

MAT Elementary K-8, campus, University of Alaska Southeast
2006-07 Annual Report on Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
 Dr. Mary-Claire Tarlow, Assessment Coordinator
 December, 2007

Mission Statement

The Master of Arts in Teaching, Elementary K-8 intensive, at UAS prepares candidates with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be informed, reflective and responsive teachers within diverse classroom, school, and community contexts.. Candidates are prepared through an intensive internship as well as interactive learning experiences on campus, emphasizing the constructivist approach that learning should be purposeful and active.

Specifically, the MAT Elementary K-8 intensive at UAS is intended to

- Connect recent theory/research with best practices, emphasizing a constructivist, integrated approach.
- Prepare teachers who can design equitable learning for students of diverse settings and backgrounds.

Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Methods

Learning Outcomes:	Assessment Method(s): Describe how student outcomes are assessed per plan
Content Knowledge	Praxis I and Praxis II Ratings by Methods Teachers Intern Evaluation Form Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form
Instruction, Curriculum, Management Knowledge	Praxis II Integrated Unit Plan Intern Evaluation Form Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form Portfolio
• Philosophy	
• Development	
• Diversity	
• Content Areas	
• Classroom Environment	
• Technology	
• Family/Community	
Professional behavior	Dispositions form Intern Evaluation Form Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form
Application of Knowledge & Skills	Intern Evaluation Form Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form Work Sample: Final Integrated Unit with Reflections Portfolio

Data Collection and Analysis

- Candidate Population: Quantity, Gender, Ethnicity, and Retention data

	No. of Stdnts Started	No. of Stdnts Graduated	% Male	% Female	% White	% AK Indgns	% Am Indian	% Hispnc	% Black	% Asian/PI	% Unkn
00-01	15	12	38	62	85	8	0	0	0	0	8
01-02	14	13	38	62	85	8	0	0	0	0	8
02-03	17	17	28	72	100		0	0	0	0	0
03-04	14	11	20	80	80	20	0	0	0	0	0
04-05	15	16	22	78	78	17	0	6	0	0	0
05-06	12	11	50	50	80	0	0	0	0	0	10
06-07	14	12	33	67	75	0	0	8	0	8	8
Summary		92	30	70	86	6	0	1	0	1	4

- **Intern Evaluation Assessment**

Mean scores on scale of 6, where informants are told that our expectations are for a “3” or “4”. Scores “5” and “6” are considered at the level of an experienced teacher.

Goal #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
04-05	3.8	3.7	3.9	4.1	3.7	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1
05-06	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.6
06-07	3.8	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.6	4.1	3.9

- **Portfolio Assessment**

on a scale of 6, where 2=developing, 4=acceptable, and 6=optimum

Goal #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
02-03	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
03-04	3.6	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	4.1
04-05	3.5	3.7	4.1	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.2	3.9
05-06	5.4	5.2	4.8	4.7	3.7	4.6	5.1	4.8	5.1
06-07	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.0
Mean Overall	4.1	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.1

- **2006-2007 Candidate Evaluation of Program Operations (End of year Survey to Candidates)**

(on scale from 1 to 5 with 5=very effective)

													Mean Rating	Median Rating
Advising	*	4	3	5	5	4	4	*	4	4	3	4	4.0	4
Internship Experience	2	3	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	4.3	4
Mentor Teacher	2	4	3	3	5+	5	5	3.5	5	4	5	4	4.0	4
Intern Advisor	5	4	5	4	5+	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4.7	5
Portfolio process	4	5	2	2	4	3	4	4	3	2.5	4	3	3.3	3.5
Quality of faculty	4	4	4	3	5	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3.8	4
Quality of program (overall)	4	4	3.5	4	5	4	4	4	4	3.5	4	3	3.9	4
Content preparation	4	4	3	5	5	3	3.5	3.5	4	3.5	3	2	3.6	3.5
Technology preparation	5	5	4	5	5	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	4.3	4
Diversity/special education preparation	5	5	4	4	3	4	3.5	4	3	3.5	3	3	3.8	3.75
Assessment preparation	3	5	3	5	5	5	4.5	3	3	3	2	3	3.7	3

*=not marked

Key Findings (2006-07):

- Student Population: Numbers are not sufficient to fund the program. Increased marketing, and a marketing plan are needed. Marketing needs to be done throughout Alaska and in the Pacific Northwest, stressing the uniqueness of the program and the Alaskan setting. An additional cohort in Sitka may also improve numbers.
- Assessment data systems: Praxis scores need to be aggregated for assessment use. A system to aggregate data for the Elementary standards also needs to be developed.
- Increased emphasis on instructional Assessment: Assessment preparation improved in 2006-2007 and is in the adequate range. However, additional work in integrating assessment in all methods courses should continue to bring the scores up to the high levels of other aspects of the program.

