



**Graduate Elementary Programs
Annual Program Report 2021-22**

**Prepared by Beth Hartley, Ph.D.
March 1, 2023**

Program Overview

The University of Alaska Southeast School of Education provides graduate elementary teacher preparation in 3 interrelated programs: a Master of Arts in Teaching degree, a K-8 Graduate Certificate that leads to recommendation for the Alaska Beginning Teacher certificate, and an Endorsement in K-8 for those already holding an Alaska teaching certificate. All programs utilize the same courses, and the Graduate Certificate is embedded in the MAT program.

These programs have been delivered by distance throughout Alaska since 2000. The programs share undergraduate coursework with the BA Elementary and the BA Special Education programs.

The programs are structured in a traditional, course-based manner via e-learning. Candidates take foundations courses and a series of “practicum methods courses” that require weekly field experiences in elementary and middle school classrooms. A semester of student teaching completes the graduate certificate portion of the programs. Candidates may opt to take 2 final courses to complete the master’s degree.

A complete description of the program is found in our Graduate Programs Candidate handbook. https://uas.alaska.edu/education/documents/elemdistpacket/2022-23_Candidate_Handbook_ELEMAT.pdf

Program enrollment and completions are summarized in Table 1. Enrollment and resultant completions are down (as reflected in the UA system). This can be partially attributed to the effects of COVID situations. Quite a few students for AY 20-21 deferred their program completion until they could take care of family and/or health issues or could work back in schools. This may be part of what is reflected in the general enrollment trends for the EPP this past year.

Enrollment and Completions Graduate Elementary Programs 2021-22

Table 1

Students Enrolled/Degrees Awarded by Academic Year

Degree Type	AY 2017-2018		AY 2018-2019		AY 2019-2020		AY 2020-2021		AY 2021-2022	
	Students Enrolled	Degrees Awarded	Students Enrolled	Degrees Awarded	Students Enrolled	Degrees Awarded	Students Enrolled	Degrees Awarded	Students Enrolled	Degrees Awarded
Grad Cert	8	31	6	16	3	21	6	8	6	7

MAT	89	12	84	23	78	21	62	10	45	1
Total	97	43	90	39	81	42	68	18	51	8

Data as of 11/14/22 Julie McBrien, UA Decision Support Database

Notes: The number of awards earned in "Grad Cert" and "MAT" reflect totals for the Academic Year (AY) reported. The number of awards earned in "Grad Cert ONLY" and "MAT ONLY" reflect totals for the year reported. No individual student is duplicated *within* the same year. However, an individual may be duplicated *across* years (e.g., Grad Cert in AY19 and MAT in AY21). Those completing a K-8 Endorsement receive a personalized program of study based on their previous program and teaching experience and will also complete a semester of student teaching in an elementary program.

CAEP Accreditation: The UAS Alaska College of Education was reviewed by CAEP in 2019 and has received full accreditation without conditions May 2020. We are currently in the continuous improvement cycle.

Analysis: We are seeing a decline in enrollment school wide and program wide. We are all working on increasing numbers through word of mouth, our physical presence in schools, and the new cross-MAU marketing strategy. Finances are creating some hardships for students. Some of our students are accepting emergency teaching jobs which tends to slow their progress through our programs. Also, competition from less rigorous educational forums is siphoning off some students. We are seeing an increase of applicants who are on emergency certificates and needing to complete their certifications in Alaska. Next fall will be the nadir of the number of students gaining certificates, but the spring promises to bring a new high number of graduates to the teaching field.

Program Student Learning Objectives

The Alaska Beginning Teacher Expectations and the CAEP Standards govern our program for Elementary Teachers. The learning outcomes are organized as follows:

Goal 1: Teachers articulate, maintain and develop a philosophy of education that they demonstrate in practice.

Goal 2: Teachers understand how human development affects learning and apply that understanding to practice.

Goal 3: Teachers differentiate instruction with respect for individual and cultural characteristics.

Goal 4: Teachers possess current academic content knowledge: Language Arts, Science, Math, Social Studies, The Arts, Health, PE

Goal 5: Teachers facilitate student learning by using assessment to guide planning, instruction, and modification of teaching practice.

