Type of Visit:
Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation
Institutional Report

OVERVIEW

This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel.

A. Institution

A.1. What is the institution's historical context?

The Alaska Context

We begin with a brief overview of the AK context because our unique features have directly shaped our institution's historical context. The historical, political, cultural, economic, and geographical contexts are distinct enough that the "Alaskan variable" must be taken into account to understand UAF's history, mission and characteristics.

Alaska is known worldwide for its rich oil fields, extreme temperatures, vast amounts of land, midnight sun, high mountains and isolation from other US states. Although these physical features are significant, other factors are equally central to defining what UAF was, and is, today.

Alaska is the largest state—equal in size to 1/3 of the rest of the US. Although it ranks 47th in population with only 670,053 people, it is 1st in the percent of Native Americans with 15.4% of aboriginal ancestry—Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts, who collectively refer to themselves as AK Natives. Although there are 20 different AK Native languages, only two are still spoken by children. English is the first language of the large majority of AK residents. There are increasing numbers of Asian immigrants moving to the state, and large military bases ensure diversity in urban schools.

Alaska has 3 major urban areas (Anch, Fbks, Juneau) as well as 20 smaller towns and about 180 rural villages. Most villages are accessible only by air. The majority of rural residents are AK Natives and their communities range between 50 and 5,000 people. Most rural residents maintain unique lifestyles. They have snowmachines, refrigerators, televisions and computers, but they also have dog teams, fish wheels, meat drying racks, and outhouses. Villages have at least one store, but many AK Native residents continue to practice subsistence lifestyles and depend heavily on moose, caribou, seal, walrus, whale, fish and berries for their food. Alaska is a land and state of contrasts and extremes and the UAF mission has evolved from this unique context.

A.2. What is the institution's mission?

"UAF, the nation's northernmost Land, Sea & Space Grant university and international research center, advances and disseminates knowledge through teaching, research and public service with an emphasis on Alaska, the circumpolar North and their diverse peoples. UAF's "America's Arctic University" promotes academic excellence, student success and lifelong learning."

The mission statement above evolved directly from UAF's history as the 1st public institution in AK
As the flagship institution in the UA system, it plays a leadership role in the state in promoting teaching, research, and service that directly responds to the unique conditions and challenges of the state's arctic context. It is the only campus that awards doctoral degrees primarily in science areas. UAF has responsibility for serving the most rural and remote interior, northern and western regions of the state. It has five small rural campuses in areas not accessible by road. Most rural students complete coursework through distance delivery because of significant distances between their communities and any of the UAF campuses. UAF has provided a distance Education degree to rural students since 1970. Bachelor degrees are now also available in Rural Development and Social Work.

UAF's 2010 Strategic Plan developed from its mission statement. Each of the seven goals directly addresses UAF's responsibility to respond to needs specific to Alaska, Alaska Native and rural people, and the larger circumpolar area.

**A.3. What are the institution's characteristics [e.g., control (e.g., public or private) and type of institution such as private, land grant, or HBI; location (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban area)]?**

UAF is a public institution and the nation's northernmost Land, Sea, & Space Grant university. Eight schools and colleges offer 28 certificates and 167 associate, baccalaureate, masters or Ph.D. degrees in 122 disciplines. No other single university in the US is as multi-dimensional.

UAF's 9,828 students (Fall 08) come from AK, most other states, and 2.5% are from 52 other countries. Undergrad students comprise 89% of the total student body. Median student age is 31, 60% are female, 20% are AK Native/American Indian, and many are non-traditional, first generation college students. UAF's 7 campuses, across the state, give students access to a 360 million acre classroom.

Fifty-three percent of UAF students enroll in courses on the Fbks Campus. Twenty-four percent enroll through one of the rural campuses and only a small percentage of these students participate in face-to-face courses. Most rural students complete their coursework via distance delivery (audioconferences, E-Live, etc.) because of the long distances and expenses of flying by small plane between their villages and a rural campus. UAF also supports a Center for Distance Ed. that serves students by offering independent learning through correspondence courses. The variety of its 100 courses is not designed to meet the requirements of any specific degree program, but some required degree courses are included in their offerings. Over 2,300 students enrolled in a correspondence course last year.

**A.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the institutional context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

See Attachments panel below.

