

Site Visit Report

CAEP Site Visit Team:

Dr. Malina K. Monaco
Suzanne M. Robinson, Ph.D.
Dr. Anna T. Kozlowski
Dr. Ann Adams-Bullock
Dr. Heather Van Mullem

State Consultant:

Sondra Meredith

NEA or AFT Representative:

N/A

Selected Improvement Pathway

**UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
ANCHORAGE**

College of Education
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
April-May, 2018

CONFIDENTIAL

CAEP Site Visit Report Selected Improvement Pathway

Section I Introduction

Overview of the EPP and program offerings: (focus on differences between what was stated in the Formative Feedback Report and what was verified onsite.)

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.

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 (Post-BA) and Early Childhood Education (BA), Early Childhood Special Education, Elementary Education (Post BA) and Elementary Education (BA), Secondary English Education, Secondary Education General Science, Secondary Education Music, Secondary Education (MAT) - Physical Education (K-12), Secondary Mathematics Education, Secondary Social Studies Education, Special Education and Secondary World Languages.

Summary of state partnership that guided the visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or a CAEP-only visit)

This was a CAEP only visit. There were two official members of the state team and one NEA observer. The state team was not responsible for writing to any state standards but were present in interviews and the team workroom.

Special circumstances of the onsite review, if any. (Example: No unusual circumstances affected the visit.)

No unusual circumstances affected the visit.

Section II CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

1. Tasks completed by the team:

Task(s)

| | |
|--|--|
| 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. | (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? |

| | |
|---|---|
| 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.

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

- (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

3.

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?
- (2) The three assessment instruments provided are labeled "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?

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

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

(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

5.

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

Standard 1 Task 6: Candidates' use of research and student data

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

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

6. (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?

Action:

2. Analysis regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 1 :

a. Narrative analysis of findings

The UAA COE has 13 initial licensure programs that have submitted SPA reports for national recognition. Six programs are recognized by their Specialty Professional Associations (SPA). These programs are Early Childhood Education (BA), Early Childhood Education (Post-BA), Early Childhood Special Education, Secondary Education - English. Secondary Education - World Languages is recognized with conditions.

Five programs are not recognized by their Specialty Professional Associations (SPA). These programs, Elementary Education (BA) and Elementary Educations (Post-BA) programs and Secondary Education programs in mathematics, science, and social studies currently do not have recognition status by their respective SPAs. The SSR Addendum reports that EPP faculty are addressing input provided in the most recent feedback reports although specific improvement plans were not discussed. The next submission date for program recognition is March 2022. Two programs (Music and Physical Education) pursue recognition through their respective SPAs and faculty in different colleges, although teacher candidates are recommended for licensure in these areas through the College of Education. No program reports or program data were uploaded to AIMS. The program approval status of

these two programs is unknown at this time; the college accreditation and assessment director did not locate that information during the visit. The Secondary Ed program lead stated in the interview that he has just become aware this year of the need to bring these teacher education programs under the same guidelines as all other teacher preparation programs; it appears that that work has just begun. The SSR addendum describes and emphasizes the "many leadership changes (3 deans) and faculty turnover over the past seven years. The impact of this turnover resulted in limited use of data to inform continuous improvement and to collect data primarily for compliance purposes". Beyond personnel turnover, "the EPP's quality assurance system PeTAL, built in 2013, was inadequately maintained leading to questionable data reporting over the most recent three-year data cycle. Moreover, the use of Taskstream to collect student work samples to be evaluated using SPA Key Assessments was not implemented across initial licensure programs consistently and coherently". Another factor influencing the EPP's improvement efforts has been "the move by the UA Board of Regents, at the recommendation of the university president, to create a single Alaska College of Education to be administered by the University of Alaska Southeast (UAS). As part of the UA Strategic Pathways process ... [the plan was to] consolidate all UA teacher preparation and educational leadership programs (currently at UAF, UAA, & UAS) in one streamlined academic unit. (see 5.1.1) In October 2017, the UA President put forth an adjustment to the consolidation recommendation. (see 5.1.1 FFR Presidents AKCOE Charge) The instability created by the conversation surrounding consolidation during the last two years negatively affected the work-loads and program review process within the EPP" (p.1). "Thus, the EPP is in essence at the beginning phases of building a quality assurance system that is informed by reliable and valid data (p.1)." Candidates reported in the interviews that they learned to use data to guide instruction. However, no specific assessment or variety of assignments within programs were identified as the programs' mechanism for evaluating candidate proficiency across time and EPP programs. The interviews confirmed what was reported in the SSR. The SSR (p.18) reported "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 standardize assessments for Initial Programs to better compare candidates' skills and knowledge across the EPP rather than just within individuals programs". The Department of Teaching and Learning program leads shared in the interview that key assessments were defined by their program SPA reports and data collection and review were program specific. The assessments are collected in a digital portfolio for most programs. SPED faculty formally review the portfolio contents using an approved rubric, SEC ED has students collect the assessments in a digital portfolio which is not evaluated, and for student use only, ELEM ED score assessments as a faculty at the end of each semester but are moving to a culminating program portfolio process, and EC reported that key assessments