Goal 6: Teachers create and manage a stimulating, inclusive and safe learning community in which students take intellectual risks and work independently and collaboratively.

Goal 7: Teachers work as partners with parents, families and the community.

Goal 8: Teachers develop and maintain professional, moral and ethical attitudes, behaviors, relationships and habits of mind.

Goal 9: Teachers use technology effective, creatively and wisely.

Alignment of the CAEP, InTasc, and TESOL standards, the AKCOE Goals, and the Alaska Beginning Teacher Expectations can be found on at this link which is also provided in the Elementary Graduate Candidate Handbook: [Elem. Grad. Alignment and Standards](#)

How the Data are Collected on the Program SLOs

Data for program assessment are collected:

- 1) at program entry - Gate 1 – (attached),
- 2) prior to and during Student Teaching ED 688 - Gate 2 – Student Teaching & Placement Request Form (Google Doc https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdeXixZY-xk_TOx6WcTcITxDWfbH_Q8AG-057rG5urlQdwkNg/view) and,
- 3) Gate 3 upon completion of the Master’s Portfolio ED 698 (Gate 3 -attached).

For program entry, all candidates must pass the Praxis Core exam, a national test of basic academic skills that is required by the State of Alaska. The data is aggregated by Institutional Research at UAS. An evaluation of content preparation is prepared by the advisor, showing any content deficiencies that candidates must make up before they are fully admitted. Prior to Student Teaching, candidates also must take and pass the Praxis II Elementary Education - Content Knowledge exam.

During Student Teaching, candidates complete two summative assessments including:

- Plan and teach a self-designed Interdisciplinary Unit based on backwards design.
- Complete the Renaissance Teacher Work Sample” (TWS) – a standards informed, assessment driven, unit of instruction.

The assessment rubrics for these assignments are housed in LiveText, our online assessment system. The assignments are aligned to the UAS SLOs as well as the CAEP and InTasc standards. These assignments are reviewed and scored by the University Supervisor assigned to each student teacher.

All SOE initial licensure candidates are evaluated twice throughout their student teaching internships (formative and summative) on two standards-based, valid and reliable assessments:

- the Student Teacher Observation Template (STOT) designed to provide a comprehensive overview of the student teacher’s classroom practice over time and (assessed by the University Supervisor)
- the Professional Characteristics Assessment (PCA) designed to assess the professional behaviors and attitudes expected of candidates (Assessed by the Host Teacher)

The first time the assessments are administered is formative for goal setting purposes. The second time the assessments are administered is summative to show evidence of growth and proficiency. These assessments and related rubrics are housed in LiveText.

Host Teachers, in collaboration with Student Teachers, also evaluate the student teacher’s content area knowledge and performance using the rubrics for the Evaluation of Classroom Practice and Content (ECPC) also housed in LiveText. These are also administered as formative (goal setting) and summative assessments.

Additionally, in an ongoing response to CAEP requirements, student teachers engage in an ELL student analysis examining opportunities that ELLs have to engage in oral academic language (English) through an ELL Shadowing exercise. Candidates also consider using the recommended strategies of building background and comprehensible input for ELLS (and all students) as they design their units of instruction. We keep record of the analyses on LiveText.

Most students opt to complete the MAT degree at some point after their internship. They conduct and prepare a “Master’s Portfolio” that is evaluated by a three person committee consisting of 2 faculty and one

outside educator. The assessment is also housed in LiveText.

Program Data 2021-22

For the purposes of this report, representative data from the Praxis Core, Praxis II, TWS, ECPC ,STOT, PCA, and the Masters Portfolio are included in this report. Other program evaluation data can be retrieved from LiveText as necessary.

