Formative Feedback Report for the Selected Improvement Pathway

I: Introduction

1. Brief overview of the Educator Preparation Provider (EPP): Context and unique characteristics; organization structure; vision, mission, and goals; shared values and beliefs; capacity tables

The University of Alaska at Anchorage (UAA)is a Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities-larger programs public coed EPP located in an urban location. Its institutional accreditation is with the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges. At UAA, the Teacher Education programs are housed within the College of Education under the supervision and guidance of the Dean of the College of Education. The mission statement of the College of Education is "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." The shared mission and philosophy include intellectual vitality, collaborative spirit, inclusiveness and equity, and leadership.

2. Summary of programs offered: Number, delivery mode, location(s)

All programs are offered on campus, in person or through distance education. The EPP listed no online programs. The EPP offers 13 baccalaureate or certificate programs leading to initial licensure.These are Early Childhood Education, Early Childhood Special Education, Elementary Education, Secondary English Education, Secondary Education General Science, Secondary Education Music, Secondary English Education, Secondary Mathematics Education, Secondary Social Studies Education, and Secondary World Languages.

3. Special circumstances of the formative feedback review, if any

None at this time

II: Standard 1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

The EPP provides minimal evidence to support Standard 1. In a series of charts outline class assignments and key SPA evidence in relation to INTASC Standards (Evidences 1.1.6, 1.1.12, 1.1.13, 1.1.14). There are no specific examples of these correlated assessments or rubrics used to evaluate candidates' knowledge and skills beyond the name of each assignment presented in the INTASC charts. Only 2 of the 11 initial programs are approved by their respective SPA. Therefore, there is little-validated evidence of programs monitoring knowledge and skills of candidates through SPA approval. Additionally, while some data is provided over several years, there is no data disaggregation by specialty licensure area as required by CAEP. There is no specific data demonstrating candidates' acquisition of technology skills nor any clear evidence showing candidates affording P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards. The EPP states there has been some instability in faculty, process, and data collection. The data collection and alignment process seems fluid so much of the evidence is being presented as in progress. Overall, there is little evidence provided to support the criteria of Standard 1 at this time.

A.1. Analysis of program-level data

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. 1.1.4 Candidate Representative Assessment
2. 1.1.3 SPA Status

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. 1.1.7 Praxis II Means
2. 1.1.3 InTASC Standards Matrix
3. 1.1.5 InTASC standards and course syllabi
4. 1.1.6 InTASC Performance of Candidates
5. 1.1.5 Grade Distributions
6. 1.1.6a InTASC 1 Performance of Candidates
7. 1.1.6b InTASC 2 Performance of Candidates
8. 1.1.6c InTASC 3 Performance of Candidates
9. 1.1.12 InTASC Candidate Performance
10. 1.1.12a InTASC 4 Candidate Performance
11. 1.1.12b InTASC 5 Candidate Performance
12. 1.1.13 InTASC Candidate Performance Instructional Practice
13. 1.1.13a InTASC 6 Candidate Performance
14. 1.1.13b InTASC 7 Candidate Performance
15. 1.1.13c InTASC 8 Candidate Performance
16. 1.1.14 InTASC 8 Candidate Performance Prof Responsibility

17.	1.1.14a InTASC 9 Candidate Performance
18.	1.1.14b InTASC 10 Candidate Performance
19.	1.3.2 Praxis II pass rates
20.	1.3.2a Praxis II pass rates by year
21.	1.1.3 Praxis II rates for Alaska
22.	1.1.16 Completers GPA
23.	1.2.1 Key Assessments 3-5 data
24.	2.1.1 Effective Partnerships
25.	1.4.1 Summative Clinical

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.
Tasks

1.

Title: Standard 1 Task 1: Status of national program reviews (SPA reviews) in progress or not met

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) The process and status of SPA reporting for programs

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

(1) "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." (pg. 17).

(2) "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.

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Which programs have changed SPA status since submission of the SSR?

(2) Interview State liaison for Alaska context of process

(3) What is status of programs not approved?

Title: Standard 1 Task 2: Assessments of candidate knowledge of InTASC standards

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

| (1) | Additional evidence related to the application of content and pedagogical knowledge |

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

| (1) | "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". P.16 |

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

2.

(1)	What are the specific data outcomes for each INTASC standard?
(2)	What are the assessments for each INTASC standard? How is each assessment assessed?
(3)	At what transition points are InTASC standards assessed? How is this data reported?
(4)	Interview current candidates/student teachers
(5)	Interview Alumni
(6)	While there are several examples (i.e. Praxis II) of data containing information for more than one year, it is not disaggregated by specialty licensure area.

Title: Standard 1 Task 3: EPP created assessments

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

| (1) | Data congruence with broad claims |

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

3.

| (1) | "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." p.20 |
| (2) | "Based on the data available, no clear indication of any notable weakness in the performance of the candidates was identified". p.20 |

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

| (1) | What is the reliability and validity information for each of the EPP created assessments? |
| | The three assessment instruments provided are labeled |

(2) "proprietary" but seem to be EPP created? Need clarification on the origin and development of these instruments.

(3) Interview Director of Assessment

(4) How are broad claims about quality substantiated through data and reporting?

Title: Standard 1 Task 4: College and Career Ready Standards

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) How College and Career Ready Standards being Assessed.

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

4.

(1) Which college and career ready standards are students expected to meet in Alaska schools?

(2) How does the EPP measure candidates' ability to teach and assess College and career ready standards? How is this reported? Is data disaggregated by program/licensure area?

(3) Interview program faculty

(4) Interview current candidates

(5) Interview P-12 stakeholders

Title: Standard 1 Task 5: Technology

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Assessment plan with required components aligned to technology standards that are required of candidates from all licensure areas.