are tied to particular courses which become the responsibility of the course instructor when that particular course is taken. Assessments in EC are not collected in a portfolio. The program leads concurred that if students did not complete or pass the assessments, they would not be recommended for teaching licenses, but it did not appear to be a formalized gateway process to licensure recommendation. It was reported that each program handbook has its key assessments listed. The SSR included evidence of 3 cycles of data evaluating InTASC standards (Evidences 1.1.12, 1.1.13, 1.1.14). These data are disaggregated across four initial program areas (Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education and Special Education), and summative means for the EPP are also included. However, the assessments are unique to each program, and some programs are nationally recognized, and others are not recognized because of their insufficient assessment systems (SPA Reports). However, the Evidence Tables (Evidences 1.1.12, 1.1.13, 1.1.14) present the data as equivalent across programs and aggregates the scores producing means for the EPP as a whole by a standard. This data analysis seems incongruent with best practice. Assignment descriptions or rubrics defining mastery of standards are not included. In interviews with faculty, current work in process or planned plans? to create common assessments across programs was discussed. The addendum references the weakness of the data system within the unit and how data are used (p.2) which was corroborated by the interviews. Faculty have just begun the process of adopting Common Assessments to be used across programs. They include The NeXT Alumni Survey (piloted 2016-2017), NeXT Employer Survey (piloted 2016-2017), The PRAXIS I test (to be used at Admission to the Department), The PRAXIS II test, ND Common Metrics-Student Teacher Observation Tool (STOT). In the interview with the Accreditation and Assessment Director, she noted use of this observation tool was piloted in the Elementary Education program Spring 2018, with Early Childhood piloting its use Fall 2019, and the Secondary Education programs' pilot beginning Spring 2019. No mention was made of Early Childhood SPED's use of this assessment. No data were shared. Other common assessments are at the initial draft or at the conceptualization stage. In the interview, program leads reported: Assessment #3 draft due May 2018, Assessment #4 in development, Assessment #5 draft due Fall 2018, Dispositions assessment to be developed and piloted Summer 2019. 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. Evidence tables were missing explanatory information or legends (titles, column headings, document text was cut off, course numbers without title, etc. so that it was not possible to confirm interpretation of the data. Insufficient analysis was provided. The EPP SPA reports showed 38% of programs (5) received national recognition, 46% (6 programs) were not recognized, and 15% (2 programs) status was not known. Information provided about how college and career-ready standards are assessed systematically across programs is insufficient. Teacher candidates reported using standards in lesson planning in courses within

different programs and for field experiences, and faculty reported the Alaska Cultural Standards for Educators as topics included in course activities, clinical experiences, and special projects. Annual reports submitted with the addendum from 2016 and 2017 (two cycles of reporting) report that SPA assessments are aligned to Alaska Beginning Teacher Standards (Evidences 5.2.2). Two programs, Education MAT and Special Education MED, discussed results on assessments. The MAT reports discussed findings although provided no data; the Special Education MED program provided mean scores for each assessment and analysis. A table was provided in the SSR attempting to demonstrate alignment of CAEP, InTASC, Standards for Alaska Beginning Teachers, Alaska Cultural Standards for Educators, and ISTE-T (Technology Standards), however the table was not readable because information was cut off and cut up between multiple pages (Evidence 1.1.3). Technology is addressed in coursework. Some candidates (interviews) reported confidence with using technology for instruction, sharing that the extent of actual practice in using a range of technologies were dependent on what was available in clinical placements. Other candidates gave differing opinions about their level of preparation with technology. A few student teachers interviewed indicated the programs could have given them more hands-on experience. Candidates in special education said they needed more preparation for using technology for working with students with sensory impairments. However, the SSR (p.21) acknowledges the need for a robust assessment of ISTE standards. Data were not included demonstrating assessment of technology knowledge and application.

b. Analysis of Program-Level data

The UAA COE has 13 initial licensure programs that have submitted SPA reports for national recognition. Six programs are recognized by their Specialty Professional Associations (SPA). These programs are Early Childhood Education (BA), Early Childhood Education (Post-BA), Early Childhood Special Education, Secondary Education - English. Secondary Education, World Languages, and Special Education.

Six programs are not recognized by their Specialty Professional Associations (SPA). These programs, Elementary Education (BA) and Elementary Educations (Post-BA) programs and Secondary Education programs in mathematics, science, and social studies currently do not have recognition status by their respective SPAs. The SSR Addendum reports that EPP faculty are addressing input provided in the most recent feedback reports although specific improvement plans were not discussed. The next submission date for program recognition is March 2022. Two programs (Music and Physical Education) pursue recognition through their respective SPAs and faculty in different colleges, although teacher candidates are recommended for licensure in these areas through the College of Education. No program reports or program data were uploaded to AIMS. The program approval status of these two programs is unknown at this time; the university assessment director could not locate that information during the visit. The Secondary Ed program lead stated in the interview that he has just become aware this year

of the need to bring these teacher education programs under the same guidelines as all other teacher preparation programs; it appears that that work has just begun.

c. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1.1.4 Candidate Representative Assessment
1.1.3 SPA Status
Interviews with Alumni
Interviews with with Program Heads and DLT chair
Interviews with Clinical Supervisors
Interviews with Cooperating and Mentor Teachers
Interviews with Interns

d. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1.1.7 Praxis II Means
1.1.3 InTASC Standards Matrix
1.1.5 InTASC standards and course syllabi
1.1.6 InTASC Performance of Candidates
1.1.5 Grade Distributions
1.1.6a InTASC 1 Performance of Candidates
1.1.6b InTASC 2 Performance of Candidates
1.1.6c InTASC 3 Performance of Candidates
1.1.12 InTASC Candidate Performance
1.1.12a InTASC 4 Candidate Performance
1.1.12b InTASC 5 Candidate Performance
1.1.13 InTASC Candidate Performance Instructional Practice
1.1.13a InTASC 6 Candidate Performance
1.1.13b InTASC 7 Candidate Performance
1.1.13c InTASC 8 Candidate Performance
1.1.14 InTASC 8 Candidate Performance Prof Responsibility
1.1.14a InTASC 9 Candidate Performance
1.1.14b InTASC 10 Candidate Performance
1.3.2 Praxis II pass rates
1.3.2a Praxis II pass rates by year
1.1.3 Praxis II rates for Alaska
1.1.16 Completers GPA
1.2.1 Key Assessments 3-5 data
2.1.1 Effective Partnerships
1.4.1 Summative Clinical
5.2.2 ECBA 16 FFR 2016 PRGR Early Childhood Ed
5.2.2 ECPBCT 16 FFR 2016 PRGM Early Childhood PBCT
5.2.2 ECPBCR BA 17 FFR 2017 PRGM Early Childhood PBCT COE
5.2.2 EL BA FFR 2016 PRGM ELEM EB BA
5.2.2 MAT 16FFR PRGR Education MAT
5.2.2 MAT 17FFR PRGR Education MAT
5.2.2SPEDGEC 16 FFR 2016 PRGR Special Education
5.2.2 SPEDGEC 17 PRGR Special Education MED Special Education GC COE