Praxis Core

Table 2:

Praxis Core 1018 - 2022

	MAT Test Year	MAT Test Year	MAT Test Year	MAT Test Year	MAT Test Year	Grad Cert Test Year	Grad Cert Test Year	Grad Cert Test Year	Grad Cert Test Year	Grad Cert Test Year
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Basic Competency Exam: Reading										
Total Tests Taken	19	15	14	14	4	3	0	1	1	0
Total Passing	16	14	11	14	4	2	0	1	1	0
Pass Rate	84%	93%	79%	100%	100%	67%	0%	100%	100%	0%
Basic Competency Exam: Writing										
Total Tests Taken	23	17	17	21	4	4	1	1	2	0
Total Passing	12	6	5	9	2	1	0	1	1	0
Pass Rate	52%	35%	29%	43%	50%	25%	0%	100%	50%	0%
Basic Competency Exam: Math										
Total Tests Taken	24	20	15	17	4	3	0	1	1	0
Total Passing	10	9	10	9	4	1	0	1	1	0
Pass Rate	42%	45%	67%	53%	100%	33%	0%	100%	100%	0%

Data as of 11/18/22 Julie McBrien, ETS raw data

NOTE: Test Year = ETS test year dates: September 1st through August 31st.

Because these "test years" do not exactly correspond to either an Academic Year or a Fiscal Year, they have been labeled here as "Test Year" for clarity.

In each Test Year, those students who were enrolled in the Graduate Elementary Program are counted above by looking at: *The count of passing scores divided by the total number of tests taken to calculate the pass rate for that Test Year.*

Analysis: Students commonly have difficulty with the Praxis Core reading or writing – particularly our ELL candidates. They all have the opportunity to retake subsections, as needed and recommendations for accommodations are provided upon request. Candidates are admitted to the program in full standing upon successful completion of all three subtests.

Praxis II

Table 3:

Praxis II 2018 - 2022

Content Knowledge	MAT Test Year 2018	MAT Test Year 2019	MAT Test Year 2020	MAT Test Year 2021	MAT Test Year 2022	Grad Cert Test Year 2018	Grad Cert Test Year 2019	Grad Cert Test Year 2020	Grad Cert Test Year 2021	Grad Cert Test Year 2022
Total Tests Taken	35	23	19	10	22	1	6	1	10	3
Total Passing	27	19	16	10	17	1	6	1	6	3
Pass Rate	77%	83%	84%	100%	77%	100%	100%	100%	6	100%

Data as of 11/18/22 Julie McBrien, ETS raw data

NOTE: Test Year = ETS test year dates: September 1st through August 31st.

Because these "test years" do not exactly correspond to either an Academic Year or a Fiscal Year, they have been labeled here as "Test Year" for clarity.

In each Test Year, those students who were enrolled in the Graduate Elementary Program are counted above by looking at: *The count of passing scores divided by the total number of tests taken to calculate the pass rate for that Test Year.*

Analysis: All completers for the Elementary Graduate Certificate have shown consistently strong skills in the Elementary content competency exam necessary for Alaska State Teacher Certification. The same re-take options for subtests applies. Students are not eligible for Alaska Teacher Certification until they have passed all subtests.

Teacher Work Sample

Table 4:

Teacher Work Sample 2021-22

Teacher Work Sample		Not Met	Not Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Met	Met	n
Contextual Factors	Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors	0	0%	0	0%	17	100%	17
	Knowledge of Characteristics of Students	0	0%	1	6%	16	94%	17
	Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning	0	0%	3	18%	14	82%	17
	Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning	0	0%	4	24%	13	76%	17
	Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment	0	0%	5	29%	12	71%	17
Learning Goals	Significance, Challenge and Variety	0	0%	6	35%	11	65%	17
	Clarity	0	0%	4	24%	13	76%	17
	Appropriateness for Students	0	0%	3	18%	14	82%	17
	Alignment with National, State or Local Standards	0	0%	2	12%	15	88%	17
Assessment Plan	Alignment with Learning Goals and with Instruction	0	0%	2	12%	15	88%	17
	Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance	0	0%	5	29%	12	71%	17
	Multiple Modes and Approaches	0	0%	5	29%	12	71%	17
	Technical Soundness	0	0%	6	35%	11	65%	17
	Adaptations Based on Individual Needs of Students	0	0%	5	29%	12	71%	17