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

5.

(1) "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." p.21

(2) "All candidates complete a digital portfolio of key assessments and/or standards based assessments". p.21

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Which assignments or evidences measure ISTE standards outlined

	in evidence (Evidence 1.1.3)?
(2)	What process was used to establish reliability and validity?
(3)	Interview current candidates
(4)	Interview Alumni
(5)	How does the EPP ensure that all candidates in all programs are proficient in the use of technology?
(6)	Digital portfolio of key assessments requirements and an example need to be provided on-site

	Title: Standard 1 Task 6: Candidates' use of research and student data	
6.	A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
	B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed	
	(1)	"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."p. 18
	C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	
	(1)	What specific evidence and rubric indicators show candidates' competencies in the areas of using research to understand the role of teaching and the use of K-12 student data?
	(2)	What process was used to establish reliability and validity of the rubrics?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new areas for improvement (AFIs) including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The EPP provides inconsistent evidence of how candidates meet technology standards.	While in the first evidence, ISTE Standards are listed, there is a lack of clear evidence of how these standards are met or assessed by the EPP.
The EPP provides limited evidence that it monitors candidates' progress.	The SPA reports ranged from in progress to accepted with a large number of programs having an unsatisfactory review.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale
The EPP does not provide consistent, disaggregated, metrics on candidate's ability to apply content and pedagogical knowledge aligned to InTASC and SPA Standards.	While there are correlated charts showing which assignments in which classes INTASC standards are met, there is a no evidence of candidates' assignments and correlated

	assessments/evaluation methods related to each INTASC standard nor data on how candidates perform against each INTASC standard. There is mention of a conceptual framework, INTASC standards and other specialty standards along with SPA standards, It is unclear which sets of standards are used to measure students' progress.

II: Standard 2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings.

The EPP has structured, progressive experiential learning opportunities in multiple settings for candidates that increase in the number of contact hours and amount of responsibility as a candidate progresses through his/her program, concluding with a semester-long internship (SSR, p. 34-35; #22; #25). The SSR indicates that classroom placements provide an opportunity to engage with a diverse student body (#24). However, it is difficult to discern from the data provided (#23) if each candidate receives placements in diverse settings. Candidates engage in course projects (i.e., EDSE A623) where data drives teaching goals. However, it was difficult to determine from the evidence provided how this training impacted candidate performance and use of data-driven decision making in the internship experience. While candidates are trained in the use and integration of technology, little evidence was presented which shows that candidates regularly integrate technology into their teaching or to track student growth. Additionally, while the SSR (p. 29) indicates that the handbook contains instruments used to evaluate candidates, those instruments were not provided in the exhibit library.

Cooperating teachers are selected by criteria designated in Alaska Administrative Code and through collaboration with building principals. University clinical faculty are selected if they have met minimum qualifications set by the EPP (SSR, p. 30-31). The SSR (p. 32) indicates that evaluations of EPP clinical educators occurs by both school-based clinical educators and candidates and candidates are evaluated by both school-based clinical educators and EPP clinical educators. Comprehensive results were not provided which is made difficult to conclude from the data. Additionally, it is unclear how the EPP uses the data as a part of program improvement efforts. It is also unclear if EPP-based clinical educators evaluate school-based clinical educators.

The Internship Handbook (#20) provides lists of responsibilities and expectations for candidates, cooperating teachers, university supervising faculty, and principals. Additionally, the handbook provides an expected timeline of activities for the culminating internship experience. Handbooks are provided to cooperating teachers during orientation meetings (SSR, p. 31; #19) held by school districts. If a team member is unable to attend, the SSR indicates sessions are videotaped and shared electronically (SSR, p. 31). The SSR identifies EPP plans to revise the handbook and corresponding materials and will incorporate survey feedback provided by one partner school district and verbal feedback provided by members of a second partner school district (SSR, p. 29). However, the partner district feedback referenced in the SSR was not provided, nor did the EPP share how the feedback has influenced changes to the internship handbook.

During the internship, a collaboration between the cooperating teacher and clinical faculty member occurs face-to-face or via a variety of technology platforms. Additionally, pertinent materials are also accessible online (SSR, p. 31). The SSR indicates one school district is currently engaged in a one-credit professional development course focused on effective communication skills (SSR, p. 32; #21). It is unclear if this class is delivered face-to-face or online. This opportunity does not yet appear to be extended to cooperating teachers at other partner schools. School-based clinical educators qualify for compensation in the form of a monetary stipend or a tuition waiver (SSR, p. 32). While data indicates (SSR, p. 32) that tuition vouchers are being used, it is unclear from the SSR what types of classes clinical educators choose to enroll in and if those courses provide purposeful and meaningful training opportunities for their role as a clinical educator.

The SSR indicates (p. 28) that through January 2015, the EPP utilized feedback from the College of Education Advisory Board. While leadership from partnering schools were advisory board members, the majority of the committee membership was composed of stakeholders representing areas of education other than partner schools. Review of advisory board meeting notes (#17.2) indicates feedback was provided by stakeholders to assist the EPP with ideas for making a positive change in their training of pre-service teachers. Not evident was a record of the actions taken by the EPP to enact the suggestions for change nor the implications of any such changes on the construction and delivery of the teacher preparation program. A gap in advisory board meetings has occurred from January 2015 to the time of submission of the SSR.