ANC

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

| Area for Improvement | Rationale |
|---|---|
| The EPP provides inconsistent evidence of how candidates model and apply technology (component 1.5). | 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 of how candidates use research and evidence for planning, teaching, and evaluating P-12 students (component 1.2). | During the interviews, teacher candidates reported using data to determine P-12 student instructional impact, and program faculty shared that candidates experienced learning activities in classes, no formal process for evaluating students' ability to use research and data guiding K-12 instruction was in evidence across the EPP. |

Stipulation:

| Stipulation | Rationale |
|---|---|
| The EPP provides limited evidence that it monitors candidates' progress relative to standards (components 1.1, 1.3 & 1.4) | InTASC, College and Career Ready Standards (Alaska Beginning Teachers and Alaska Cultural Standards for Educators), and ISTE-T (Technology Standards) are not consistent or accurately aligned across EPP programs and assessments. |
| The EPP does not provide consistent, disaggregated, metrics on candidate's ability to apply content and pedagogical knowledge aligned to InTASC and SPA Standards (components 1.1 & 1.3). | The SPA reports ranged from not recognized (5 programs for 38%), not reported (2 programs for 15%) to accepted (6 programs for 46%). While correlated charts are 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. |

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

| 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. | (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? |

| 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? |
| 2. | 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?

Action:

1. All tasks were completed through SSR, SSR-addendum, site visit interviews, and on site evidence. All evidence reviewed by the team is compiled, by standard, in Sources of Evidence section of the report under List of all evidence file.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 2 :

a. Summary of findings

The SSR indicates (p. 28) through January 2015, the EPP utilized feedback from the COE Advisory Board composed primarily 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 actions taken by the EPP. The EPP intends to create a Dean's Community Council composed primarily of community school partners (SSR, p. 30; EPP DAA Presentation) with the first meeting anticipated during fall 2018. The EPP is creating a program-wide internship handbook to share information, expectations, and an expected timeline of activities for the culminating internship experience with the candidate, EPP faculty, and school-based clinical partners (Addendum; 1/26/16 DTL meeting minutes). The EPP indicated they would 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, partner district feedback was not provided, nor did the EPP document how the feedback influenced handbook changes. Handbooks are provided to host 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). While feedback has been shared with one partner school district's host teachers regarding perceptions of candidate preparation and suggestions for improvement by district and university supervisors (SSR p. 29-30), no evidence was provided for how data was used for program improvement. The SSR (p. 30) indicates plans to 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. While the EPP has established strategies for improvement, the evidence provided (SSR; HT and SH Interviews) documents input from P-12 teachers and/or administrators for candidate and program improvement is provided informally and is inconsistently sought. Evidence provided regarding field experience site placements indicate that the process is largely one-dimensional. That is, the EPP indicated that "placements are primarily determined by the school district and can be limited by

availability" (Addendum). Interviews with candidates, host teachers, the EPP Field Placement Coordinator, and school administrators confirmed this. Additionally, the EPP stated it "does not evaluate data on candidate placement to use for program improvement" (Addendum). The EPP has partnerships with multiple school districts (EPP DAA Presentation). Five MOU's were provided for review. Opportunities to engage in meaningful collaboration between the EPP and P- 12 schools are 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, the EPP did not provide documentation identifying if/how P-12 partners have benefited from this collaboration. Host teachers and stakeholders shared that they have not been invited to formal training or to provide input on program design (HT and SH Interviews). No documentation was provided to document a formal shared responsibility model between the EPP and P-12 stakeholders in the following areas: Co-construction of instruments and evaluations; Input into curriculum development; Criteria for entry/exit into clinical experiences; and Selection of school-based clinical educators. Host teachers are selected by criteria designated in Alaska Administrative Code and through collaboration with building principals. The EPP Field Placement Coordinator may request host teachers for experiential learning opportunities. Evidence provided (Candidate, HT and SH Interviews; EPP DAA Presentation) indicated that placement decisions are left solely to building principals. University clinical faculty are selected if they have met EPP minimum qualifications (SSR, p. 30-31). The SSR (p. 32) indicates that evaluations of EPP clinical educators occur by both school-based clinical educators and candidates. Three cycles of school-based clinical educator feedback survey data were provided (Addendum 2.2.1), but no analysis of the data or how it was used to inform program improvement was provided. School-based clinical educators are not evaluated by EPP clinical educators or candidates (EPP DAA Presentation). Evaluation of candidate performance during pre-internship field experiences is conducted via electronic survey by host teachers. Questions measure candidate dispositions (FPC Interview). Evidence (HT, SH, and Candidate Interviews) regarding intern performance is gathered from school-based clinical educators and from EPP clinical educators through lesson observations. School-based clinical educators provide feedback through school district observation instruments. EPP-based clinical educators use program-specific observation instruments to provide feedback. Historically, assessment documents were designed by EPP faculty and were program specific, but were not provided for review (Addendum; EPP DAA Presentation). Currently, EPP-based clinical educators utilize "...assessment instruments based on the Alaska Beginning Teacher Standards, the Alaska Cultural Standards for Educators, and relevant SPA standards" (Addendum). The addendum states, "Data is available from EPP-based clinical faculty for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education programs. The Secondary Education program does not formally record data. At this time, no evaluation data is collected from school-based clinical educators." Data were not provided.