Design for Instruction	Alignment with Learning Goals	0	0%	3	18%	14	82%	17
	Accurate Representation of Content	0	0%	2	12%	15	88%	17
	Lesson and Unit Structure	0	0%	4	24%	13	76%	17
	Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments, Resources	0	0%	4	24%	13	76%	17
	Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources	0	0%	6	35%	11	65%	17
	Use of Technology	0	0%	1	6%	16	94%	17
Instructional Decision Making	Sound Professional Practice	0	0%	4	24%	13	76%	17
	Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning	0	0%	3	18%	14	82%	17
	Congruence Between Modifications and Learning Goals	0	0%	1	6%	16	94%	17
Analysis of Student Learning + Learning Gain Score	Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation	0	0%	3	18%	14	82%	17
	Alignment with Learning Goals	0	0%	3	18%	14	82%	17
	Interpretation of Data	0	0%	2	12%	15	88%	17
	Evidence of Impact on Student Learning	0	0%	3	18%	14	82%	17
Reflection and Self Evaluation	Interpretation of Student Learning	0	0%	2	12%	15	88%	17
	Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment	0	0%	2	12%	15	88%	17
	Alignment Among Goals, Instruction, and Assessment	0	0%	3	18%	14	82%	17
	Implications for Future Teaching	0	0%	3	18%	14	82%	17
	Implications for Professional Development	0	0%	2	12%	15	88%	17
Totals:		0	0%	23	15%	130	85%	153

Not Met	Partially Met	Met
0%	19%	85 %

Analysis: Candidates performed very successfully in the Teacher Work Sample with a slight drop in overall scores. (SLO 5). 100% partially met or met the standards. It is evident that some reinforcement in instructional design and assessment is needed, as well as helping candidates make clear connections between the learning goals chosen and the assessments of those goals that lead to effective instructional design and the actual students they are serving or working with. Some teachers experienced the fatigue of engaging in a full-time teaching job and completing the required program assessments for student teaching. It is possible that this also contributed to the drop in the quality of the TWS units.

ECPC- Evaluation of Classroom Practice and Content.

Because self-reflection is a key element in our program as well as good practice in metacognitive responses to their practice, this assessment is completed in conversation between the candidate and the host teacher, both as a formative goal setting and summative self-reflection on the candidates content area skill and knowledge

in each of the Alaska Beginning Teacher Expectations (SLOs 1-9). The student teacher completes the actual form.

Table 5

Evaluation of Classroom Practice and Content: 2021-22

Evaluation Classroom Practice and Content Fall 2021 & Spring 2022 Combined (Summative)		Not Met	Not Met	Met	Met	Exceeds	Exceeds	n
Differentiation/UDL	Knowledge Centered Classroom	0	0%	10	50%	10	50%	20
	Learner Centered Classroom Management	0	0%	3	15%	17	85%	20
	Materials	0	0%	5	25%	15	75%	20
	Planning/Instruction	0	0%	8	40%	12	60%	20
	Process	0	0%	5	25%	15	75%	20
	Assessment	0	0%	12	60%	8	40%	20
	Overall Differentiation/UDL	0	0%	9	45%	11	55%	20
	English Language Arts	Knowledge of English	0	0%	8	40%	12	60%
Design Instruction		0	0%	7	35%	13	65%	20
Teaching Reading		0	0%	7	37%	12	63%	19
Genres of Literature		0	0%	4	21%	15	79%	19
Critical Thinking		0	0%	8	40%	12	60%	20
Writing and Speaking		1	5%	9	45%	10	50%	20
Assessment		0	0%	7	35%	13	65%	20
Overall English Language Arts		0	0%	10	50%	10	50%	20
Health Education	Knowledge about Health	0	0%	5	25%	15	75%	20
	Plan and Teach	0	0%	9	45%	11	55%	20
	Overall Health	0	0%	9	45%	11	55%	20
Science	Science Knowledge Base	0	0%	6	30%	14	70%	20
	Design Science Instruction	0	0%	3	15%	17	85%	20
	Inquiry	0	0%	5	25%	15	75%	20
	Understands Misconceptions	0	0%	9	45%	11	55%	20
	Assessment	1	5%	4	20%	15	75%	20
	Overall Science	0	0%	7	35%	13	65%	20
Social Studies	Social Studies Knowledge	0	0%	9	45%	11	55%	20
	Planning Instruction	0	0%	5	25%	15	75%	20
	Variety of Techniques	0	0%	7	37%	12	63%	19
	Higher Order Thinking	1	5%	9	47%	9	47%	19
	Assessment	1	5%	4	21%	14	74%	19
	Overall Social Studies	0	0%	9	45%	11	55%	20
The Arts	Knowledge in The Arts	0	0%	9	45%	11	55%	20
	Importance of The Arts	0	0%	7	35%	13	65%	20
	Communication and Insight	0	0%	6	30%	14	70%	20
	The Arts Overall	0	0%	7	35%	13	65%	20
Mathematics	Knowledge of Mathematics	0	0%	7	35%	13	65%	20