- The Elementary K-8 Intensive (campus) program is a high-quality program: Scores and employment indicate that the program provides high satisfaction among its students and is highly regarded by employers.

Program Changes Based on Assessment Results


- Increase marketing around Alaska and in the Pacific Northwest. Work with the UAS admission and recruitment office to develop advertising coverage. Develop a marketing plan with timeline that will engage all personnel involved and produce wide coverage. We must create more awareness of the program.
- Develop a cohort in Sitka. This will build numbers and engage one of our regional campus sites that has been wishing to be included for many years.
- Aggregate data from Praxis scores, Integrated Unit Rubric, and Dispositions Form for yearly perusal. This is still problematic, because there is no system being used to capture ACEI standards, and any aggregation of data must be done by hand
- Continue to work with faculty to better integrate content, increase preparation in assessment and reduce student workload whenever possible.
-

Assessment Plan Changes Based on Assessment Results

The assessment plan was changed at the beginning of 2007-2008 because of changes in the ACEI/NCATE requirements for reporting. Fewer measures are being used, which will streamline effective measurement and aggregation of data. The measures chosen are:

- Licensure assessments (PRAXIS I and II)
- Ratings by Methods Teachers (Content-based assessment)
- Integrated Unit Plan (Candidate ability to plan instruction)
- Intern Evaluation Form & Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form (Student teaching)
- Work Sample (Candidate effect on student learning)
- Portfolio (Additional assessment)
- Dispositions Form (Additional assessment)

A system for aggregation of data for Elementary Standards is currently not available. Data is collected with the hope that a system may be developed in the future.



UAS School of Education
MAT Elementary K-8 (Campus)
Yearly Program Report for 2006-2007

HISTORY

The MAT Elementary K-8 program was developed as an outcomes-based program in 1997-98, with the initial year being 1998-99. The program is in partnership with the Juneau School District. It was designed by faculty and the Juneau educational community to be an intensive 12-month cohort program with an extensive internship in the Juneau School District. It is a 40-credit program based on the pedagogical concept of immersion and experiential learning.

DEVELOPMENT

Over the years courses have been reorganized for greater clarity, ability to find excellent instructors, and greater learning for candidates. Recent changes are continuing to be made so that courses can be better coordinated through UAS Online, and grades can be coordinated between faculty. The program has successfully converted all course segments into workable courses with only one course carrying over between Fall and Spring semesters. Work is continuing to work with instructors who share courses to use UAS Online effectively.

This coming summer, the arts course ED 641, is planned be spread over two weeks and given concurrently, so that students can conceptualize the content and absorb the content more readily.

Continuous progress has been made in communication between instructors and connections and integration made between course segments. In the fall we succeeded in requiring one assignment that entails a technology tool in each course. This allows the technology course to be purposeful and more connected. It also allows the assignments to be more creative.

ASSESSMENT PLAN

Learning Outcomes:	Assessment Method(s): Describe how student outcomes are assessed per plan
Content Knowledge	Praxis I and Praxis II Ratings by Methods Teachers Intern Evaluation Form Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form
Instruction, Curriculum, Management Knowledge	Praxis II Integrated Unit Plan Intern Evaluation Form Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form Portfolio
• Philosophy	
• Development	
• Diversity	
• Content Areas	
• Classroom Environment	
• Technology	
• Family/Community	
Professional behavior	Dispositions form Intern Evaluation Form Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form
Application of Knowledge & Skills	Intern Evaluation Form Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form Work Sample: Final Integrated Unit with Reflections Portfolio

The assessment plan has been altered due to changes in the ACEI/NCATE guidelines about assessments. Fewer assessments are to be used, as reflected above. The gate sheets are being adjusted and procedures are being refined.