During the spring 2018 semester, the STOT is being piloted with Elementary and Secondary Education candidates (Addendum; EPP DAA Presentation) by EPP clinical faculty. The addendum indicates "the STOT tool being piloted is shared with the school-based clinical faculty, and they are asked for feedback on each criterion...". However, during the Host Teacher interview, participants indicated that they had no opportunity to provide feedback on items outside of candidate performance. During the internship, collaboration between the host teacher and clinical faculty member occurs face-to-face or via technology. Additionally, pertinent materials are also accessible online (SSR, p. 31). The SSR indicates one school district is currently engaged in a 1-credit professional development course focused on effective communication skills (SSR, p. 32; #21). The delivery method of the class was not documented. This opportunity does not appear to be extended to host teachers at other partner schools. School-based clinical educators are compensated 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 addendum stated that "the EPP is developing and implementing training courses for school-based clinical faculty and adjunct university clinical faculty to ensure greater inter-rater reliability across all individuals involved in assessing candidates' skills, knowledge, and dispositions during the clinical experience." No calendar, timeline, or course titles/descriptions were provided. The EPP has structured, progressive experiential learning opportunities in multiple settings for candidates, across programs, 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; FPC Interview). 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; FPC Interview) if each candidate receives placements in diverse settings. Host teachers indicate that candidates appear ready to teach college and career-ready standards (HT Interview). However, data measuring effective preparation and application within and across programs was not documented. Coursework specific to the integration of culturally responsive teaching practices is required (Candidate and Alumni Interviews). Candidates and Host Teachers shared that all candidate lesson plans must identify inclusive strategies (Candidate and HT Interviews). One example of candidate work was provided for review. However, data measuring effective preparation and application within and across programs was not documented. Candidates engage in course projects (i.e., EDSE A623) where data drives teaching goals. Examples of candidate work were provided on-site for review. Candidate and Alumni interviews indicate that program training focuses on formative assessment strategies. Candidates also shared that case studies are built into the advanced practicum course in which student growth is tracked and measured to inform teaching goals. However, the EPP also identified that this was measured inconsistently between

programs (Addendum). It was difficult to determine from the evidence provided how this training impacted candidate performance. While candidates are trained in the use and integration of technology, and candidates and alumni indicate being comfortable using technology, documentation shows that candidates do not regularly use technology to track student growth. The addendum stated the "EPP has not created an assessment for measuring ISTE standards in many forms and applications" (Addendum).

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

SSR: #18: Partnership Agreement Blank
SSR: #17.1: EPP Advisory Council
SSR: #20: Internship Handbook
SSR: #22: Program Progression Tables
SSR: #25: Coherence of Clinical Experiences
SSR: #24: AK School Demographics
SSR: #19: Internship Orientation Agenda
SSR: #21: PACE Mentor Course for School-Based Clinical Faculty
SSR: #17.2: EPP Partner Mtg Minutes Oct 16
Addendum
Addendum 2.2.1FFR: Survey ASD School-Based Clinical Faculty
Candidate Interview
Host Teacher (HT) Interview
Stakeholder (SH) Interview
Field Placement Coordinator (FPC) Interview
EPP Assessment Coordinator (DAA) Presentation
1/26/16 DTL meeting minutes
Alumni Interviews

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

SSR: EPP Table InTASC Standards and Representative Samples
SSR: In TASC Candidate Performance LL SPA Assessments
SSR: Key Assessment 3 to 5 data
SSR: Summative Clinical Data
SSR: EPP Advisory Council
SSR: Program Progression Tables
SSR: Clinical Field Placements

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

| Area for Improvement | Rationale |
|--|---|
| The EPP's school partners have limited participation in the design and co-construction of field experiences and clinical practice (component 2.1). | The EPP has identified the need for the 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 district. |
| The EPP provides inconsistent evidence of training, both online or face-to-face, of clinical educators on evaluative instruments (component 2.2). | The EPP provides inconsistent evidence of training, both online and face-to-face, of clinical educators on evaluative instruments. |

Stipulation

| Stipulation | Rationale |
|-------------|-----------|
| | |

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

| | |
|----|--|
| | 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? |
| 1. | 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? |

| | |
|--|--|
| | 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 |

- 2.
- (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?

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?

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? |

| | |
|----|--|
| | How does the EPP ensure candidates can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development? |
| | 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 |
| 5. | (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? |

Action:

1. All tasks were completed through SSR, SSR-addendum, site visit interviews, and on site evidence. All evidence reviewed by the team is compiled, by standard, in Sources of Evidence section of the report under List of all evidence file.
2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 3:
 - a. Summary of findings

The EPP has a recruitment plan that is based on the UAA's mission to increase social, cultural, and intellectual diversity. UAA has an open enrollment policy and does not require the ACT or SAT scores for admission to the University. The SSR evidence showed candidate diversity has been increasing. The SSR

and interviews with EPP faculty and staff confirmed the EPP is aware of and makes some efforts to meet needs in the local region and throughout Alaska.

The FFR requested additional information about how the EPP recruits candidates with the high academic ability and for STEM areas. The Addendum included information about the EPP plan to work with other institutions in the UA system to seek a Noyce grant. However, the team learned on site that work on the grant application was suspended due to lack of capacity. A related concern is that their respective SPAs have not recognized the mathematics and science programs.

Interviews with faculty confirmed there are some program-based recruitment efforts and the Student Services Center also has a recruitment plan. The early childhood education program is seeking to increase diversity that allows high school students to take an introductory online course and receive credit. The special education program works with the Anchorage School District to identify special education para-professionals who would like to seek certification in special education. One person has completed this approach to certification. The secondary program recruits through content courses on campus. The COE's Student Services Office has recently developed a recruitment plan for the EPP and is working toward implementation. Candidates may do field experiences in remote schools and interns may request to be placed in a remote school for an internship.

Faculty and partners identified the General Education to Special Education (GETS) Initiative which allows general education teachers to earn a special education certificate while working in the special education classroom. However, this is an advanced, add-on program and thus falls outside the scope of this visit for initial programs.

Candidates who were interviewed indicated they chose the EPP because of location, online courses and programs, and low cost. School partners were unable to give examples of how they are involved in recruitment to initial teaching fields.

No evidence was found in documents or interviews to describe how the EPP intends to gather and analyze data about the efficacy of the recruitment efforts.

Each program sets its academic achievement criteria although the EPP is considering establishing admission criteria common to all programs. The EPP provided three years of aggregated data (3.2.1) to demonstrate the EPP and all programs leading to licensure meet CAEP's requirement of a minimum cohort GPA of 3.00. Programs set the minimum GPA requirement for each candidate. The special education program will consider the GPA from the last 30 credit hours for non-traditional candidates.

Candidates must also pass the Praxis Core assessment. Beginning in 2018-2019, all candidates must pass Praxis Core before internship. Faculty and staff monitor whether candidates pass. Candidates who do not pass are provided support. The EPP provided a Praxis Core data report for three years on Monday afternoon just before 5:00 p.m. The data report included scores for teaching fields that are not offered at UAA, such as vocational education. The report did not include any data point that indicated whether the EPP's scores reach the 50th percentile. The Addendum and interviews confirmed the data had not been analyzed. The team was unable to ask to follow up questions since the report was received so late.