**B. The unit**

**B.1. What is the professional education unit at your institution and what is its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators?**

The professional education unit at UAF is the School of Education. UAF has three other schools and four colleges. Our SOE unit and each of the three departments within the SOE (Elementary, Graduate and Secondary) work closely with other UAF units and with other units in the larger Univ of Alaska system. We maintain a particularly close working relationship with three colleges: Liberal Arts (CLA),
Natural Science and Mathematics (CNSM), and Rural and Community Development (CRCD).

We have a close working relationship with CLA and CNSM because they provide the large majority of content courses for most elem teacher ed candidates and for some secondary candidates. Two SOE faculty have a joint appointment with CNSM (in mathematics and in biology) and one with CLA (in the AK Native Language Program and in the Linguistics Dept). Through its extensive system of regional and smaller branch campuses, CRCD provides additional student support services for many of our rural candidates. Several faculty members from these three colleges actively participated in the development of the Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education degree in 1999.

UAF School of Education programs also involve collaboration among the three University of Alaska institutions. For example, our new M.Ed. in Special Education and our BA in Elementary Education degree were developed through extensive collaboration with colleagues at the University of Alaska Anchorage and at the University of Alaska Southeast.

B.2. How many professional education faculty members support the professional education unit? Please complete Table 1 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

Table 1
Professional Education Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Education Faculty</th>
<th>Full-time in the Unit</th>
<th>Full-time in the Institution, but Part-time in the Unit</th>
<th>Part-time at the Institution &amp; the Unit (e.g., adjunct faculty)</th>
<th>Graduate Teaching Assistants Teaching or Supervising Clinical Practice</th>
<th>Total # of Professional Education Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty</td>
<td>B.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.3. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare candidates for their first license to teach? Please complete Table 2 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

Table 2
Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Award Level (e.g., Bachelor's or Master's)</th>
<th>Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted</th>
<th>Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)</th>
<th>Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)</th>
<th>State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)</th>
<th>Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>ACEI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Post-Bac Licensure</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ACEI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts Educ</td>
<td>Post-Bac Licensure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NCTE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Revised Report in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Education</td>
<td>Post-Bac Licensure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACTFL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Revised Report in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td>Post-Bac Licensure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NCTM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Post-Bac Licensure</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>NSTA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>Post-Bac Licensure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NCSS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Revised Report in process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.4. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals? Please complete Table 3 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

### Table 3
**Advanced Preparation Programs and Their Review Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Award Level (e.g., Master's or Doctorate)</th>
<th>Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted</th>
<th>Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)</th>
<th>Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)</th>
<th>State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)</th>
<th>Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Masters &amp; Licensure</td>
<td>New Programs, Aug 2009</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Approved in July 2009</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Master's (no longer offered)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Recognized with Probation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.5. Which of the above initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are offered? [In addition to this response, please review the "Institutional Information" in AIMS and, if updating is needed, contact NCATE with details about these programs.]

All of the UAF initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs listed in Tables 2 & 3 are offered via distance learning technologies to candidates who do not live in Fbks (typically described as our "off-campus" candidates). Candidates who live in AK, and who do not live in the Fbks area, have the option to complete any of our programs by distance. Three of the programs listed above (Counseling, Post Bac Elem Program, and Post Bac Secondary Program) do require that candidates come to the Fbks Campus for one 6 week period in the summer.

The large majority of off-campus courses are taught by the same instructors who teach them on the Fairbanks Campus, and the course and programs standards are exactly the same for on- and off-campus candidates. Most of the graduate level courses are taught with on- and off-campus candidates participating in the same section of the course. A wide range of distance learning technologies are used by SOE faculty for distance delivery courses.

B.6. (Continuing Visit Only) What substantive changes have taken place in the unit since the last visit (e.g., added/dropped programs/degrees; significant increase/decrease in enrollment; major reorganization of the unit, etc.)? [These changes could be compiled from those reported in Part C of the AACTE/NCATE annual reports since the last visit.]

The majority of substantive changes since 2004 have occurred in our Graduate Department. These are listed in chronological order. In most instances, the wording is taken directly from Part C of our annual NCATE Reports.

In an effort to provide endorsements only in those areas that are most sought after by candidates and by school districts, the Grad Dept. made the decision to no longer offer the following programs: Bilingual Multi-Cultural Ed Endorsement, World Language Ed Endorsement, and Native Language Ed Endorsement. Admission was suspended to these programs in 2006 and the very limited number of
students enrolled were able to complete their programs. The Linguistics Dept. and AK Native Language Programs do provide options for candidates who want to pursue additional work in the area of AK Native Languages. One faculty member in the Grad Dept. holds a joint position with the SOE and with the Dept. of Linguistics, and this provides the option for increased collaboration between the two units.