	Planning Instruction	0	0%	10	50%	10	50%	20
	Mathematical Reasoning & Language Understands	0	0%	4	20%	16	80%	20
	Misconceptions	0	0%	8	40%	12	60%	20
	Formative/Summative Assessments	1	5%	11	55%	8	40%	20
	Overall Mathematics:	0	0%	10	50%	10	50%	20
Totals:		5	1%	299	37%	511	63%	815
Not Met	Met	Exceeds						
1%	37%	63%						

Data as of 11/18/22 Julie McBrien, LiveText data

Analysis: Our goal is to see that all candidates have demonstrate competence in meeting content standards at the Met level or better. Their overall sense of competence and confidence is evident in their self-assessment and through the observations of their host teachers. 99% of our candidates have met or exceeded these standards. It is also telling that a few recognized their challenges with assessing student learning in particular areas. Assessment continues to be a needed focus for all of our practicum courses. Engaging students in higher order thinking is also a continued need.

PCA - Professional Characteristics Assessment

Table 6

PCA 2021-22

PCA: Fall 2021 & Spring 2022 (Combined)	N/A		Un met		Partially Met		Met		Exceede d		n
	N/A	N/A	Un met	Un met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Met	Met	Exceede d	Exceeded	
1a. Motivated to become an effective practitioner and committed to his/her decision to teach.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	11%	16	89%	18
2a. Committed to meeting the needs of individuals from diverse backgrounds, recognizing that all individuals can learn, no matter their age, race, ethnicity, culture, class, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, abilities or exceptionalities.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	17%	15	83%	18
3a. Works collaboratively with all members of the school community.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	17	94%	18
4a. Demonstrates intellectual curiosity	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	5	28%	12	67%	18
5a. Flexible in his/her thinking and creative in his/her ideas.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	17	94%	18
6a. Professional and ethical in his/her behavior.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	11%	16	89%	18
7a. Demonstrate observable behaviors that reflect the importance of helping students develop the skills and strategies needed for healthy interpersonal relationships.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	17%	15	83%	18
Totals:	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	17	13%	108	86%	126

Data as of 11/18/22 Julie McBrien,

LiveText data

N/A	Unmet	Partially Met	Met	Exceeded
1%	0%	0%	13%	86%

Analysis: 99% of our students met or exceeded their mentor’s perceptions of professional dispositions. We are very proud of our candidates’ self-presentation as professionals in the teaching field. With regard to #4, demonstrating intellectual curiosity also includes extending oneself beyond the immediate classroom for learning. It is difficult for some candidates to seek out extended learning due to the overwhelming nature of student teaching and/or being hired as a teacher before finishing their practicum. Sometimes it is simply the disposition of the candidate. Student teachers are strongly encouraged to attend the staff development opportunities offered in their schools where they can continue their professional development.

STOT – Student Teacher Observation Template

Table 8

STOT 2021-22

STOT Summative: Fall 2021 & Spring 2022 Combined		N/A	N/A	Und erde velo ped	Und erde velo ped	Und erde velo ped +	Und erde velo ped +	Eme rgin g	Eme rgin g	Eme rgin g +	Eme rgin g +	Pro fici ent	Profi cient	Profi cient +	Disti ngui shed	Disti ngui shed	n	
Standard #1: Learner Development.	(O) Supports student learning through developmentally appropriate instruction	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%	7	41%	8	47%	17
	(O) Accounts for differences in students’ prior knowledge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	12%	8	47%	7	41%	17
Standard #2: Learning Differences.	(O) Uses knowledge of students’ socioeconomic, cultural and ethnic differences to meet learning needs	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	12%	6	35%	9	53%	17
	(O) Exhibits fairness and belief that all students can learn	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	18%	14	82%	17
Standard #3: Learning	(O) Creates a safe and respectful environment for learners	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	12%	5	29%	10	59%	17