Additionally, while feedback has been shared with one partner school district's cooperating teachers regarding perceptions of candidate preparation and suggestions for improvement by district and university supervisors (SSR p. 29-30) it is unclear from the information provided how the data was used for program improvement and in what semester(s) the data was collected. The SSR (p. 30) indicates plans include the creation of a comprehensive survey, through a collaborative process with P-12 stakeholders, that will be disseminated to all partner districts. A description of how the survey will be designed was not provided. The EPP's plan to create a Dean's Community Council composed of more community school partners (SSR, p. 30) is intended to help the EPP move forward with their efforts to gather meaningful feedback and engage in purposeful collaboration with P-12 partners through a Shared Responsibility Model. A calendar for intended meeting dates and meeting topics was not provided.

Opportunities to engage in meaningful collaboration between the EPP and P-12 schools is evolving. Evidence provided (#17.2; SSR, p. 29-30) delineates that the EPP has received information which may positively influence program improvement, but it is unclear if the EPP has made changes as a result of the data. Additionally, it is unclear from the evidence provided if P-12 partners

have benefited from this collaboration.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. #18: Partnership Agreement Blank
2. #17.1: EPP Advisory Council
3. #20: Internship Handbook
4. #22: Program Progression Tables
5. #25: Coherence of Clinical Experiences
6. #24: AK School Demographics
7. #19: Internship Orientation Agenda
8. #21: PACE Mentor Course for School-Based Clinical Faculty
9. #17.2; EPP Partner Mtg Minutes Oct 16

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Task

1.

> **Title: Partnership between EPP and P-12 Partner Schools**
>
> **A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration**
>
> (1) Implementation of Dean's Community Council
>
> **B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed**
> **C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews**
>
> (1) Copies of Partnership Agreements - have all been completed?
>
> (2) Can the feedback from P-12 partner surveys regarding internship handbook construction be provided?
>
> (3) Can the evaluation data of EPP-based clinical educators and school-based clinical educators be provided in its entirety? How will this data influence future trainings?
>
> (4) What plans are in place to provide relevant and pertinent training for clinical educators?

2.

> **Title: Candidate Assessment**
>
> **A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration**
>
> (1) If candidates have areas of concern as evident in course performance (or other measures), how does that information factor into internship site placement?
>
> **B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed**
>
> (1) As a Danielson program, how is her work incorporated into the observation process?
>
> **C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews**

(1)	Is there candidate placement data available by candidate and by program?
(2)	Can copies of candidate assessment documents be provided?
(3)	How is candidate impact on student learning being measured? What have you learned? How has what you've learned impacted candidate preparation? Can you share samples of candidates work which illustrate this area?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The EPP's school partners have limited participation in the design and co-construction of field experiences and clinical practice.	The EPP has identified the need for development of a collaborative plan in the SSR. While the SSR shares information about different components of a plan, there is a lack of cohesiveness with current practices. Additionally, the data collected and presented is incomplete and primarily focused on one partner school.
The EPP provides inconsistent evidence of training, both online or face-to-face, of clinical educators on evaluative instruments.	The EPP references a collaborative plan but no details about clinical educators professional development, training, or involvement in the use of evaluative instruments.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale

II: Standard 3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

The EPP presented a written recruitment plan, last revised in June 2017, that reflects the institutional and EPP mission to increase social, cultural, and intellectual diversity. The plan addresses recruiting diverse candidates, consistent with the EPP mission, to become teachers for English language learners (ELLs), special education, and rural schools. The SSR and articles in the exhibits demonstrate the EPP monitors shortage areas in the state. There is no discussion of STEM areas in the recruitment plan or of how UAA works to attract candidates with high academic ability. The SSR and exhibits did not address how the EPP monitors implementation of the recruitment plan. It is not clear if the recruitment plan is the same as the pilot program described in the SSR (p. 40). It is not clear if the EPP has analyzed the data to determine how recruitment efforts impact enrollment in various programs, primarily high-needs areas.

The racial/ethnic data provided in 3.13 indicates the program has increased racial/ethnic diversity among initial candidates over the last decade. The last three years of data and data from 2007 were reported. The percentages of American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black, and two or more races have increased while the percentage of White candidates has decreased. The bar charts were hard to interpret since the bars were not labeled by year. An article on teacher demographics (3.1.2) suggests greater diversity among the UAA candidates than among the pool of Alaska teachers, although the reporting years are different.

The SSR (p. 40-41) describes several ways the EPP works to place teachers in rural schools and high needs teaching fields. The EPP also works to alleviate the shortage of special education teachers in the Anchorage School District (ASD) by allowing candidates to work as special education teachers while earning their certification. UAA also offers minors in special education which can be used to make special education certification in Alaska. The EPP also works with the Office of Student Affairs and College of Education's Student Service Center on recruiting and retaining a diverse, well-qualified student body. The EPP reported these initiatives but did not provide evidence or data on their effectiveness. For example, has the number of candidates from rural areas changed over time?

The SSR (p. 44) reports "many" programs require incoming candidates have a 2.75 overall GPA. Program admission criteria (3.2.1) show programs for early childhood special education and special education require each candidate to have a 3.0 GPA in the most recent 30 credits. Data presented indicate the cohorts for the last three years have met the 3.0 criteria. Data are also disaggregated by program and monitored each year from admission to completion. In addition, each candidate must have a 3.0 GPA prior to internship. No information was presented about state requirements for

admission GPA.

