Graduate Elementary Programs Annual Program Report 2023-24
Prepared by J. Kevin Spink, Program Coordinator
February 2025

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 within the MAT program.

These programs have been delivered by distance throughout Alaska since 2000. The programs share undergraduate foundational 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. Earning the master's degree occurs when candidates complete the final two graduate capstone courses, Classroom Action Research (ED 626) and the Master's Portfolio Course (ED 698).

A complete description of the program is found in our Graduate Programs Candidate handbook: https://catalog.uas.alaska.edu/certificate-degree-programs/graduate-studies/elementary-ed-mat/

PROGRAM LEARNING OBJECTIVES

The Academic Year 2023-24 Report provides assessment results for Program Learning Objectives 1-5, which are also referred to as InTASC standards 1-5.

Table 1

Program Learning Objectives 1-5

1. The teacher demonstrates their understanding of how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. (inTASC/PLO 1)
2. The teacher demonstrates their ability to use their knowledge of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards. (inTASC/PLO 2)
3. The teacher demonstrates their ability to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. (InTASC/PLO 3)
4. The teacher demonstrates their understanding and application of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content. (InTASC/PLO 4)
5. The teacher demonstrates their ability to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues. (InTASC/PLO 5)

DATA COLLECTION

Student and program success on PLOs 1-5 are represented by the summative data from the following program assessments — all of which are assessed using rubrics —during their Student Teaching semester, as the teacher candidates:

- Complete the Renaissance Teacher Work Sample (TWS) – which demonstrates their ability to design a standards informed single subject instructional sequence of lessons based on formative and summative assessment data, followed by analysis of and reflection upon student growth. The TWS is scored using a 1 – 3 scaled rubric with: 1 = Not Met, 2 = Met, 3 = Exceeds. (InTASC 1-10).

- Plan and teach a self-designed Interdisciplinary unit of instruction based on a backwards design (UbD) approach. It too is scored on a rubric with a scale from 1 to 3: 1 = Not Met, 2 = Met, 3 = Exceeded (InTASC 1-8)

- Are assessed by their university supervisors using the STOT (Student Teacher Observation Tool / rubric) designed to provide a comprehensive overview of the student teacher's classroom practice over time. (InTASC 1-9)

- Self-Evaluate their content knowledge and practice using the Evaluation of Content Practice and Content (ECPC) (InTASC 4 and 5)

- Complete a Masters Portfolio (InTASC 1-10)

Alignment of the CAEP, InTASC, TESOL standards, School of Education Goals, and 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](#)

These student teacher assessments are reviewed and scored by the University Supervisor assigned to each student teacher. The first time the assessments are administered as "formative," for goal setting purposes. The second time the assessments are administered as "summative," to show evidence of growth and proficiency. These assessments and related rubrics are housed in LiveText.

School based Mentor 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 evaluations are also administered as formative (goal setting) and summative assessments.

Elementary MAT students complete the K-8 MAT degree at some point after their internship. They conduct a classroom action research project (ED 626) and prepare a "Master's Portfolio" (ED 698) that has been evaluated by a three-person committee consisting of 2 faculty and one outside educator. The assessment is also housed in LiveText.

For the purposes of this report, representative data from TWS, Integrated Lesson Sequence, STOT, Integrated Unit, ECPC, and the Masters Portfolio are included in this report. More specific program evaluation data can be also retrieved from LiveText, as necessary.

TWS

Minimum Expectations: The minimum performance expectation is a "2" where 2 equals "meets expectations". To proceed, candidates are expected to receive no scores at level "1" and 50% of measures should be at level 3 "exceeds".