Environments.	(O) Structures a classroom environment that promotes student engagement	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	18%	3	18%	11	65%	17
	(O) Clearly communicates expectations for appropriate student behavior	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	29%	6	35%	6	35%	17
	(O) Responds appropriately to student behavior	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	11	65%	5	29%	17
	(O) Guides learners in using technologies in appropriate, safe, and effective ways	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	12%	7	41%	8	47%	17
Standard #4: Content Knowledge.	(O) Effectively teaches subject matter	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	4	24%	9	53%	3	18%	17
	(O) Guides mastery of content through meaningful learning experiences	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	11	65%	5	29%	17
	(O) Integrates culturally relevant content to build on learners' background knowledge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	12%	7	41%	8	47%	17
Standard #5: Applications of Content	(O) Connects core content to relevant, real-life experiences and learning tasks	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	12%	9	53%	6	35%	17
	(O) Designs activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	24%	5	29%	8	47%	17

	(C/O) Accesses content resources to build global awareness	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	12%	8	47%	6	35%	17
	(O) Uses relevant content to engage learners in innovative thinking & collaborative problem solving	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	24%	6	35%	7	41%	17
Standard #6: Assessment.	(C/O) Uses multiple methods of assessment	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	12%	5	29%	7	41%	3	18%	17
	(O) Provides students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	47%	6	35%	3	18%	17
	(C/O) Uses appropriate data sources to identify student learning needs	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	35%	7	41%	4	24%	17
	(O) Engages students in self-assessment strategies	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	18%	6	35%	7	41%	1	6%	17
Standard #7: Planning for Instruction.	(O) Connects lesson goals with school curriculum and state standards	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	5	29%	11	65%	17
	(C) Uses assessment data to inform planning for instruction	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	29%	6	35%	6	35%	17
	(C) Adjusts instructional plans to meet students' needs	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	12%	8	47%	7	41%	17
	(C) Collaboratively designs instruction	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	12%	3	18%	12	71%	17
Standard #8: Instruct	(O) Varies instructional strategies to	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	24%	7	41%	6	35%	17

ional Strategi es.	engage learners (O) Uses technology appropriately to enhance instruction	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	18%	6	35%	8	47%	17
	(O) Differentiates instruction for a variety of learning needs	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	29%	6	35%	6	35%	17
	(O) Instructional practices reflect effective communicati on skills	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%	7	41%	8	47%	17
Standar d #9: Professi onal Learnin g and Ethical Practice	(C/O) Uses feedback to improve teaching effectiveness	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	18%	14	82%	17
	(C/O) Uses self-reflection to improve teaching effectiveness	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%	15	88%	17
	(C/O) Upholds legal responsibilitie s as a professional educator	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%	15	88%	17
	(C/O) Demonstrates commitment to the profession	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	18%	14	82%	17
Standar d #10: Leaders hip and Collabo ration.	(C/O) Collaborates with colleagues to improve student performance	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	12%	15	88%	17
	(C/O) Collaborates with parent/guardi an/advocate to improve student performance	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	18%	4	24%	10	59%	17
Totals:		1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	7	1%	90	16%	200	35%	279	48%	578

Data as of 11/18/22 Julie McBrien, LiveText data

N/A	Underdeveloped	Underdeveloped +	Emerging	Emerging +	Proficient	Proficient +	Distinguished
-----	----------------	------------------	----------	------------	------------	--------------	---------------

0% 0% 0% 0% 1% 16% 35% 48%

Analysis: 100% of candidates met or exceeded CAEP/InTasc goals. Minimum expected summative ‘score’ is Emerging +. 100% of our candidates demonstrated performance at or above that standard. 85% of our students demonstrated Proficient + or Distinguished levels of competence. The use of multiple methods of assessment and student self-assessment in general. We will continue to work on ways to better support this understanding.