The 3.2 section in the SSR (p. 44) does not address candidate performance on a nationally normed assessment of mathematical, reading, and writing achievement or a substantially equivalent state-normed or EPP-developed reliable and valid evaluation. The program admission criteria identify Praxis I as an admissions requirement (3.2.1) (although this was discontinued in 2015) and Praxis Core (3.3.2). No Praxis I or Praxis Core data were found in the exhibits. There is no evidence the program has data from an appropriate assessment of competency in mathematics and reading to demonstrate cohorts meet or exceed the 50th percentile. No explanation was provided for how the EPP shows academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

The SSR (p. 44-45) describes how the EPP currently addresses additional selectivity factors and its plan for a more robust system in the future. The current system uses a variety of instruments and across programs, during field experiences and internship. The SSR acknowledged the need to have a single valid and reliable instrument and provided evidence of a plan. The draft instrument (3.3.1) is a simple four-point rating scale and is not explicitly aligned to any standards. Some criteria are vague, such as "demonstrates effective interpersonal skills" and "is open to new ideas and cultures." The new instrument includes a section on diversity, but it is not clear how it will address or be connected to student achievement. The EPP is in the process of piloting the draft instrument and will involve P-12 partners in revisions. Insufficient evidence was presented about the validity, and no evidence was presented about reliability. The EPP has not provided evidence of how it will report data that show how academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching. At least one cycle of data and analysis should be available in the addendum or during the site visit.

Each program has articulated decision points (entry, midpoint, completion of the internship, and post-graduation follow up), based on factors such as GPA, passing certain courses, passing Praxis Core and content assessments, passing courses, and background check (3.3.2).

The EPP sequences courses in each program into three blocks (admission, development, and completion (2.3.1) and monitors candidate progression from admission to completion for developing content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology. This is done through a variety of assessments in the exhibits that are tagged to 3.3 and 3.4, including both proprietary and EPP-developed assessments (1.1.13-14, 1.2.1), including those used for SPA submissions. However, the SPA reports available in AIMS and summary (1.2.1) raise concerns. Only the initial early childhood special education programs are fully recognized. The initial programs for elementary education, general science, mathematics, social studies, and world languages

are not recognized, or recognition has expired. The SPA reviews for initial programs in early childhood education and English language arts are in process. There is no SPA report for physical education in AIMS. An additional concern was identified in the SSR (p. 17). The EPP uses data from SPA assessments to create data for InTASC standards, which raises concerns about validity and reliability of the reported data. Insufficient evidence was presented in the SSR and exhibits about how candidate acquires and demonstrate the ability to teach to college- and -career-ready standards. Available data must be reported and analyzed.

The EPP reported Praxis subject assessment cut scores and pass rates for the EPP, but data was not disaggregated by program (1.3.2-3). Praxis is required either before the internship or for completion, depending on the program.

The EPP has also articulated student (candidate) learning outcomes (SLOs) that differ by program (1.1.1 and 2.3.4). These are aligned to and assessed in specified courses which provides some evidence for Standard 3, but the SLOs cannot provide EPP-level data at this time. The SSR (p. 69) indicates the EPP intends to develop a single set of SLOs for all initial programs.

The EPP also presented an analysis of how the cross-cutting themes of diversity, technology, and social justice are addressed in the curriculum (CCTX.1-2). The EPP also submitted a summary of assessments as exemplars of deep understanding (1.1.4); a grade distribution report covering three-years of data (1.1.15), a report comparing candidate grades in selected courses to grades of others taking the same courses (1.1.16); and grades from an internship (2.3.1). Grade data indicate most candidates do well as compared to other taking the same courses, often exceeding peers, not in education. A concern is the large numbers of incompletes and drops for the internship in 2014. Additional evidence will be sought in the addendum and via interviews to determine how the program uses these tools to monitor individual candidate performance and how data is analyzed for program improvement.

The EPP documents candidates have a high degree of content knowledge through grade and curriculum requirements. Candidates must have at least a C in all work and a 3.0 GPA for all major courses; successful completion of assessments for field experiences and internship; and an earned bachelor's degree. Content knowledge is also ensured through the Praxis subject area assessments, which candidates must pass prior to recommendation for certification.

Impact on student learning is addressed through at least one course and assessment in each program (1.1.4, 1.1.5, 2.3.1), in clinical and SPA key assessments. The curriculum alignment charts provide evidence of the EPPs plan to address the impact on student learning, but the InTASC-based data may not be valid or reliable since they were derived from SPA assessment

data. The outcome of the SPA reviews also raises a concern about the quality of the assessments, as discussed above. The EPP also uses the alumni and employer surveys (4.0.7-.08) to gather data related to assessments. Data from relevant items are reported but not analyzed.

Candidates must also have at least a C in all work and a 3.0 GPA for all major courses; successful completion of assessments for field experiences and internship; and an earned bachelor's degree to be recommended for certification.

Candidate understanding of professional expectations is addressed through course-embedded assessments and SPA assessments (1.1.4, 1.1.6); course grades (1.1.15-16); clinical experiences (2.3.5); and alumni and employer surveys (4.0.7-.8). The EPP did not provide an analysis of data.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. 1.1.4 Candidate Representative Assessment Exemplars of Deep Understanding
2. 1.1.16 InTASC Candidate Performance SPA Assessments
3. 1.1.7 Praxis II Mean Pass Rates of Completers
4. 1.1.12 InTASC Candidate Performance Content Knowledge SPA Assessments
5. 1.1.13 InTASC Performance of Candidates Instructional Practice SPA Assessments
6. 1.1.14 InTASC Performance of Candidates Professional Responsibility SPA Assessments
7. 1.1.16 Completers Selected BA Education Courses Performance 2014-2017
8. 1.2.1 Key Assessment 3 to 5 Data
9. 1.3.1 SPA Status In
10. 1.3.2-3 Praxis II Measures
11. 2.3.1 Program Progression Tables of EPP 2014-2016 3.2.2 GPA Data (Admitted, Enrolled, Completed)
12. 3.1.1Recruitment Plan
13. 3.1.2 2013 Teacher Turnover article
14. 3.1.3 Recruitment for Academic Ability and Diversity (only for diversity)
15. 3.2.1 29 Program Admission Criteria (for GPA)
16. 4.0.9 Alumni Survey #1
17. 4.0.16Alumni Survey #2
18. 1.0.9 Employer Survey #1
19. 3.3.2 Decision Points of EPP for Initial Programs

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. 1.1.1 EPP Student Learning Outcomes
2. 2.3.5 Coherence of Clinical Experiences (only for elementary)
3. 3.1.3 Recruitment for Academic Ability and Diversity (academic ability not in document)
4. 3.2.1 Program Admission Criteria (for assessment of mathematical and reading skills)
5. 3.3.1 EPP Dispositions Assessment Initial Programs Draft
6. CCTx.1 UAA Cross-Cutting Themes Analysis

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Task

1.