In the fall of 2006, the SOE assumed responsibility for the Community Counseling strand of the M.Ed., previously administered through the Psychology Dept. As a result, the Counseling Program added 3 new courses, hired a community psychology faculty member, and experienced an increase in students.

In 2006, the SOE made it mandatory for all post-baccalaureate and all senior level undergraduate initial licensure candidates to have a laptop computer with designated software prior to beginning their internship year. At the same time the School of Education entered into an agreement with Apple Computers to allow SOE candidates to purchase a laptop computer and required software at a competitive cost. The SOE continued to make substantive investments in technology personnel, training, hardware and software.

Changes were made in M.Ed. specialization areas in 2006. Elementary Education and Secondary Education were added as areas of specialization within the Curriculum and Instruction M.Ed. and they are available only to candidates who have already completed the requirements of these post-baccalaureate licensure programs and who have already acquired between 12 and 16 graduate credits as part of their post-baccalaureate course requirements.

In 2007, the Counseling Program made the decision to offer 85% of its M.Ed. program by distance delivery. It is the only program in the state that is now available to candidates who are not in Anchorage or Fairbanks.

In the spring of 2009, the SOE suspended admission to the M.Ed. in Reading due to low enrollments due to the fact that very few Alaska School Districts require an endorsement in reading.

In June of 2009, the UA Board of Regents approved a new M.Ed. and Endorsement in Special Education for the UAF SOE. In July, the AK State Board approved the programs, and in August, the NW Commission on Colleges & Universities also approved. Both programs will be available in Fall 2009.

B.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table_1_Professional_Educ_Faculty.doc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview - Section B - Exhibit List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This section provides an overview of the unit's conceptual framework(s). The overview should include a brief description of the framework(s) and its development.
C.1. How does the unit's conceptual framework address the following structural elements? [Please provide a summary here. A more complete description of the conceptual framework should be available as an electronic exhibit.]

- the vision and mission of the unit
- philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit
- knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit
- candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards
- summarized description of the unit's assessment system

The vision and mission of UAF's School of Education (SOE) are the foundation of the unit's conceptual framework. SOE's vision is one of schools that function as integral parts of their communities. Such schools consist of highly qualified educators who have deep understandings of:

- Academic and pedagogical knowledge;
- The cultural, environmental and emotional contexts of children;
- The cultural and linguistic backgrounds that reflect the diversity of the students in the community.

Our mission is to prepare professional educators who are culturally responsive, effective practitioners for AK schools. Such educators:

- Respond to the individual needs of the child;
- Seek to develop the classroom as an inclusive community of learners;
- Work collaboratively within the community;
- Incorporate the varied cultures and languages of AK children into the learning environment.

Social constructivist, sociocultural, sociolinguistic, and sociohistorical theories and bodies of research provide the basis for the faculty's philosophy, knowledge and understandings of the unique and diverse contexts of AK. In addition, the theories and research addressing technology as a means of providing equitable and accessible education to candidates in rural and remote settings support the faculty's application and use of technology in the programs and classes, as well as candidates' use in their own classrooms and communities.

SOE's goals and standards reflect the AK Content & Performance Standards for Students, the AK Cultural Standards, professional organizations' stds for specific content areas, and SOE's stds. Historical research regarding the policies of language, culture and educational practices in AK provide perspectives through which past, current and future polices can be considered, and those that positively impact all children in AK be supported.

Overview of Assessment System
The SOE employs a diverse yet cohesive array of assessment strategies to monitor applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, competence of graduates, unit operations and program quality.

Candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions prior to admission to all programs are based on a systematic evaluation of candidate GPA; Praxis I and/or II scores; an interview; admissions essay; resume and/or autobiography; letters of reference; evaluation of tech competence; and evidence of adequate communication skills. This evidence is evaluated relative to the candidate's future ability to successfully meet the AK/UAF SOE Standards & Performances for Culturally Responsive, Effective Practitioners.
Candidate proficiencies in all SOE programs are evaluated relative to the AK/UAF SOE Stds. These provide the foundation for successful completion of our programs, and individual program assessment systems have been developed with these standards as the foundation. This cohesive foundation ensures that all programs fundamentally adhere to the shared vision of our Conceptual Framework. Over the last 6 yrs, all programs have worked through a "backwards mapping" system to develop a program assessment system that meets the needs of their program and adheres to the shared standard. Some programs chose to develop their own program-specific "performance standards" to articulate the expectations within the program relative to the overarching AK/UAF SOE Standards (e.g. elem "competencies"), while others used the standards as stated. Individual programs looked at the AK/UAF SOE Standards, and then looked at the current assessment strategies being employed to determine candidate proficiency, and aligned their assessments with the SOE standards. Where there were "gaps" additional assessments were developed. As a result of this gradual development of standards-based assessments, all UAF SOE program graduates now have to demonstrate proficiency relative to a shared set of outcomes. All programs evaluate candidate proficiency at a minimum of 3 transition points (admissions, mid way, program completion). All program assessment systems employ a variety of assessment strategies including the development and implementation of instructional materials, work samples, evaluations of student work and documentation of impact on student learning, research projects, case studies, on-site evaluations by cooperating practitioners and fieldwork supervisors, etc. All programs place a high value on performance-based assessments. The majority of performance-based tasks used to assess candidate proficiency are evaluated using analytic, task-specific rubrics.

A number of strategies are used to assess the competence of our graduates in the workplace following completion. We have developed and disseminated a variety of surveys for graduates of our initial licensure programs, our M.Ed. programs, and for employers (primarily AK principals). We also systematically request feedback on program quality from cooperating practitioners our candidates collaborate with in their fieldwork. While we have gathered some useful data as a result of these formal survey strategies, we continue to find that our most valuable sources of feedback come in the form of informal conversations faculty engage in on a regular basis with principals and educators around our state. We maintain positive and productive relationships with most of the 53 districts in our sparsely populated state. Our ongoing partnerships allow us to place interns in communities throughout the state. We use the opportunities provided by these placements, as well as yearly statewide conferences and teacher job fairs, to communicate regularly with employers and to solicit feedback regarding the efficacy of our programs.

Ongoing assessment of unit operations is accomplished primarily through the collective review of a variety of annual or semi-annual reports submitted to various organizations by both program heads and the Dean. These include yearly "outcomes-assessment" reports, annual AACTE reports, annual NCATE reports, SPA reports, and a variety of unit-level operations reports prepared by the Dean. Many of these reports are shared at either program or dept level faculty meetings and are used to guide program and unit level decision-making.

Data listed above are systematically gathered and compiled using a variety of software applications, primarily Excel and FileMaker Pro. The relatively small size of our cohorts allows us to keep track of our candidate and unit data without the use of a large database.

Candidate Proficiencies Related to Diversity and Technology

Candidate proficiencies related to diversity are embedded in our AK/UAF Stds. In the attached document we have listed the proficiencies from the AK/UAF Standards that specifically address
candidate knowledge and understanding of diverse populations. The proficiencies relating to diversity are assessed in various ways in all of our programs. Individual programs have also developed program-level assessments of professional dispositions (referred to as Professional Characteristics Feedback Forms or PCFFs) that assess professional dispositions, including assessment of professional characteristics aligned with the candidate proficiencies related to diversity.

After several years of work with our initial set of candidate proficiencies in the AK/UAF Standards, the SOE faculty determined that although technology instruction and use was certainly prevalent in all of our programs, our AK/UAF SOE Standards did not adequately reflect our expectations for candidates relative to the use of technology both as professionals and with students. To address this shortcoming, the School of Education developed a set of student technology outcomes based on the International Society for Technology in Education, Nat'l Ed Tech Stds for Students and the Nat'l Ed Tech Stds for Teachers. These outcomes address the specific technology skills that initial teacher candidates are expected to have upon completing their programs.

The Theme of our Conceptual Framework
The theme of our Conceptual FW is to "Prepare Professional Educators Who Are Culturally Responsive, Effective Practitioners." This theme embodies the important components and serves as our guide for determining priorities, policies, and practices. All programs use the same Conceptual Framework. The main components are reflected in our Unit's programs in multiple ways, and some are listed below.

Our Conceptual Framework defines CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE educators as those who have an understanding of and respect for the children, families, and communities they serve as professionals. They are educators who interact with their communities in ways that honor the cultural and linguistic heritages of the children they teach, and who are committed to the personal and academic success of the community's children.