Master’s Portfolio

Table 6

Master’s Portfolio Candidate Performance 2021-2022

Master's Portfolio: Spring and Summer 2022 Combined								
Rubric Item	Alignment	Not Met	Not Met	Met	Met	Exceeds	Exceeds	n
Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction	SOE Goal # 4	0	0%	6	18%	27	82%	33
Critical Thinking, Problem Solving	SOE Goal # 4	2	6%	4	12%	27	82%	33
Learning Environments - Classroom Management	SOE Goal # 6, InTasc Goal 3	0	0%	6	18%	27	82%	33
Leadership & Collaboration with Parents & Families	SOE Goal # 7, InTasc Goal 10	0	0%	11	33%	22	67%	33
Professional Behaviors	SOE Goal # 8, InTasc Goals 9 & 10	0	0%	5	15%	28	85%	33
Collegiality	SOE Goal # 8, InTasc Goals 9 & 10	0	0%	12	36%	21	64%	33
Communication	SOE Goal # 8, InTasc Goals 9 & 10	0	0%	5	15%	28	85%	33
Technology	SOE Goal # 9	0	0%	12	36%	21	64%	33
Learner Development	SOE Goal #2, InTasc Goal 1.2	0	0%	11	33%	22	67%	33
Diversity and Differentiation	SOE Goal #3, InTasc Goal 2	0	0%	8	24%	25	76%	33
Assessment of Student Learning	SOE Goal #5, InTasc Goal 6	0	0%	9	27%	24	73%	33
Reading, Writing & Oral Language	SOE Goals # 4 & 5	0	0%	11	33%	22	67%	33
Mathematics	SOE Goals # 4 & 5	0	0%	6	18%	27	82%	33
Science	SOE Goals # 4 & 5	0	0%	7	21%	26	79%	33
Social Studies	SOE Goals # 4 & 5	0	0%	8	24%	25	76%	33
Arts Integration	SOE Goals # 4 & 5	0	0%	11	33%	22	67%	33
Philosophy of Education	SOE Goal #1, InTasc Goal 1.1	0	0%	9	28%	23	72%	32
Annotated Bibliography		0	0%	10	30%	23	70%	33
Totals:		2	0%	151	25%	440	74%	593

Data as of 11/18/22 Julie McBrien, LiveText data

Not Met	Met	Exceeds
0%	25%	74%

Analysis: 100% of our Master's students met or exceeded their understanding of and application of educational theory and best practices to their instructional practice. The teachers' professionalism and commitment to the field are evident characteristics of their work.

Summary

Areas in Need of Improvement: Varied means of assessment and the use of self-assessment measures in the classroom are evident areas that we can focus on reinforcing in our course instruction. We will be focusing on this area in our program meetings this spring and fall to encourage instructors to bolster their efforts in helping students understanding and use of these varied means of assessment. It should also be noted that, as students engage in their student teaching, putting all the instruction and assessment pieces together in their work is still largely formative. As they gain more experience in the classroom, their skills with assessment typically get more robust.

Areas of Success: Candidates continue to do well on all program assessments We have been especially concerned with Diversity over the years, and this year's data reveals noticeable improvement, both in practical and in academic areas. We have spent more time on differentiating instruction for ELLs and looking at the broader aspects of multi-modal instruction and two SCI (Sheltered Content Instruction) elements of Building Background and Comprehensible input. These efforts seem to be increasing students' capacity for differentiating instruction for many students, not just ELLs.

We continue to receive positive feedback from outside readers and faculty readers for the Master's Portfolios regarding the high quality of the student framing statements using the revised Master's Portfolio format. The format engages the students in describing their own classrooms and the application of educational theory to their instructional practice.

Future Plans to Improve Student Learning: This coming year we will spend some time as program faculty discussing varied aspects of assessments and see if we can bolster our candidates' skills prior to student teaching. Our instructors re-evaluate their courses every semester and program faculty meetings to discuss our courses and program needs 3-4 times/year. We will continue concerted efforts to encourage effective differentiation in the design of instruction.

We have adopted a letter that is to be sent to school site administrators to advocate for our student teachers who are hired in full-time teaching jobs under proof-of-program-enrollment or emergency certificates (Link: [Request for Student Teacher non-instructional time](#)). The purpose of which is to create an understanding of the demands put on our candidates in this situation as well as to make space for them to conduct the necessary university work and receive effective mentoring as they engage in their student teaching. Our placement coordinator is designing a placement approval form for teachers in this situation that should also bring attention to the time requirements of their internships. Adjustments in assignments for individual circumstances are made, as needed.