Title: Determine the EPP's efforts to monitor the efficacy of its recruitment plan.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Implementation of the recruitment plan

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) Is the recruitment plan the same as the pilot program described on p. 40 of the SSR? If not, what are the differences between the two?

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) How does the EPP recruit candidates with high academic ability?

(2) What evidence shows the impact of the recruitment plan on increasing diversity and academic ability?

(3) What evidence shows how the recruitment plan has impacted enrollment in high-need teaching fields?

(4) Can an interview be scheduled faculty/or and staff with direct responsibility for the recruitment and retention of EPP candidates?

2.

Title: Determine if the EPP has appropriate assessments of academic achievement.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) Are there state requirements for admission GPAs? If so, what are these requirements? Do the state requirements exceed CAEP requirements?

(2) How have the EPP and programs analyzed GPA data? What has been learned? What changes if any, have been made as a result?

(3) What acceptable nationally-normed assessment (or other acceptable assessment) of mathematical, reading, and writing achievement is used by the EPP? What data are available? How have the data been analyzed? What has been learned? What changes, if any, have been as a result?

(4) What is the rationale for allowing candidates in the early childhood special education and special education programs to be admitted with a 3.0 GPA in the most recent 30 credits rather than overall GPA?

| (5) | How does the EPP show how academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching? |

Title: Investigate how the EPP establishes and monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic factors.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

3.

(1)	What progress has been made in developing and implementing the piloted dispositions assessment? What data are available? How has they been analyzed? What has been learned?
(2)	How has or how will the validity and reliability be established?
(3)	How will the EPP report data that show the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching?
(4)	How is the instrument used to monitor individual candidates? What happens when a candidate receives low scores?

Title: How does the EPP use assessments to monitor individual candidates and use resulting data to inform continuous improvement

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

| (1) | The grade distribution report (1.1.15) indicates a significant number of incomplete grades in 2014. How has this been analyzed? What was learned? |
| (2) | What is the "NB" grade in the grade distribution report? |

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

4.

(1)	What evidence is there that candidates acquire and demonstrate the ability to teacher to college- and -career ready standards during the program? What progress has been made in the development of common student (candidate) learning outcomes?
(2)	What progress has been made in the development of common student (candidate) learning outcomes?
(3)	How does the EPP use assessments to monitor individual candidate performance on an ongoing basis and provide interventions as appropriate?

	(4)	How does the EPP use assessment data to inform continuous improvement related to candidate quality throughout the program, such as changes in curriculum or clinical experiences?

		Title: How does the EPP ensure candidates can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development?
5.		A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
	(1)	How has data from multiple sources related to impact on student learning been analyzed? What has been learned? What changes, if any, have been made?
	(2)	What efforts has the EPP made to address SPA conditions or unmet standards related to impact on student learning?
	(3)	What evidence from the internship assessment related to impact on student learning? How has this data been analyzed? What has been learned? What changes if any, have been made?
	(4)	Can the EPP provide representative samples of candidate work in field experiences and internship related to impact on student learning?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The EPP provided limited evidence in the establishment of non academic selectivity factors at multiple transition points.	The EPP provides a pilot non-academic factors instrument (implementation 2018). Limited data is provided on the prior instrument (3.3).
The EPP did not address STEM in the analysis of shortage areas and provided limited evidence for the plans implementation.	The EPP provided a recruitment plan however, inconsistent metrics were provided to support plan(demographics, specific recruitment numbers). Additionally, STEM was not explicitly addressed in shortage area analysis. (3.1)
The EPP provides inconsistent evidence or analysis on candidate's ability to teach to college and career ready standards and integrate technology.	CAEP Component 3.4 requires candidates to demonstrate the ability to teach to college and career ready standards and integrate technology. There is limited evidence that supports this portion of the component.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale
The EPP provide limited evidence of group average performance on nationally-normed assessments or substantially equivalent state-normed assessments of mathematical and reading achievement in the top 50 percent of those assessed.	CAEP component 3.2 requires nationally normed ability/achievement assessments be provided and meets the top 50% threshold.There was no evidence the program assesses candidate proficiency in mathematics and reading on appropriate assessments.

II: Standard 4. Program Impact

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

Overall, the evidence provided that is consistent with Standard 4 is limited, and the evidence that is deemed inconsistent is difficult to evaluate, both because the criteria for success do not appear to be defined and because it is difficult to assess the completeness of the data. Many of the pieces of evidence provided are in the form of raw data, means with no interpretation or connection to other data. Newspaper articles(4.1.1 and 4.1.4), a summary of statewide data (4.1.3 and 4.1.2), and a summary of test changes at the state (4.1.7) are included as data sources with no triangulation to the EPP's work in meeting the standard. Alumni and Employer survey data are provided, however, with only 1 cycle of data and no reference to data collection cycles(future or past) or criteria for success. A research-based methodology is not described adequately measure completers effective application of professional knowledge and dispositions. A focus group and survey process are described, but no P-12 impact data or structured observation instrument is provided.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. The Alumni Survey(4.0.7a, 4.0.8, 4.0.8a, 4.0.16) appears to measure completers perceptions of their preparation.