Aggregation of data for this program is limited to the NCATE standards, as the data collection system for the Elementary ACEI standards has not been developed. At this time, therefore, there is no way to aggregate the data from the Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS FOR THE YEAR 2006-2007

Male/Female/Ethnicity Distribution by Year

	No. of Stdnts Started	No. of Stdnts Graduated	% Male	% Female	% White	% AK Indgns	% Am Indian	% Hispnc	% Black	% Asian/PI	% Unkn
00-01	15	12	38	62	85	8	0	0	0	0	8
01-02	14	13	38	62	85	8	0	0	0	0	8
02-03	17	17	28	72	100		0	0	0	0	0
03-04	14	11	20	80	80	20	0	0	0	0	0
04-05	15	16	22	78	78	17	0	6	0	0	0
05-06	12	11	50	50	80	0	0	0	0	0	10

06-07	14	12	33	67	75	0	0	8	0	8	8
Summary		92	30	70	86	6	0	1	0	1	4

Numbers: The numbers of graduates of the program over the last nine years has averaged 13 students. While this is above the minimum of 10 that makes the program viable, it is considerably lower than the 20-graduate target. Retention is substantial. More applicants are needed so that there is a substantial number of students beginning the program.

Gender: Men have had a consistent presence in the program, ranging from 20 percent to 50 percent. For elementary level, this is commendable. It is evident that the program is sufficiently attractive to males as well as females.

Ethnicity: Diversity of the cohorts has been generally 15% of each cohort. While this is not high, it has been fairly consistent. PITAS support has helped to attract more Alaska Native students, which should be the target minority in Juneau. The program has a good reputation within the local Native community. If marketing can be increased within Alaska, there is a potential for more Natives from throughout the state.

Praxis Scores:

Since we are going to use the Praxis tests as one of our assessments for content, I have asked my administrative assistant to collect the score information so it can be view historically. This will be included in next year's report.

Intern Evaluation Assessment (final)

Mean scores on scale of 6, where informants are told that our expectations are for a "3" or "4". Scores "5" and "6" are considered at the level of an experienced teacher.

Goal #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
04-05	3.8	3.7	3.9	4.1	3.7	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1
05-06	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.6
06-07	3.8	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.6	4.1	3.9

While there does not appear to be much "improvement" in the Intern Evaluation Assessment scores, there is not much difference in the scores either. Some discrepancy from year to year will be expected, since the individuals involved in these scores are different every year, and their tendencies to score high or low will likely vary. Given the guidelines for scoring (see above) the data shows consistently high quality in our candidate's performance in all nine standards. The lowest average score for any of the goals is 3.4, which is a

satisfactory level for an average! No one goal in particular seems to be weak at this time.

Portfolio Scores by Academic Year on a scale of 6. where 2=developing, 4=acceptable, and 6=optimum

Goal #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
02-03	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
03-04	3.6	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	4.1
04-05	3.5	3.7	4.1	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.2	3.9
05-06	5.4	5.2	4.8	4.7	3.7	4.6	5.1	4.8	5.1
06-07	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.0
Mean Overall	4.1	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.1

Portfolio scores for 2006-2007 were somewhat lower than for 05-06, but higher than the average, except in technology. That is interesting, given that this last year was the first year the entire portfolio was electronic! While these are satisfactory scores, they are not much above the acceptable level. Some thought may need to be given to either the way these portfolios are scored, or the way they are prepared.

2006-2007 Candidate Evaluation of Program Operations (End of year Survey to Candidates) (on scale from 1 to 5 with 5=very effective)

													Mean Rating	Median Rating
Advising	*	4	3	5	5	4	4	*	4	4	3	4	4.0	4
Internship Experience	2	3	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	4.3	4
Mentor Teacher	2	4	3	3	5+	5	5	3.5	5	4	5	4	4.0	4
Intern Advisor	5	4	5	4	5+	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4.7	5
Portfolio process	4	5	2	2	4	3	4	4	3	2.5	4	3	3.3	3.5
Quality of faculty	4	4	4	3	5	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3.8	4
Quality of program (overall)	4	4	3.5	4	5	4	4	4	4	3.5	4	3	3.9	4
Content preparation	4	4	3	5	5	3	3.5	3.5	4	3.5	3	2	3.6	3.5
Technology preparation	5	5	4	5	5	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	4.3	4
Diversity/special education preparation	5	5	4	4	3	4	3.5	4	3	3.5	3	3	3.8	3.75
Assessment preparation	3	5	3	5	5	5	4.5	3	3	3	2	3	3.7	3

*=not marked

The perception of students is very important data. While in some ways the candidates do not have an accurate view of how adequately they have been prepared until they have been working, the general satisfaction is important. While there were a few twos given, the only item in which more than one two was given was the portfolio process. This was the first year we attempted an

electronic portfolio, and so guidance may not have been as substantial as it might have been. However, even so, the mean score across all students for the portfolio process was 3.3, which is noticeably in the acceptable range.

