP Standard 4, CAEP Standard 5)
b. Identify goals and objectives aligned with the selected area for improvement

**Goal #1:** The EPP will implement a systemic plan for assessing candidates' attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability at admission and during the pre-service training program.

- **Objective #1:** Identify the attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admission and during the program.
- **Objective #2:** Develop the EPP assessment tool(s), policies, and procedures to assess candidate attribute and dispositions beyond academic ability.
- **Objective #3:** Fully implement data collection, analysis, and application of assessment tools.

**Goal #2:** Develop an assessment cycle that uses multi-data sources for assessing academic and non-academic factors of candidates to 1) predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching, and 2) make program adjustments.

- **Objective #1:** Identify method(s)/tool(s) for assessing academic and non-academic factors.
- **Objective #2:** Systemize an assessment cycle that sets goals and objectives, maps learning opportunities, assesses goals and objectives, analyzes and discusses results and uses data for improvement.
- **Objective #3:** Refine system(s) for comprehensive monitoring of candidate qualifications, progress, and performance, as well as completer achievement, program quality, and EPP operational efficacy.

* c. Describe the specific strategies and interventions to be implemented in the Selected Improvement Plan along with a timeline for implementation

**Goal #1**

**Strategies and Timeline:**

#1 September - December 2017
Convene working groups comprised of members from internal and external stakeholders to: Select the candidate attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that will be assessed, develop the measurement tool(s), and establish the policies and procedures for implementing this assessment.

Share tool(s), policies, and procedures with internal and external stakeholders for review and feedback.

#2 January - May 2018
Pilot the innovation with Elementary Education candidates and convene focus groups (candidates, and school partners) for feedback.

#3 June 2018
Convene a small working group from the Spring 2018 working group to analyze data, and develop actions for improvement.

#4 September - December 2018
Share data and recommended actions with internal and external stakeholders.
Pilot the revised innovation with Early Childhood and Elementary Education candidates.

#5 December 2018
Convene small working group from original working group to analyze data, and
develop actions for improvement.
Share data and recommended actions with internal and external stakeholders.

#6 January 2019
Implement measurement tool(s), based on established policies and procedures, across all initial licensure programs.

Goal #2
Strategies and Timeline:
#1 September - October 2017
Identify assessments to be used by the EPP for measuring the academic and non-academic factors of candidate to: 1) predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching, and 2) make program adjustments.

#2 September - December 2017
Develop and publish a cohesive and comprehensive assessment cycle with clearly delineated assessments and cycle times.
Provide faculty, staff, clinical educators, and stakeholders training in data literacy.

#3 September 2018 - June 2019
Revise and update current assessment, where needed (Key Assessment for Initial Programs, Clinical observation and feedback documents, Key Assessment for SPAs, ePortfolio at completion.)
Review and upgrade data collection storage systems (PeTAL, AIDE, ePortfolio.)
Make data accessible and user-friendly through storage systems.

#4 May - August 2019
Collect, analyze and apply findings from data for program improvement; document findings and resulting changes for program implementation.

#5 Academic Year 2019-2020
Fully implement continuous an improvement cycle that includes multi-data sources for assessing academic and non-academic factors of candidates to 1) predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching, and 2) make program adjustments.

d. Present a complete description of the assessment plan that details how each goal or objective is to be assessed

For both Goal #1 and Goal #2, the Director of Accreditation and Assessment (DAA) will monitor progress on the timeline and successful completion of all specific tasks for each strategy. Since this is an outcomes-based plan and is internal to the EPP, the DAA's monitoring acts as a formative assessment and can guide in providing added support or alternative strategies if necessary for full achievement. For example, if the pilot with Elementary Education candidates that is scheduled for Fall 2017 can only be completed if faculty, clinical educators, and candidates receive training in implementing the assessment, the DAA will arrange for that support and revise the timeline accordingly. The DAA will also ensure that all resources needed to implement the plan are in place and, if they are not, may also revise the strategies and timelines.

e. Describe the resources available to implement the plan. This includes staffing and faculty cost (time, salary, or reassignment time), budgeting impacts such as travel or training costs, expertise, and other resources
COE has a demonstrated commitment to continuous improvement.

The EPP will use regularly occur fund balances to fund the Selected Improvement Plan through the workload process for reassignment of time and extended contracts. The EPP will also fund additional resources such as travel to conferences and training, contract with experts in the field, the appointment of a Director of Accreditation and Assessment and the placement of student workers with designated faculty. Further, the EPP has institutional support for the continuous improvement efforts through financial allocations that will offset the array of expenses, that range from consultants, travel conferences, and workload assignments.

If preferred, please upload entire SI plan as an attachment here.

Selected Improvement Plan Evidence

No Evidence found.
No Evidence found.
Please click "Next"

This is the end of the Self-study Report. You may log out at any time and come back to continue; your report will be saved.

When you are ready to submit the report click "Next" below. This will take you to the submit button on the next page. Once you click on "Submit" you will not be able to make changes to the report and evidence.