The programs rely on their SPA assessments as evidence of academic quality, only five programs are nationally recognized, one is recognized with conditions, and five not recognized. The EPP did not provide evidence about the status of two programs (music and physical education.) The Addendum narrative and interviews with faculty, program heads, and the Department of Teaching and Learning indicated the programs are in the process of planning to develop common assessments based on InTASC and ISTE standards. Evidence of plans was anecdotal and not supported by written documentation of plans for timelines, resources, and data quality. SPA assessments do not have to meet CAEP criteria for validity and reliability.

Each program requires candidates to meet minimal requirements for GPA, Praxis Core, and Praxis content assessments. Each program is responsible for monitoring its candidates. No information was provided for how the physical education and music programs monitor candidate compliance.

The SSR reported the EPP was working to determine how academic factors in selection predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching but no additional evidence was found in the Addendum or site visit interviews.

The EPP responded to a question in the FFR about incomplete grades with an explanation the data set was incorrect. An NB or "no basis" grade indicates there is insufficient attendance or progress to assign a grade.

The Addendum and interviews with faculty, program coordinators, and the DTL chair indicated the EPP intends to develop a dispositions assessment to use at admissions and during the program but the work has been postponed until after the CAEP visit. Evidence of plans was anecdotal and not supported by written documentation of plans for timelines, resources, and data quality. The special education program uses dispositions assessment of the Council for Exceptional Children but will use the common assessment in the future.

Each program monitors individual candidate progress via advising, grades, and program requirements. Interviews with candidates and faculty provided anecdotal evidence that candidates are required to use Alaska's college- and

career-ready standards and the state's standards for cultural responsiveness in all lesson plans. However, the team did not receive copies of the lesson plan templates, rubrics, or resulting data. Each program uses its assessments, developed for SPA review, to provide evidence of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical skills. Evidence for this component is weak due to the number of programs that did not attain national recognition, the lack of common assessments, and lack of written documentation of plans that address InTASC standards, timeline and resources, and data quality.

Candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate skills related to technology throughout the program, but the EPP does not have a common assessment that will produce quality data on technology. The alumni survey indicated 17% of respondents reported the EPP did not prepare them to use technology effectively, creatively, and wisely in professional practice (4.0.16). Interviews with candidates, student teachers, and alumni elicited distinct impressions on whether the program provided adequate preparation to use technology. School teachers and administrators who were interviewed indicated candidates are prepared to use technology effectively. The same survey showed similar percentages with concerns about how well-prepared candidates are to address diversity in ways linked to promoting student learning.

The annual UAA Assessment Reports (5.2.2) for the various teaching fields provided some evidence of the use of data for monitoring candidates. Program assessment processes are described, and the analysis of data is summarized. The report for the special education program indicated that the program requires the Praxis special education assessment, which is not required in Alaska.

The information in the SSR and Addendum focuses on candidate requirements and does not provide sufficient evidence of data collection or analysis on the EPP level.

All candidates are required to pass the state required Praxis assessments in the content area. The program provided overall pass rates by year but did not disaggregate by programs. The SSR, addendum, and interviews with candidates, student teachers, and interns suggested candidates are able to teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning, but the program does not have a common assessment to provide evidence of this. The Department of Teaching and Learning has had initial discussions on developing such an assessment, but the plans are not developed enough to meet CAEP criteria.

The EPP has used internship assessments based on the Alaska Standard for Beginning Teachers. It is in the process of piloting an assessment adopted from another state, the STOT assessment, as an internship assessment. Data

have been collected for candidates in the elementary and some secondary programs.

The programs for early childhood, early childhood special education, special education, and secondary English earned national recognition, providing evidence candidates can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 learning and development. However, the programs for elementary education, secondary mathematics, and secondary science were not recognized, and the programs for secondary social studies and secondary world languages were recognized with conditions. The team could not verify candidates in all programs can teach effectively with positive impacts on student learning and development.

The programs address expectations of the profession, the Alaska Code of Ethics for Teachers, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies in courses, as part of internship seminars, and speakers for the Alaska Department of Education. Interviews with program leaders and faculty, candidates, and host teachers suggest candidates understand and meet these expectations.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

3.2.1 FFR Program Admission Criteria

- Interview with current students
- Interview with Stakeholders
- Interview with CAEP coordinator
- Interview with Faculty
- Interview with interns

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

- 3.1.1.a Noyce Capacity Building Grant Meeting
- 3.1.1.b Noyce Organizing Graph
- 3.1.1.c Project Summary
- 1.3.3 FFR Praxis II Alaska Requirements
- 5.2.2 FFR 2016 Program Reports (multiple documents)

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

| Area for Improvement | Rationale |
|--|---|
| The EPP did not provide evidence that all programs use non-academic criteria are used for candidate selection at multiple points in the program (component 3.3). | While the Special Education program utilizes CEC dispositions, the EPP does not have a valid and reliable instrument to assess non-academic factors for candidates in all programs. Although it intends to do so, there are no plans that meet CAEP criteria. |
| The EPP does not have a robust recruitment plan that adequately addresses candidates with high academic achievement and STEM areas (component 3.1). | Program faculty articulates new recruitment efforts that bear promise, particularly for special education recruitment, but there is no evidence of measurable goals or a plan to address the efficacy of the recruitment plan. |

Stipulation

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

| Stipulation | Rationale |
|---|--|
| The EPP did not provide evidence that it meets the requirement that admitted cohorts reach the 50th percentile on a nationally normed test (component 3.2). | The EPP presented Praxis Core data reported; however, the data reports did not provide any evidence to show cohorts reached the 50th percentile. |

Standard 4: Program Impact

The provider demonstrates 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.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Standard 4 Task 1: Verify employer and completer perceptions of preparation.</p> <p>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</p> <p>(1) (4.3) The NExT Employer survey appears to measure employer 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.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</p> <p>1. (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</p> <p>(2) "Unavailability of three consecutive cycles of data for each area. p.54"</p> <p>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</p> <p>(1) What are the program's criteria for success for survey data?</p> <p>(2) The NExT Employer Survey data does not provide 3 cycles of data. How is a cycle defined and where is the comparative data?</p> <p>(3) Interview personnel who administer surveys and analyze the results.</p> <p>(4) The Alumni Survey data does not provide 3 cycles of data. How is a cycle defined and where is the comparative data?</p> <p>(5) Is there any trend data or triangulated data from the various data collections?</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

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

(2) "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."p.53

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

(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?