Preparation for assessment was not rated substantially lower than others, indicating that this year the attention to assessment helped meet last year's goal. Continual work will be done to ensure that preparation in assessment is considered as highly as other aspects of the program.

The mean and median scores are consistently at a very high-average to excellent range, a substantially high satisfaction score. Students are satisfied with the program in all areas of the Conceptual Framework goals. Given the resources available in terms of personnel, time and other factors, this is extremely complimentary to the program. To be especially noted for especially high ratings are the internship and the intern advisors, and technology.

Comments from this survey were also revealing.

INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCE:

"...good experience. It was good to be able to see the full school year."

"At times I felt the parameters for the contrast experience were unclear."

"The biggest learning experience for me."

"Great experience."

"Learned a lot—applied learning to experience."

MENTOR TEACHER:

"Was out of touch with skill set of a beginning teacher; unrealistic expectations...

However, I could tell she cared about my success."

"Two mentor teachers gave me two different perspectives—one very positive and one somewhat negative. Juggling the two to arrive at my own was an interesting challenge and added learning experience."

"She did a good job, although there were times when I felt she would not work with my schedule."

"...very responsive and always available to me. There were a lot of miscommunications, probably arising from lack of understanding between my mentor teacher and program expectations, such as what my role was supposed to be in the classroom."

"Excellent role model; reflective, willing and eager to learn; willing to step back when I was teaching. Treated me with respect and like a colleague."

"She went out of her way to help me..."

"Excellent teacher. She taught me a lot and provided quality feedback."

"My host teacher and I were a perfect match."

"Great experience. It was a good match and I learned a lot."

INTERNSHIP ADVISOR:

"Excellent"

"Time to truly talk often seemed limited, but feedback was often useful"

"Great link between host teachers/UAS, etc."

"She was wonderful but I did not see her enough. Also she had a close relationship with my mentor teacher, which made me feel uncomfortable disclosing difficulties. I needed more of an advocate."

"Very supportive, open minded, non-judgmental, knowledgeable, caring person."

"She was amazing. A wealth of helpful advice."

"Her feedback was invaluable. It really made my year and filled in the gaps where my mentor teacher's feedback lacked."

“Very supportive but did not try to micro-manage. Provided quality feedback.”
“Effective, supportive and responsive to my needs.”
“Very supportive and willing to help.” (2)

PORTFOLIO PROCESS:

“In general it was fun to see all my work together. Would be helpful to have instruction on the four knowledge statements due at the time of portfolio.

“Very glad we wrote products for the portfolio throughout the year rather than all at one time.”

“I feel that there wasn’t enough time to make it quality work with everything that was going on.”

“I really wish we had done paper portfolios so we could walk away with a hand copy. Also, much of the information regarding the process came so early on, that I felt lost.”

“Often unclear. Big picture revealed too late. Reflections should be more spread out. Need time.”

“The portfolio seems to be a valuable tool. It should be accessible from “outside” UAS, though.”

“I appreciated doing the portfolio throughout the year, though I was frustrated because on a few of my knowledge statements I got ‘optimum’ without any negative feedback, but then in the portfolio process I only got a ‘good’ on them.”

“I think the electronic portfolio is the way forward. User-friendly and saves so much paper.”

“More examples early on with a complete outline of expectations would have made the process more manageable.”

“I think clarity of instructions will improve over time.”

“Was not fun, but I liked the electronic version.”

QUALITY OF FACULTY

“I learned more from some than from others. Everyone made it clear that they felt rushed, trying to cover so much in a few weeks time.”

“Overall, they are all knowledgeable in their areas and helpful.”

“There was a wide range in quality overall. The master teachers were more in tuned to the needs of students/program than the university professors.”

“Most faculty members showed sincere care.”

“Some teachers were amazing, some were okay and some were awful. All were nice. I preferred master teachers because they provided real world, concrete instruction. I also thought both literacy classes were top notch as well.

“All classes but one was helpful.”

“It would have been more beneficial to have a greater variety of instructors to experience more teaching styles.”

“Some were great. Some did not ‘teach what they preach.’”

QUALITY OF PROGRAM

“I have learned a lot, but certainly do not feel like an expert. I expect to have to look over the year’s materials and notes to process information that was rushed the first time.”

“Program was great; however, it felt like it was too rushed at times.”

“Challenging and rewarding.”

“Like everyone, there were parts of the program that I am critical of, but overall I felt it was effective.”

“One year is not enough time—but given the reality I think it’s a good program.”

“Good program but there seemed to be a lot of busy work that was not beneficial.”