We are planning on creating a host teacher mentoring certificate based on a pre-recorded training that will be provided to all host teachers to take advantage of (and to support their mentoring skills).

CAEP / InTasc Standards

This program report is based on the CAEP and InTASC standards. We continue to make efforts to successfully address CAEP's rigor for program assessments and data analysis. All program rubrics and assessments have

been aligned with the InTASC and CAEP K-6 standards. We address the TESOL Standards with a strategic focus on English Language learners through three of our content courses and the student teaching seminar. We have added targeted focus in the student teaching seminar on the SCI elements of Building Background and Comprehensible Input. Evidence of the success of this is seen in the student teaching internships and in the design of student teacher Units of instruction as well as more articulated thinking in the classroom regarding effective instruction of ELLs.

As initial programs, we also met to review the Spring 2022 Host Teacher Survey and discuss the responses from the student teachers to determine what actions we might take in our respective programs to support the host teachers as well as the student teachers.

Attachments

Gate 1

Gate 3

GATE 1



Name:

UA ID #:

GATE 1

K-8 Certificate/MAT Elementary

Semester applied for:	EVIDENCE				Date Received		
	Graduate Application: MAT / Certificate						
	Release of Information Form						
	Student Information Sheet						
	Resume						
Prerequisites for Admission	ED 230	Grade:	Term:		Met	Not Met	Overall Met, Provisional, Not Met
	ED 333	Grade:	Term:				
	ED 320A, C, or D	Grade:	Term:				
	ED 320B	Grade:	Term:				
	ED 320E	Grade:	Term:				
	EDSE 482	Grade:	Term:				
Evaluation of K-8 Certificate and MAT Elementary Education							
Knowledge of Content	Official Bachelor's Transcript						
	GPA (minimum 3.0)						
	Content Review of Transcripts						
	Passing Praxis I or Praxis CASE scores	Reading	Writing	Math			
	Impromptu Writing Sample						
Dispositions	Statement of Professional Objectives						
	Early Classroom Experience						
	Letter of Recommendation (#1)						
	Letter of Recommendation (#2)						

<input type="checkbox"/>	Signature of Advisor	Date
--------------------------	----------------------	------

<input type="checkbox"/>	Admit w/Dept. Provisions (Financial Aid available)	Signature of Advisor	<u>Due</u>	Date	<u>Met</u>
	1.				
	2.				
	3.				

<input type="checkbox"/>	Deny Admission (see Dean's letter)
--------------------------	---------------------------------------

Signature of Advisor

Date

Signature of Dean

Date

***Gate 1 Elementary Education K-8 Certificate & MAT
(10/21, EG***



Gate 3

MAT Elem Course Completion Checklist

NAME: _____ UA ID#: _____
 Address: _____ Phone: _____
 Email: _____

<u>Preparatory Coursework (12)</u>			<u>UAS</u>	<u>Transfer</u>	<u>Credit</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Term</u>
ED S230*	Intro to Educational Technology	all			3		
ED S333*	The Learner & the Learning Process	all			3		
ED S320A, C or D Art or Drama K-8 Curriculum							
ED S320A	Art or Drama K-8 Curriculum	all			1		
ED S320B	PE in K-8 Curriculum	all			1		
ED S320E	Health in K-8 Curriculum	FSp			1		
EDSE S482	The Inclusive Classroom	all			3		
Program Coursework (33)							
ALST 603	Children's Lit in Alaska Context	Su			3		
ECE S661	Literacy & Young Children	FSp			3		
ED S615	Literacy in Int. & Mid. Sch. Grades	FSp			3		
ED S616	Math Methods in K-8 Classroom	FSp			3		
ED S617	Science in K-8 Classroom	FSp			3		
ED S618	Social Studies in K-8 Classroom	FSp			3		
ED S619	Classroom Management & Discipline	FSp			3		
ED 620	Curriculum Development	Fa Sp			1		
ED S680	Advanced Multicultural Education	SuF			3		
ED S688	Student Teaching	FSp			6		
Remaining coursework MAT degree (6)							
ED S626	Classroom Research	FSp			3		
ED S698	Master's Portfolio	all			3		

Advisor's Signature		Date	
---------------------	--	------	--

3/1/23 11:17 PM