2. The NExT Employer survey (4.0.9, 4.0.9a, 4.0.14) appears to measure employer perceptions of completer preparation.

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. 3.1.2 2013 Teacher Turnover Report
2. 4.1.1 Newspaper Article.
3. 4.1.2 State-wide test scores
4. 4.1.3 State Report Card
5. 4.1.4 Repeal of Teacher Evaluation Plan
6. 4.1.7 Impact on student learning statements
7. 5.1.2 Supervisor Survey Validity and Reliability
8. 5.1.1 Quality Assurance systems of the EPP
9. 5.1.3 TTS 2017 Validity and Reliability
10. 5.4.1 Employment data state level (empty document)
11. 4.0.6 NExT Survey overview
12. 4.3.8 Employer survey satisfaction

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary

Task

Title: Standard 4 Task 1: Verify employer and completer perceptions of preparation.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(4.3) The NExT Employer survey appears to measure employer

1.

(1)	perceptions of completer preparation. However, documentation includes response rates but not three cycles of data. Interview employers regarding their satisfaction with completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.
(2)	(4.4) The Alumni Survey appears to measure completers perceptions of their preparation. However, documentation includes response rates but not three cycles of data. Interview completers regarding their perceptions of the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation. Interview alumni regarding their satisfaction with their preparation to work in P-12 schools.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1)	"Strong history of following up with completers using survey data both when exiting the program and within the first five years after graduation" p.54
(2)	"Unavailability of three consecutive cycles of data for each area. p.54"

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1)	What are the program's criteria for success for survey data?
(2)	The NExT Employer Survey data does not provide 3 cycles of data. How is a cycle defined and where is the comparative data?
(3)	Interview personnel who administer surveys and analyze the results.
(4)	The Alumni Survey data does not provide 3 cycles of data. How is a cycle defined and where is the comparative data?
(5)	Is there any trend data or triangulated data from the various data collections?

Title: Standard 4 Task 2: Verify multiple measures of student learning growth.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1)	"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." p.53
	"The district teacher evaluation plans were collected from the five

(2) focus districts to help inform the EPP's understanding of how completers might be evaluated in the future."p.53

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

2.

(1) What measures are provided of student learning growth?

(2) Since State data is scarce, what research- based methodology is being utilized for collecting impact data?

(3) Interview Assessment Coordinator/CAEP coordinator.

(4) SSR discusses focus groups with completers. What P-12 impact data is collected from the focus group?

(5) How are district evaluation plans utilized? Is there data on completers for this instrument? Comparative data?

Title: Standard 4 Task 3: Clarify structured and validated observation instruments to demonstrate application of professional knowledge and dispositions.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

3.

(1) "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.." p.51

(2) "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."p.51.

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What measures are provided for observation instruments for professional knowledge and dispositions?

(2) How are these measures validated?

(3) Interview faculty involved in the focus groups.

(4) How does the focus group connect to the observation instrument?

(5) How are reflective memos utilized? Is data provided?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
Multiple measures of program completer contribution to student	The narrative did not clearly articulate the multiple measures of

learning growth is not provided (4.1).	student learning growth utilized.
Observation or student survey assessments do not measure the application of professional knowledge and dispositions.(4.2).	The narrative did not provide application of professional knowledge and dispositions measures.
The EPP does not provide appropriate analysis or interpretation of results for Employer survey(4.3) for the Alumni survey(4.4).	Narrative provided one cycle of data with no comparison markers or trend analysis.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale
The EPP does not demonstrate/document program completers contribute to an expected level of P-12 student growth.	EPP does not provide 3 cycles of survey data, multiple measures of P-12 impact data or a consistent process for gathering data for continuous program improvement.

II: Standard 5. Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

While the EPP uses electronic collection methods, the Self Study Report (SSR) does not clearly outline a quality assurance system. Additionally, the majority of data reports does not report using 3 cycles or show dis-aggregation by specialty licensure areas. While several datasets are provided, many of the charts are incomplete (technology issue of cutting form off). There is a lack of clarity of the standards used to assess all candidates, the specific pieces of evidence each candidate completes, and the EPP created assessments used to collect data on all candidates and cohorts. The SPA report evaluations range from in progress, unsatisfactory to satisfactory, resulting in inconsistency in evidence to determine if learner outcomes are met.

There are limited examples of data-driven decisions at the program level, and little to no examples at the EPP level. The report outlines many plans related to an assessment process, but it is unclear which have been executed and which are still left to be done. The SSR outlines how stakeholders will be and are involved with the EPP, but there is a lack of clear evidence of stakeholder involvement in making data-driven decisions.

Overall, there is a lack of evidence to support many of the Standard 5 criteria at this point in the review process.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. Use of PETAL and Taskstream/Digiction (5.1.1) for technology
2. 5.1.1Use of Taskstream/Digication
3. 5.1.2 Supervisor Survey Validity and Reliability
4. 5.1.2a Exit Survey validity reliability
5. 5.1.5 ETS Why and How (reliability and validity of Praxis II)
6. 2.1.2a EPP Partner Mtg Minutes

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. Inconsistent evidence of standards being assessed across EPP (common EPP assessments).
2. Evidence 1.3.1 SPA Status Initial Programs
3. 4.1.7 Impact on P-12 Student Learning, (no Alaska Test from 2014-2016)
4. 1.1.7 Praxis II Scores are given but not disaggregated
5. 1.4.1 Summative Clinical Data (Is this instrument reliable and valid?)

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary

Task

Title: Surveys

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) In the SSR, it states there is a dispositions form. Does it have

1.
    reliability and validity?