“Difficult to fit it all in in just a year.”

CONTENT PREPARATION

"Math was thin on actual authentic instructional practices."

"Not so much on building knowledge of actual content, but rather how to teach it."

"For the amount of time given, I believe it was okay."

"I think it was hard having the summer literature class. It came so early that a lot of the valuable content was lost on me."

"Try to integrate art, music, PE into rest of program to gain time and greater awareness of cross-curricular. (sic) I feel entirely unprepared to teach mathematics."

"Depended on the teacher as to the effectiveness."

"Too broad to differentiate—some well prepared, some not."

"Very little on early childhood literacy and math."

TECHNOLOGY PREPARATION

"This part of the program was extremely helpful."

"Instructor was very helpful and knowledgeable. Always willing to help."

"Overall the tech prep covered good content. However, neither teacher took into consideration where each of us were starting off from and what skills we brought to the class. For me the classes were not challenging. Wish the structure had been more individualized."

"Had a lot of exposure to technology."

"I learned a lot. Would like more practice in Excel and handout making trick though."

"A lot of exposure to new technology."

DIVERSITY/SPECIAL EDUCATION PREPARATION

"Looking in depth at adaptations was very helpful."

"Very informative and helpful in helping us become aware and preparing for it."

"I understand why these two categories were combined, but I feel I would have benefited from a more rigorous in-depth special education class."

"(Need) more exposure to real kids in person or movies/films/documentary"

"Please make sure to distinguish between professional and private issues."

"Could have used more focus on special education."

"The one beneficial part of class was the handout listing a disability in one column and a concrete applicable adaptation in the next. Virtual book box was not useful."

"I think I will learn as I go about all the technicalities."

ASSESSMENT PREPARATION

"It seemed like assessment was present in all classes, but was included as an afterthought. Very little instruction on assessment in class except literature."

"I certainly learned that assessment is a more in-depth process than simply giving a test."

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

"Thank you Mary Claire!"

"Mary-Claire did a great job of making herself completely available and flexible throughout the program. Thank you."

"I feel the program did not do an adequate job preparing me for mathematics. I also think literacy should have been continually taught throughout the year. Other than that I thought the program did a good job squeezing in a lot of info in just a year."

These comments underscore the satisfaction with the internship experience, including the intern advisors support in that experience. Since all of the coursework is essentially pointed toward helping the candidates be prepared for the classroom experience, this is indicative of a strong, high-quality program. There was pointed dissatisfaction with one course and the teaching within it, and

that situation has already been remedied. Although there were comments about the portfolio process, the language was not strongly negative. The schedule for the coming year is changed and will allow for more reflection time at the time when portfolios are formed.

The comments about assessment reinforce the need to work with faculty further in addressing assessment more directly, as noted above.

Comments about being “rushed,” reveal the balance needed between providing all of the beneficial content and pedagogical knowledge in a twelve-month time period. Work will continue with faculty as well as students on the balance of understanding with knowledge. We must constantly explore more efficient and effective ways to involve students in learning in this condensed situation.

There is definitely more work to be done in working with faculty to be more collaborative with the program goals and more “efficient” in their teaching. However, it must also be recognized that candidates are at a stage where they want to know concretely “how to do it” in relationship to teaching. They are not in a position to appreciate that for the full extent over their career it is important that they understand why they are using the techniques they choose and how those techniques fit with the process as a whole. A more intellectual approach in coursework offers students this theoretical understanding connected to the practical teaching techniques. If students do not understand the pedagogical theory behind their instructional techniques, they are subject to each educational fad that sweeps through the school, and fail to overlap and interweave subject matter to strengthen learning.

KEY FINDINGS FOR THE YEAR 2006-2007

Student Population: Application numbers have not been high enough to generate a projected number of 20 students. Marketing techniques need to be examined and enhanced. A marketing plan needs to be designed and put into effect, with work beginning in October so that there is substantial coverage by January. Juneau itself gets some coverage, but around Alaska and through the Pacific Northwest, much more can be done. The Coordinator is currently working with the field recruiters in the Pacific Northwest to try to conduct some information evening events in the Northwest and in Anchorage. Considering the extremely low number of applicants for the 2007-2008 year, I believe that the response to phone calls and electronic inquiries as early as September is also extremely important. The quality and consistency of personnel in these positions is important and should be addressed.

A higher number of candidates may be reached by starting a cohort in Sitka, one of our regional campuses. The Sitka school district is interested in having an elementary cohort, and may be likely to support some of their own personnel as program participants, providing a base of students. This will be explored.