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

(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

3. (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?

Action:

1. All tasks were completed through SSR, SSR-addendum, site visit interviews, and on site evidence. All evidence reviewed by the team is compiled, by standard, in Sources of Evidence section of the report under List of all evidence file.
2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 4 :
 - a. Summary of findings

In order to probe the accuracy of the EPP's statements regarding the evidence related to Standard 4, the site visit team examined the results of the various surveys used by the EPP, interviewed completers and employers, the CAEP coordinator/Director of Assessment, Student Teacher Supervisors, and the Director of Field Services. In addition, Evidence 4.1.7 Impact of P-12 Learning and Development of EPP Completers, was examined. Evidence 4.1.1 Newspaper Article, 4.1.2 Alaska State Test Scores, and 4.1.3 State Report Card were inconsistent with meeting the standard. Component 4.1 requires that "multiple measures shall include all available growth measures required by the state." The state of Alaska provides no value added or performance data. The EPP conducted interviews and collected survey data to evaluate educator effectiveness. The SSR describes a process for creating the interview protocol. Participants were called on the phone to complete the interviews. The response rate was very low at 7.5%. The NExT surveys were also administered. Raw data was provided, but no data analysis or triangulation with other measures was provided. In addition, no strength and weakness analysis was completed. CAEP allows for a plan for the subcomponent 4.1, but the EPP did not provide a CAEP sufficient plan for review. In addition, the demonstration of completers to effectively apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions (4.2) was also not included in the evidence the EPP provided.

The EPP Self-Study Report provided an EPP create employer survey (Evidences 4.0.9 Employer Survey, 4.0.9a Employer Survey Response rates, and 4.0.14 Employer Survey Data) designed to measure employers' satisfaction with completers (4.3). The employer survey measured employer perceptions' of candidate preparation in several areas. The EPP provided one cycle of data (2016) that was disaggregated by degree level and reported a response rate of 25.7%. The EPP survey was not linked to any standards. Survey data were presented with minimal interpretation for EPP continuous improvement initiatives and strength/weakness analysis. For the 2016 survey, the EPP did not present percent for items, the frequency of score, or mean percentages nor a triangulation of items to other EPP data. In 2017, the Addendum states, "Additionally, data were collected through the administration of a more reliable and comprehensive survey, which was sent

out in May-June of 2017 (NExT Employer Survey). This survey focused on instructional practices, professionalism, diverse learners, learning environments, and overall satisfaction. The team was unable to locate a copy of the survey. Raw data was provided (4.3.7 NExT Employer Survey Satisfaction Qual) but no interpretation, triangulation, or linkage to standards was provided. Response rates for 2014 and 2016 were 58% and 42% respectively. Interviews with principals, school personnel, and stakeholders during the onsite could not substantiate the survey findings because the EPP did not provide data analysis or dissemination. Partners did make positive statements about UAA graduates employed in their schools. However, only three principals participated in Stakeholder interviews.

"The EPP is unable to provide valid and reliable data on employment milestones such as promotion and retention. According to Alaska Statute 14.20.149(h) (which describes employee evaluation), teachers', administrators', and special service providers' evaluations are not and will not be public record. However, EPP faculty have found that employers can talk anecdotally about their employees and complete outside evaluations." (p.16 Addendum). CAEP allows for a plan for subcomponent 4.3, but the EPP did not provide a CAEP-sufficient plan for the team to review.

The EPP Self-Study provided an alumni survey (4.0.7 Alumni Survey #1, 4.0.8 Alumni Survey #2) designed to assess the degree to which completers perceive their preparation regarding job responsibilities and if preparation was effective (4.4). The EPP provided one cycle of data. Response rates for alumni survey #1 was 20.4% (p54 SSR). The EPP provided one cycle of data for Alumni survey #2. Response rates for alumni survey #2 were 27.2% (p. 54 SSR) In addition, it appears the NExT alumni survey was administered, but data were not included for component 4.4. Alumni interviews indicated completers felt UAA best prepared them to have a strong personal philosophy and educational foundation. Interviewees mentioned they would have preferred to have more classroom management experience and more experience with some aspects of technology. Some also indicated they would have liked to be engaged in classes rather than simple observation. The technology area was split, as some alumni felt well prepared while others wanted more hands-on experiences. Interviews could not be supported by alumni survey data because survey data analysis was not provided.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

4.0.7a Alumni Survey Response Rate
4.0.8 Alumni Survey #2
4.0.8a Alumni Survey #2 Response Rate
4.0.16 Alumni Survey #2
4.0.9 Employer Survey #1
4.0.9a Employer Survey #1 Response Rate
4.0.14 Employer Survey #1
3.1.2 2013 Teacher Turnover Report

- 4.0.6 NExT Survey overview
- 4.3.8 Employer survey satisfaction
- 4.0.12 FFR Alumni Interview Qualitative
- 4.1.5 NExT Alumni Survey on Measuring Student Growth
- 4.3.7 NExT Employer Survey on Satisfaction Qualitative
- 4.1.4 Repeal of Teacher Evaluation Plan
- 4.1.7 Impact on student learning statements
- 5.1.3 TTS 2017 Validity and Reliability
- Interview with alumni
- Interview with current students
- Interview with stakeholders
- Interview with host teachers/cooperating teachers
- Interview with current interns
- Interview with DLT chair and program leads
- Interview with CAEP coordinator/Director of Assessment and Accreditation
- Interview with EPP faculty
- Interview with clinical supervisors

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

- 5.4.1 Employment data state level (empty document)
- 4.1.2 State-wide test scores
- 4.1.3 State Report Card
- 5.1.2 Supervisor Survey Validity and Reliability
- 5.1.1 Quality Assurance systems of the EPP