    (2) In the SSR, it states there is a clinical observation instrument. Does it have reliability and validity?

    (3) In the SSR, it states that a clinical observation instrument was piloted. Was this piloted? What were the results?

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

---

Title: Data Presented

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

2.

    (1) 1.1.12a InTASC 4 Key Assessment Matrix--What do these mean? Are these SPA evidences?

    (2) 3.2.2c GPA Admitted Enrolled Completed.pdf--Chart cut off, so hard to read all data and interpret

    (3) 1.1.15 Grade Distribution of Candidates in Teacher Education 2013-2016--What is the purpose of this?

    (4) 1.3.2 Praxis II UAA Graduates of All Initial Teacher Preparation Programs: Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests (Praxis 2); Results by Year of Graduation, 2010-2017 (Percentage of Graduate Test Takers)--How many students passed for each program? No disaggregation seen.

    (5) 1.4.1 Summative Clinical Data of the EPP 2014-2016-What is this measuring?

    (6) 1.1.6 lists SPA evidences and correlation with INTASC. --Are SPA evidences correlated with INTASC? Is there evidence?

    (7) 4.0.7a Alumni Survey #1 Response Rates .pdf--Product showing response rates but no evidence of results. Are there results?

    (8) Data 5.4.3 UA Alumni in Alaska Public K-12 Education (shows only placements and percentages)--What are the results of your graduates?

    (9) 5.4.2 CAEP 8 Annual Measure --The information does not allow me to conclude that all 8 Annual Measures are met based on how it is presented.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

    (1) It states on page 46 there is a conceptual framework. What is it and are outcomes measured against it?

    (2) On page 67, it states feedback loops are used. How and when are

they used?

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What is the relationship between SPA data and the Quality Assurance System?

Title: Continuous Improvement

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

3.

(1) On page 68 it states, "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)." Has this been done?

(2) On page 69, there is mention of doing a WebCrawl, Massive Update Project (MUP) and Systemizing All Processes (SAP) as interim dean initiatives. What are these initiatives and how do they impact the Assessment System?

(3) On page 67, the following is stated: "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." -How is this done?

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

---

Title: Stakeholder Input

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

4.

(1) In the SSR, there is mention of various meetings and activities involving stakeholders. Which of these have happened and which are plans?

(2) How are stakeholders involved in providing input on data driven decisions?

---

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each. AFIs related to the Selected Improvement Plan are cited under Standard 5.

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The EPP provides unclear evidence of the 8 Annual Reporting Measures for CAEP.	While the 8 reporting measures of CAEP are discussed in the narrative, it isn't clear from the narrative or the evidence that these measures are reported annually or that all of the measures

	are met.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each. Stipulations related to the Selected Improvement Plan are cited under Standard 5.

Stipulation	Rationale
The EPP did not provide evidence of a quality assurance system that is used to regularly and systematically collect and analyze assessment performance data against program goals and relevant standards, track results over time, nor evidence of using results to improve program elements and processes (5.1 and 5.3).	There is limited evidence of a clearly defined quality assurance system nor clear and tangible evidence the EPP uses data results to assess candidates' performance against program goals and relevant standards. There is a description of a partial plan for data collection and dissemination.
The EPP did not provide documentation of verifiable, cumulative, relevant, and actionable of evidences (5.2)	Large gaps are present in many of the assessments provided. Most do not have 3 cycles, reliability and validity data were not available, and criteria for success on survey data was not evident.

III: Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

DIVERSITY

1. Preliminary analysis of evidence from Self Study-Report (SSR)

a. Holistic evaluation of the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence related to diversity

The EPP addresses diversity in coursework. The SSR indicates that in 8 of the 15-course syllabi contained course descriptions or SLO's related to diversity. Additionally, 2-course syllabi address social justice (#1). The Master Standards Chart (#2) includes culturally responsive educator standards but does not document how such standards are assessed. Individually, all candidates must take EDFN A478: Issues in Alaska Native Education, K-12 (SSR, p. 71). Beginning in the AY17-18 year, two Alaska Native faculty members began to collaborate with another faculty to integrate their knowledge and experiences into the curriculum delivered in multiple classes (SSR, p. 71). It is unclear the impact of these efforts on candidate's abilities to incorporate culturally responsive practices into their teaching strategies.

Candidates are placed in a variety of practicum and internship settings (#22; #23). The SSR indicates at least one placement occurs in a Title I school. While the number and description of practicum settings indicate the opportunity to be placed in a variety of diverse settings (#22; #24), it is difficult to determine the diversity of each candidate's placements based on the data provided (#23).

Alumni surveys indicate that 22% of respondents did not feel prepared to "differentiate instruction in order to maintain environments that accept, affirm, and constructively build upon the diversity of students, 12% of respondents did not feel prepared to "respond positively to cultural differences," and 27% did not feel prepared to "provide adequately for students with special needs" (#38). It is not clear what steps the EPP has taken to address the concerns noted in responses to the alumni survey.

Employer surveys indicate that 62.5% respondents believe "the graduate differentiates instruction in order to maintain environments that accept, affirm, and constructively build upon the diversity of students," 50% of respondents believe "the graduate provides adequately for students with special needs," 75% of respondents believe "the graduate responds positively to cultural differences," 50% of respondents believe "the graduate examines diverse perspectives," 50% of respondents believe "the graduate creates learning communities that include all voices," and "50% of respondents believe the graduate creates learning communities that advance knowledge and ensure the development, support, and inclusion of people's abilities, values, ideas, languages, and expressions" (#37). It is not clear how the EPP used this information in their program improvement efforts.

The EPP is working closely with the UAA Office of Student Affairs to recruit and retain diverse students. A recruitment plan (#28) has been developed and is being implemented with particular focus noted on rural school districts.