Table 2

TWS MAT ELED AY 23-24 (InTASC Standards 1-5)

N=10						

Key: 1 = Not met; 2 = Partially met; 3 = Indicator met; Target score = 3						
Rubric	Indicators	*M*	1	2	3	% me t
Learning Goals (InTASC 4)	Significance, Challenge and Variety	2.91	0	1	9	90%
	Clarity	2.83	0	2	8	80%
	Appropriateness for Students	3.03	0	0	10	100%
	Alignment with National, State or Local Standards	3.04	0	0	10	100%
Contextual Factors (InTASC 1)	Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors	3.09	0	0	10	100%
	Knowledge of Characteristics of Students	3.09	0	1	9	90%
	Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning	3.09	0	0	10	100%
	Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning	3.00	0	0	10	100%%
	Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment	2.97	0	1	9	90%
Design for Instruction (InTASC 1-5)	Alignment with Learning Goals	3.03	0	0	10	100%
	Accurate Representation of Content	3.08	0	1	9	90
	Lesson and Unit Structure	3.06		0	10	100%
	Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments, Resources	3.01	0	0	10	100%
	Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources	2.96	0	1	9	90%

	Use of Technology	2.82	0	2	8	80%
Instructional Decision Making (InTASC 1,2,5)	Sound Professional Practice	3.07	0	0	10	100%

Integrated Unit
Candidates design and implement an original interdisciplinary unit of instruction. Minimum performance expectations: Candidates are expected to receive no scores at level "1" and 70% of the items on the rubric should attain a level 2 or above.

Table 3

Integrated Unit MAT Elem. AY23-24 (InTASC 1-5)

N=10 Key: **1** – Did Not Meet, 2 – Partially Met, 3 – Indicator Met						
Rubric Categories	Indicators	M	1	2	3	% PM/IM
Development, Learning, and Motivation (InTASC 1 & 3)	Student Development	2.90	0	1	9	100%
	Student Learning	3.00	0	0	10	100%
	Student Motivation	2.90	0	1	9	100%
Integrating and Applying Knowledge for Instruction (InTASC 4 &5)	Context/Overview	2.90	0	2		100%
	Understanding of Backwards Design	2.70	0	3	7	100%
	Knowledge of Students	2.70	0	3	7	100%
	Learning Theory	2.50	0	5	5	100%
	Connections Across the Curriculum	2.60	0	4	6	100%
	Resources	2.90	0	1	9	100%
Adaptation to Diverse Students (InTASC 2)	Differentiation	2.40	0	4	6	100%
	Varied Instructional Approaches	2.90	0	1	9	100%
	Reflection on Cultural Capital	2.70	0	3	7	90%
Development of Critical Thinking and Problem Solving (InTASC 5)	Critical Thinking, Problem Solving	2.40	0	4	6	100%
	Design for Understanding	2.90	0	1	9	100%

STOT
Conducted through observation(s) by the university supervisor. Minimum performance expectations: Candidates in practicums prior to or during student teaching are expected to receive no more than three scores of "1" on the formative assessment and 50% of measures should be at level 3 or above. Candidates in a student teaching placement are expected to receive no scores at level "1" on the summative assessment and 90% of

measures should be at level 3 or above.

Table 4

STOT Data MAT ELED AY23-24 (InTASC Standards 1 – 5 reported)