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

| Area for Improvement | Rationale |
|---|--|
| Multiple measures of program completer contribution to student learning growth is not provided (component 4.1). | The EPP provided an interview protocol and research process for collecting program completer data. However, limited data analysis was presented, and interviews revealed the data collection discontinued. |
| The EPP did not provide analysis or interpretation of three cycles of data on employment milestones and employer satisfaction with completer's preparation (component 4.3). | EPP provided one cycle of data with no comparison markers |
| The EPP did not provide analysis or interpretation of three cycles of data on completer perception of effective preparation (component 4.4). | While one cycle of alumni survey data was provided, the EPP did not include appropriate analysis, interpretation of results, or trend analysis over time. |

Stipulation

| Stipulation | Rationale |
|--|--|
| The EPP did not provide evidence that program completers apply the professional knowledge, skills and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve (component 4.2) | 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. |

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

1. Findings for each offsite report task to be verified onsite:

Task(s)

| | |
|--|--|
| Surveys | |
| A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration | |
| B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed | |
| 1. | (1) In the SSR, it states there is a dispositions form. Does it have 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 | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Data Presented | |
| A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration | |
| | (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? |
| | 1.3.2 Praxis II UAA Graduates of All Initial Teacher Preparation Programs: Pass Rates on |

(4) 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.

2.

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?

Continuous Improvement

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(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?

3.

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

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?

Action:

1. All tasks were completed through SSR, SSR-addendum, site visit interviews, and on site evidence. All evidence reviewed by the team is compiled, by standard, in Sources of Evidence section of the report under List of all evidence file.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 5:

a. Summary of findings

Using the SSR, SSR Addendum, evidence, interviews and document review on site, there was not clear evidence outlining a quality assurance system used to 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. In the SSR Addendum, the EPP writes, "The Formative Feedback Report raised critical questions that the EPP has already begun to address this academic year. Generally, anecdotal evidence and general perceptions inform current EPP faculty about program quality. Thus, the EPP is in essence at the beginning phases of building a quality assurance system that is informed by reliable and valid data. Data are used to examine candidates before, during and after the program." (p. 1) In the Addendum, the EPP also states, "The College of Education recognizes that the quality assurance system has struggled with producing valid and reliable data that leads to comprehensive program improvement." (p. 16) In the SSR Addendum, the EPP states they have adopted Via by Watermark as an electronic collection system. This was confirmed in the interviews and presentations on site. This system will provide an electronic collection system for evidence on teacher candidates.

While there are some EPP assessments, the total number of EPP assessments, the reliability, and validity of those assessments were not provided.

In the SSR, the majority of data reports do not report using three cycles or show disaggregation by specialty licensure areas. While several datasets are provided, many of the charts are incomplete making them unactionable. Charts were missing headings, title, and aggregated or disaggregated data. Also, there is no evidence that at least 50% of EPP-created assessments are scored at the sufficient level or above on the CAEP assessment Rubric.

The SSR states there are learning outcomes for 4 of their programs_ECE, ELEM, SPED, Secondary. The EPP has different outcomes by program. The

SPA reports submitted in the SRR ranged from NOT RECOGNIZED in progress to accepted with a large number of programs having an unsatisfactory review. There is no evidence that assessments measure against the stated Conceptual Framework. In the SSR Addendum, the EPP states, "While outcomes are not formally measured against the Conceptual Framework, we are continually guided by it and make decisions that support designing programs that reflect it." (p. 18/SSR).

In the SSR Addendum, the EPP provided 11 self-assessment reports for a variety of programs (i.e., 5.2.2ECBA, 5.2.2.ECPBCT, etc.). There are a series of narrative questions asked for each program including any changes made, etc. There is no quantifiable data provided in any of these reports, nor any specific decisions outlined, made by quantifiable data.

One example of a piloted EPP instrument is the STOT observation instrument outlined in the Addendum. In the on-site presentation by the DAA, it was noted that the elementary program was piloting the STOT. The EPP states in the SSR Addendum, "There are differences of opinion among faculty whether school-based clinical faculty should use formal observation documents to provide feedback on intern progress or even formally to evaluate interns at all. This topic is scheduled to be addressed by the Department of Teaching and Learning (initial programs) shortly. (p. 19). Faculty who were interviewed supported a common assessment, but faculty from music and physical education did not participate in interviews.

Another example of an EPP data point is the measure of GPA for admission. The EPP provided limited evidence of an average score for each admitted cohort for three cycles (more of a summary/not an analysis) making this EPP assessment point unclear in its use.

In the SSR, there are some examples of the data analysis. However, there is a lack of examples of improvement related to data sources. Subsequently, in the SSR, there are limited examples of data-driven decisions at the program level (i.e., pg. 17, first paragraph), 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.

In the SSR, the EPP provides evidence that contains school district placements of graduates. No other data was provided nor was this data analyzed or disseminated. Eight annual measures were not provided. (SSR, Addendum, Interviews)

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. In the SRR, the EPP provides minutes of a partner meeting where clinical placements were discussed with strengths and challenges. No data was provided as part of the SSR.

In the SSR Addendum and on-site presentation by the dean, stakeholders

have been reintroduced as part of the quality system. In the SSR Addendum, the EPP states, " The newly-formed Dean's Community Council will meet twice yearly to provide input on teacher preparation programs. The Community Advisory Council consists of the site- and district-based educational leaders, lead teachers, and community partners. The EPP is also forming stakeholder groups that will engage in an ongoing review of processes, procedures and data analysis to support program improvement." (EPP Addendum, pp. 19-20) No evidence is provided that these new groups have met or have given input based on complete data. On-campus interviews confirmed that this group has not met. At the program level, on-site interviews with faculty resulted in learning that the Early Childhood Program brought in a group of stakeholders to review their program and provide suggestions for that curriculum only.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Use of PETAL and Taskstream/Digication (5.1.1) for technology.LIST TITLES and Numbers
5.1.1 Use of Taskstream/Digication
5.1.2 Supervisor Survey Validity and Reliability
5.1.2a Exit Survey validity reliability
5.1.5 ETS Why and How (reliability and validity of Praxis II)
2.1.2a EPP Partner Mtg Minutes