Additionally, the EPP has plans to facilitate opportunities to introduce pre-service teachers seeking jobs with rural school districts seeking teachers to help meet high needs areas.

b. Evidence that adequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of diversity

1. #1: EPP Student Learning Outcomes
2. #22: Program Progression Tables
3. #24: AK School Demographics
4. #38: Alumni Survey Data #2
5. #37: Employer Survey #1 Data
6. #28: Recruitment for Academic Ability and Diversity

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of diversity

1. #2: InTASC Standards Matrix

2. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data and/or interviews, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting a standard (if applicable)

1. Are UDL and/or culturally responsive standards regularly a part of lesson planning? Could you share some representative examples?
2. How has the EPP used the data from the alumni and employer surveys to engage in program improvement?
3. What impact has the shifting of course load responsibilities of the two native faculty members had on improving candidates ability to understand and integrate diversity?

Recommendations for new AFIs and/or stipulations including a rationale for cross-cutting themes are cited under the relevant standard(s)

TECHNOLOGY

1. Preliminary analysis of evidence from self-study report (SSR)

a. Holistic evaluation of the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence related to technology

The SSR indicates the EPP relies on technology to deliver instruction through distanced learning technologies and faculty are reported to use technology in instruction. However, the SSR (p. 72) acknowledges none of the 15 syllabi address technology as a student (candidate) learning outcome.

Technology is addressed in coursework (CCTx.2) Candidates in early childhood, elementary, and special education take EDFN A302 Foundations of Educational Technology. Candidates in secondary education programs take EDSY A648 Developing Literacies in the 21st Century Classrooms which addresses the integration of technology into content-specific instruction to address the needs of adolescent learners. Secondary candidates receive less instruction in the use of technology. Grades from the courses (1.1.15) suggest candidates have a high level of proficiency, but it is clear how much of the grade is based on knowledge and skills related to technology.

The articulation of student learning outcomes (1.1.1) includes technology-related outcomes for the special education and secondary programs but not for the early childhood or elementary programs. The matrix that aligns InTASC standards with other standards (1.1.3) includes ISTE technology standards on facilitating and inspiring student learning and creativity as well as modeling digital age work and learning. Neither document provides evidence of how technology is integrated into the curriculum or how technology-related competencies are assessed.

The SSR (p. 66) indicates the EPP gathers external data from a variety of sources and uses the data to improve the use of technology. However, the data from these sources were not presented in original or summary form.

The EPP also assess program completers competencies with technology through the alumni survey. Data indicate 17% report the program did not prepare them to use technology effectively, creatively, and wisely in professional practice (4.0.16). Some additional information was provided in the open-ended response items which suggested more methods in applying technology in the teaching field; showing how to use technology in real-world classrooms; and identifying technology as an area that needs more emphasis in the program. It is not clear what steps the EPP has taken, if any, to address the concerns.

The SSR (p. 21) acknowledges the need for a robust assessment ISTE standards to determine if candidates are able to design and facilitate digital learning and share student performance data digitally. The intent is to design and pilot the assessment in the 2017-2018 school year.

The EPP uses technology for virtual meetings with cooperating teachers and P-12 partners. Candidates are required to assemble a digital portfolio.

b. Evidence that adequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of technology
   1. 1.1.15 Grade Distribution of Candidates in Teacher Education
   2. 4.0.8 Alumni Survey Data #1
   3. 4.0.16 Alumni Survey Data #2
   4. CCT x.2 Cross-Cutting Themes Technology CCG Review

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of technology
   1. 1.1.1 EPP Student Learning Outcomes
   2. 1.1.3 InTASC Standards Matrix Align with Other Standards

2. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data and/or interviews, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting a standard (if applicable)
   1. What evidence can the EPP provide about how it stays current on the technology needs in local and partner schools?
   2. The SSR (p. 66) indicates the EPP gathers data from school district partnership meeting, principal employer surveys, academic program evaluations and reviews, and annual program assessment reports. Where is the data housed and how has it been analyzed? What has been learned? What changes, if any, have been made?

Recommendations for new AFIs and/or stipulations including a rationale for cross-cutting themes are cited under the relevant standard(s)

IV: Preliminary findings related to Area(s) for Improvement (AFIs) from previous accreditation decisions, if any

1. Area for Improvement

No AFI(s) found.

V: Response to the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

1. Use the Rubric For Evaluating the Capacity and Potential of the SIP to provide analysis on:

A. The EPP's capacity for initiating, implementing, and completing the SIP

> The SIP is primarily a plan to implement a recruitment and retention plan. There is identification capacity but no substantive investment of faculty. The EPP's capacity to initiate the plan is progressing.

B. The potential of the SIP to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates

> The EPP's capacity to implement and complete the SIP is emerging. There is a general timetable provided for year by year activities that includes yearly indicators, specific actions, evaluation and monitoring activities.

C. The proposed use of data and evidence

> The potential of goals to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates is progressing. Goals for improvement involve multiple programs (all initial licensure programs) and are related to the rationale for the focal area. Potential to have a positive impact on the EPP or its candidates appears to be good.

D. The potential of the EPP to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards

> Potential to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards is Progressing.

E. Overall evaluation of SIP

> Most indicators are progressing.

Evaluation of the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

This rubric is intended to be used as a tool by the site visit team to provide feedback to an EPP on the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP) and its progress, including
(a) its capacity for initiating, implementing, and completing a SIP;
(b) the potential of the SIP to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates;
(c) the proposed use of data and evidence;
(d) the potential of the EPP to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards. An overall evaluation of the SIP is also provided.

Click here to open the rubric in a new window.

Comments from state on requirements, standards, and/or perspective