Praxis Scores: Now that the three Elementary programs have designated what assessments will be used for program assessment, this information can be aggregated and examined on a yearly basis. While not available at this time, this aggregation will be organized and available by next Fall.

Assessment: It was noted in last year's report that the score for Goal #5 was lower than others. More attention was given to assessment in each of the content methods segments and in ED 645, Integrated Unit. The score this last year is considerably higher, showing that the efforts to increase learning about assessment were successful. However, the aggregated scores and comments indicate that continued work with faculty is indicated.

Achievement of the School of Education Conceptual Framework Goals:

Satisfactory achievement of all nine goals of the School of Education Conceptual Framework is evident. Candidates are producing both high quality portfolios as evidence of their knowledge and skills, and scoring high on their internship performance.

The best evidence of the success of our candidates is the amount of graduates that are hired by the Juneau School District directly out of the program. It is very difficult to be hired as a teacher in Juneau, as it is a very popular location, and every teaching position has a huge quantity of applicants. Of the twelve candidates in the MAT Elementary K-8 program in the 2006-2007 year,

5 teaching for Juneau Schools

4 teaching with regular contract

1 long-term subbing for entire year (as his preference),

3 teaching in Anchorage

1 teaching in Bethel

1 working for Southeast Regional Resource Center in Juneau

1 teaching in Yukon, Canada

1 has just moved to Nebraska and will be applying for teaching jobs.

RESULTS OF CHANGES MADE FOR THE 2006-2007 YEAR

1. Integration of content was tried to reduce cognitive overload. Specifically, the Multicultural Education and Special Education courses were integrated. This was particularly successful and should be continued. The integration of technology in the Fall semester with all other content methods courses should also be continued, indicated by the high scores in technology.
2. Adjustment of the ED 630 and ED 632, technology courses, into 1 credit in the summer, 3 credits in the fall, and 2 credits in the Spring to better reflect what has been found to be most effective for learning. Basics are

taught in the summer and fall, and classroom applications are emphasized in the spring.

3. Knowledge of assessment was emphasized more in the content methods courses and in ED 645, Curricular Integration, and portfolio scores for Goal #5, which includes assessment, were much higher.
4. Changes in Gate Sheets were made to reflect the changes in assessments.

PROGRAM CHANGES BASED ON ASSESSMENT RESULTS

1. Increase marketing around Alaska and in the Pacific Northwest. Work with the UAS admission and recruitment office to develop advertising coverage. Develop a marketing plan with timeline that will engage all personnel involved and produce wide coverage. We must create more awareness of the program.
2. Develop a cohort in Sitka. This will build numbers and engage one of our regional campus sites that has been wishing to be included for many years.
3. Aggregate data from Praxis scores, Integrated Unit Rubric, and Dispositions Form for yearly perusal. This is still problematic, because there is no system being used to capture ACEI standards, and any aggregation of data must be done by hand.
4. Continue to work with faculty to better integrate content, increase preparation in assessment and reduce student workload whenever possible.

ASSESSMENT PLAN CHANGES BASED ON ASSESSMENT RESULTS

The assessment plan was changed at the beginning of 2007-2008 because of changes in the ACEI/NCATE requirements for reporting. Fewer measures are being used, which will streamline effective measurement and aggregation of data. The measures chosen are:

- Licensure assessments (PRAXIS I and II)
- Ratings by Methods Teachers (Content-based assessment)
- Integrated Unit Plan (Candidate ability to plan instruction)
- Intern Evaluation Form & Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form (Student teaching)
- Work Sample (Candidate effect on student learning)
- Portfolio (Additional assessment)
- Dispositions Form (Additional assessment)

In the following manner:

Learning Outcomes:	Assessment Method(s): Describe how student outcomes are assessed per plan
Content Knowledge	Praxis I and Praxis II Ratings by Methods Teachers Intern Evaluation Form Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form
Instruction, Curriculum, Management Knowledge	Praxis II Integrated Unit Plan Intern Evaluation Form Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form Portfolio
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Philosophy 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content Areas 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom Environment 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family/Community 	
Professional behavior	Dispositions form Intern Evaluation Form Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form
Application of Knowledge & Skills	Intern Evaluation Form Supplemental Intern Evaluation Form Work Sample: Final Integrated Unit with Reflections Portfolio

A system for aggregation of data for Elementary Standards is currently not available. Data is collected with the hope that a system may be developed in the future.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Mary-Claire Tarlow, Coordinator
MAT Elementary K-8, campus