N= 10 **Key**: 1 = Undeveloped; 1.5 = Underdeveloped+; 2 = Emerging; 2.5 = Emerging+; 3 = Proficient; 3.5 = Proficient+; 4 = Distinguished Target score = 3.0										
Rubric Category	Rubric Element	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.5	1.0	NA	% 2.5 +
Standard #1: Learner Development.	(O) Supports student learning through developmentally appropriate instruction. AK-UAS-SGP.2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%
	(O) Accounts for differences in students' prior knowledge. AK-UAS-SGP.3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%
Standard #2: Learning Differences.	(O) Uses knowledge of students' socioeconomic, cultural and ethnic differences to meet learning needs	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	100%
	(O) Exhibits fairness and belief that all students can learn	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	100%
Standard #3: Learning Environments.	(O) Creates a safe and respectful environment for learners. AK-UAS-SGP.6	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	100%
	(O) Structures a classroom environment that promotes student engagement. AK-UAS-SGP.6	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	100%
	(O) Clearly communicates expectations for appropriate student behavior. AK-UAS-SGP.6	5	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	90%
	(O) Responds appropriately to student behavior. AK-UAS-SGP.6	5	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	90%
	(O) Guides learners in using technologies in appropriate, safe, and effective ways. AK-UAS-SGP.9	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	100%
Standard #4: Content Knowledge.	(O) Effectively teaches subject matter. AK-UAS-SGP.4	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%
	(O) Guides mastery of content through meaningful learning experiences. AK-UAS-SGP.4	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%
	(O) Integrates culturally relevant content to build on learners' background knowledge. AK-UAS-SGP.4,AK-UAS-SGP.3	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	100%
Standard #5: Applications of Content.	(O) Connects core content to relevant, real-life experiences and learning tasks. AK-UAS-SGP.5	1	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	100%
	(O) Designs activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives. AK-UAS-SGP.5	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	100%
	(C/O) Accesses content resources to build global awareness. AK-UAS-SGP.3,AK-UAS-SGP.5	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	100%
	(O) Uses relevant content to engage learners in innovative thinking & collaborative problem solving.	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%

Table 5

ECPC- Evaluation of Classroom Practice and Content. (InTASC 4 and 5)

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. Expected Performance: minimum score of 14 or better at meets or exceeds. Self-assessment in collaboration with host teacher does not incur any penalties. Goal setting action plan set up in formative EC

ECPC AY23-24- summative

N=10						
Rubric	*M*	N/A	1 Does not meet	2 Meets	3 Exceeds	% meet/ exceeds
English Language Arts	2.50	0	0	5	5	100%
Science	2.40	0	0	6	4	100%
Mathematics	2.30	0	0	7	3	100%
Social Studies	2.60	0	0	4	6	100%
The Arts	2.70	0	0	3	7	100%
Health Education	2.30	0	0	7	3	100%
Differentiation/UDL	2.60	0	0	4	6	100%
Key: 1 = Not Met; 2 = Met; 3 = Exceeds						
Generated 2/14/25Source: LiveText						

Masters Portfolio - K-8 MAT
Earning the Master's degree requires that students complete the Master's Portfolio. This table represents those students who completed all the requirements for the elementary MAT including the final capstone Masters Portfolio in AY 23-24. As the final course requirement for the K-8 MAT, the Masters Portfolio assesses students' knowledge of educational best practices and theory and their real-time application of these practices

and theories to their current teaching practice.

Table 6

K-8 Masters in Teaching Graduates

Summer 20223	Fall 2023	Spring 2024	Total AY 23-24
4	4	3	11

ECPC AY24- summative

N=11						
Rubric	*M*	N/A	1 Does not meet	2 Meets	3 Exceeds	% meet/ exceeds
English Language Arts	2.83	0	0	3	8	100%
Science	2.57	0	0	5	6	100%
Mathematics	2.64	0	0	4	7	100%
Social Studies	2.57	0	0	5	6	100%
The Arts	2.83	0	0	3	8	100%
Health Education	2.35	0	0	8	3	100%
Differentiation/UDL	2.64	0	0	4	7	100%
Key: 1 = Not Met; 2 = Met; 3 = Exceeds						
Generated 2/14/25 Source: LiveText						

ANALYSIS AND PLANS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

TWS: Candidates performed very successfully in the Teacher Work Sample with a slight improvement in overall scores from the AY 22-23 data cycle. 100% partially met or met the standards. The 70% minimum performance was introduced in the preceding year. Also beginning last spring, we have posted minimum performance expectations for the TWS rubric scores.

A few areas continue to warrant greater attention. One is the evidence that students can address Students' Skills and Prior Learning in their TWS unit. One reason that this recurs is that many of the student teachers are still learning who their students are, sometimes in large classes, and with rare exceptions, this is their first introduction to them. We reinforce the importance of this through the focus on the contextual factors. An area of improvement from the previous cycle is that of essential elements of lesson and unit design. We have adjusted our seminar conversations to help students think beyond the TWS prompt which is broad and non-specific. Variety of activities, etc. are often problematic in designing the TWS lesson sequence which is quantitative as well as qualitative – and the expectation for the TWS project has a very narrow focus by nature, which, along with very structured school district expectations, may preclude sufficient variety in activities, etc.