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1.3.1 SPA Status Initial Programs
4.1.7 Impact on P-12 Student Learning, (no Alaska Test from 2014-2016)
1.1.7 Praxis II Scores are given but not disaggregated
5.2.2 (all examples for all programs--(Addendum)
5.1.1 5.1.1 FFR Presidents AKCOE Charge (Addendum)

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

| Area for Improvement | Rationale |
|---|--|
| The EPP provided evidence for only 5 of the 8 Annual Reporting Measures for CAEP (component 5.4). | Information was presented for 5 of the 8 measures. There are 3 measures where brief plans are outlined, but there is no data provided. |

Stipulation

| 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; or evidence of using results to improve program elements and processes (components 5.1 & 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 evidences (component 5.2) | The EPP presented program-based data rather than common key assessments. There are missing data from some programs and less than three cycles of data for most assessments. There was no evidence provided showing the reliability and validity of the EPP-created assessments. |
| The EPP did not provide evidence that stakeholders are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models | There was no evidence in the SSR and SSR-Addendum, and limited evidence in on site interviews that program evaluation |

of excellence (component 5.5).

involves stakeholders. One program provided an example that was program-related. No EPP-wide feedback examples were provided of stakeholder feedback.

Section 3: Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

1. DIVERSITY

a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy 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. Candidates and alumni expressed during interviews that they felt prepared to incorporate culturally responsive pedagogical practices into lessons. Candidates spoke to a programmatic practice of examining school and classroom demographics before deciding how to differentiate curriculum design and delivery. Additionally, engagement in personal reflection occurs, and candidates reflect on its impact on their teaching. 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. Individual faculty research projects focused on multilingual children's books and technology, and tutoring of students in rural schools provided additional opportunities for candidates to develop culturally responsive teaching strategies (EPP Dean

Presentation). The EPP is working 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 one intent to focus on rural school districts.

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

SSR: #1: EPP Student Learning Outcomes
SSR: #22: Program Progression Tables
SSR: #24: AK School Demographics
SSR: #38: Alumni Survey Data #2
SSR: #37: Employer Survey #1 Data
SSR: #28: Recruitment for Academic Ability and Diversity
EPP Dean Presentation

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

SSR: #2: InTASC Standards Matrix

Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

2. TECHNOLOGY

a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to technology

The FFR reported 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 addendum did not provide assessment data related to the use of technology. This is cited under Standard 1. The SSR indicated faculty would design and pilot a technology assessment in the 2017-2018 school year, but the team was unable to find evidence of this.

Faculty, school partners, host teachers, interns and most candidates who were interviewed reported program completers are well prepared to use technology effectively. However, a few interns in the early childhood program stated it would have been helpful to have more hands-on experience with technology. A candidate in special education also indicated the program did not provide enough training for working with technology for sensory impairments. These comments are consistent with the alumni survey, which revealed 17% of respondents reported the EPP did not prepare them to use technology effectively, creatively, and wisely in professional practice (4.0.16).

The discussion of Standard 4 in the Addendum includes several ways the EPP collects data from program completers and employers. The technology was not addressed in the discussion.

The addendum (p. 17) stated the EPP strives to apply innovations in technology. No evidence was included in the addendum. Interviews with faculty and staff, candidates, and interns provided multiple examples of how

candidates are provided with multiple course-base opportunities to hone their competencies for using technology.

The EPP offers courses and programs online. The COE has an instructional designer who provides support to faculty, staff, and candidates to improve teaching and learning. She works closely with a UAA librarian who is a specialist in education.

The EPP uses multiple software platforms for a variety of purposes within the COE and across the University. The COE has changed its data platforms several times over recent years which is one of the reasons the faculty cited for the missing data frequently cited in this report. The University has some new software that has potential to support accreditation work of the EPP. The team heard conflicting information about who had access to what data.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.

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

Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

Section 4: Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

| Area for Improvement: | Rationale: |
|-----------------------|------------|
| | |

Section 5: Response to the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

(Use the Rubric for Evaluating the Capacity and Potential in the SIP)

1. Summary of findings and overall evaluation of Selected Improvement Plan

The University of Alaska-Anchorage (UAA) College of Education selected 3.3 for its Selected Improvement Plan, establishing and monitoring 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.

a. The EPP's capacity for initiating, implementing and complete the SIP.

The plan to work on a common dispositions assessment was chosen because the EPP recognized the need to have an instrument that would provide meaningful data that could be aggregated and disaggregated as well as analyzed to provide evidence for multiple standards. The EPP indicated the new dispositions assessment would be used for all standards but it was not clear how it would provide evidence for Standard 4. Relevant goals and objectives were included.

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

The plan for identifying strategies and timeline are clearly articulated in the SSR, but the time of the site visit had made little progress. For Goal #1, implementing a systematic plan for assessing candidate attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability at admission and during the program. Numerous EPP faculty who were interviewed indicated the prime focus has been on working to create common assessments of instructional planning, internship, and impact on student learning as the programs moved from relying on SPA assessments to common assessments for CAEP purposed. This work is ongoing, although behind schedule, and led by the chair of the Department of Teaching and Leading. Stakeholders who were interviewed reported they had not been involved with the selected improvement plan. The new internship assessment was adopted from another state and was piloted with elementary and selected secondary student teachers in spring 2018.

c. The proposed use of data and evidence.

Progress on Goal #2, developing an assessment cycle that uses multiple data sources for assessing academic and non-academic factors of the candidate to predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching as well as to make program improvement. Objectives were outlined and timeline established, but progress is lagging. There is no evidence the EPP has a clear plan to use appropriate data for predictive purposes.

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

Although the intent of the SIP is clear, the capacity of the EPP to implement the plan is questionable since it has fallen behind its intended schedule. The capacity to implement the plan was also questionable, because of the lack of

sustained leadership in the COE and the University.

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 and its progress, including (a) its capacity for initiating, implementing, and completing a Selected Improvement Plan (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.

Sources of Evidence

List of interviews and participants

See Attachment

List of exhibits reviewed /List additional sources consulted (website, etc.)

See Attachment

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

| |
|-------------------|
| List of attendees |
| Evidences |

See Attachment panel below.