STOT – Summative. In the STOT observation process, the student teachers performed effectively as practicing teachers. Emerging plus (2.5) is the minimum expectation for this summative assessment because this is really the formative process in taking on full teaching responsibilities. The area in which candidates have traditionally experienced challenges is classroom management. Creating an engaging and consistent environment with rules and routines and finding cognitive flexibility in managing unexpected behaviors is a huge task and the common maxim is "student teaching is classroom management 101". That said, only a small minority of our teacher candidates experienced significant challenges in managing their students' behaviors. 80-87% of the teacher candidates scored at proficient or better, reflecting their growth in achieving reasonable success in taking feedback and practicing strategies from both mentor teacher and supervisor in the real-time classroom. Our student teacher exit survey also reveals that the many practicum methods courses taken prior to student teaching has provided our student teachers with a valuable teaching and classroom management base. Most were engaged in collaboration with other support professionals in the schools, as well, learning how to work as a building team. In the most recent data cycle, we have included a segment on 'just in time' learning during the student teaching seminar to have conversations specifically about issues in classroom engagement and management.

Interdisciplinary Unit of Instruction. All student teachers met or exceeded the expected quality of the standards/PLOs 1-5 in the design and implementation of their Interdisciplinary units. Critical thinking continues to get relatively lower scores. It seems that the students are so focused on designing the content of the unit and teaching it that critical thinking, as an intentional element of design, is secondary in their thinking and planning process. This is regularly emphasized in their practicum course work. It will be a target of conversation in the upcoming student teaching seminars. We have now also posted minimum performance expectations for the Unit starting in the spring of 2023. Initial programs, led by the assessment committee undertook a major revision of the integrated unit assessment rubric, and the "new and improved" rubric will be used beginning in the spring semester of 2025.

ECPC. The areas candidates showed the least amount of confidence and skill were in Social Studies, and Science Education. The primary reason for the first two are, we believe, the result of a disproportionate emphasis on ELA and the fact that science and social studies get very limited time in public school classrooms. Since we don't have narrative feedback, we are unsure why these are more commonly perceived as weaknesses. We have been able to hire excellent content adjunct instructors who are true "professors of practice," and who receive high student evaluation ratings and positive comments. We are exploring options for more fully integrating our literacy and our content methods instruction and there-by providing our students with a model for strengthening their own content instructional practices in the K-8 classroom.

Masters Portfolio. The Master's portfolio covers the 10 InTASC standards. The Portfolio submissions are scored on a 1 – 3 rubric: 1 = not met, 2 = met, and 3 = exceeds. All students completing their degree have met and/or exceeded the standards represented by the 5 PLOs in their Masters Portfolio submissions.

Areas of Success: Candidates continue to do well on all program assessments and on the 5 identified PLOs. We have received consistently positive performance feedback from surveys and on these assessments regarding candidates' and graduates' skill in responding to multilingual students and in multicultural classroom settings.

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, including the 5 target PLOs. Readers regularly comment about the professionalism and range of the graduates' considerations of and reflections on the standards in their framing statements.

Our recently completed CAEP accreditation review process, which included an in-depth EPP self-study research project involving three years of interviews with and observations of our former students as they engage as practicing teachers, resulted in very favorable feedback from our graduates and a determination that our initial licensure programs currently rate high with zero identified "areas for improvement."

To conclude, I will quote an educator in Delta Junction who has just completed her PhD at UAF. *"I have heard so much about [your GC/MAT program]! [Your program] is "legendary" to teachers that have graduated from U.A.S. and have come to work in our schools [NSBSD]--in a positive way. I've never heard a bad thing and that's something!"*

CAEP / InTASC Standards

This program report is based on the InTASC standards/PLOs 1-5. 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.