We strive to prepare CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE educators by:

a. recruiting, retaining, graduating diverse candidates with a focus on AK Natives who comprise 16% of the state's population;
b. providing the option for more AK Natives to seek degrees through our quality distance programs despite significantly higher costs to our Unit;
c. investing significant time and resources in technology to support faculty use of distance delivery to a more diverse group of candidates;
d. strengthening the AK Teacher Stds by adding several components from the AK Stds for Culturally Responsive Teachers to assist candidates to become more culturally responsive;
e. supporting a place-based/culturally responsive approach to teaching and learning with assignments that require completion in ways that are appropriate and meaningful in the specific context of each school/community;
f. addressing, in every SOE course, the knowledge, skills and dispositions that prepare candidates to be culturally responsive;
g. providing urban candidates the opportunity to spend time in a rural community.

2. Our Conceptual Framework defines EFFECTIVE educators as those who develop goals for themselves and their students, and who are able to demonstrate that they and their students have attained the intended goals. We strive to help our candidates become effective educators who will have a lasting, positive impression upon the students, families, schools, organizations and communities in which they serve.

We strive to prepare EFFECTIVE educators by:

a. designing our programs to assure that candidates have content knowledge and pedagogy necessary to
assist all students in meeting the AK Student Stds;
b. assuring that goals we develop for our candidates and goals they develop for their students are directly
aligned with the UAF/AK Teacher Stds and with AK Student Stds;
c. designing teaching and learning opportunities that allow all candidates to know, respect and respond
to the diverse interests of their particular students, families, schools and communities;
d. requiring candidates to assess direct evidence of student learning throughout their program;
e. maintaining accountability with AK districts through regular communication;
f. insisting on efficacy from our candidates—i.e., accepting no excuses relative to student learning.

3. Our Conceptual Framework defines PROFESSIONAL educators as those who are fully functioning
members of the education profession, and who feel connected to that profession even before they exit
our programs.

We strive to prepare PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS by:
a. requiring a yearlong internship;
b. selecting mentor teachers and supervisors who have excellent qualifications;
c. providing monthly seminars that allow candidates and mentors to interact;
d. emphasizing professionalism from candidate admission until program completion through ongoing
use of a Professional Characteristics Feedback Form;
e. hiring faculty who are directly connected to the profession through their depth and breadth of
experience and expertise in the areas in which they are teaching or providing supervision.

C.2. (Continuing Visits Only) What changes have been made to the conceptual framework since
the last visit?

The mission and goals in our CFW now include the 2010 strategic plan. This section shows how the
School of Education's (SOE) mission and goals are articulated with and support this plan.

The vision and mission of the SOE reflects the faculty's consensus with regard to the definitions of the
key terms in the conceptual framework; i.e., professional, effective and culturally responsive. Each of
these terms is now defined and described within the culturally responsive theory and research base.

The overview of programs and graduates section reflects recent data gathered from the updated and
extensive SOE hiring database. Current data has also been retrieved from statewide reports.

The description of the SOE's partnerships reflects the current, ongoing partnerships with schools,
districts, school/community-based projects, and state and federal grant projects.

The overview of the SOE's assessment system provides more information on how it relates to the
candidates' proficiencies/state standards and describes how it is used to guide program revisions and
changes.

The faculty philosophy emphasizes the theory and research bases of culturally responsive and place-
based education, in addition to the constructivist learning theories of Dewey, Vygotsky, etc. Current
research in these areas, conducted by UAF faculty, graduate students and PK-12 educators/partners has
been highlighted.

The social, historical language/cultural contexts of education in Alaska, past and present, continue to
provide a foundation for understanding the policies and directions of education in Alaska in our 21st
century global society. In addition, the geographical and technological contexts are discussed in this
section. The unique supports and challenges that educators, students, families and communities
throughout Alaska face with regard to urban, rural and remote settings and how the SOE is addressing the use and functions of technology in classrooms is now emphasized.

C.3. (First Visits Only) How was the conceptual framework developed and who was involved in its development?

C.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the conceptual framework may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

STANDARDS

This section is the focus of the institutional report. A description of how the unit meets each standard element must be presented. Significant differences among programs should be described as the response is written for each element under subheadings of initial teacher preparation, advanced teacher preparation, and other school professionals. Significant differences among programs on the main campus, in off-campus programs, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs should be identified. Links to key exhibits to support the descriptions may be attached to the last prompt of each element.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Directions When Programs Have Been Reviewed Nationally or by a Similar State Review

To reduce burden and duplication, units have fewer reporting requirements for Standard 1 when programs have been submitted for national review or similar state review. These review processes cover many of the elements in Standard 1. For programs that have been submitted for national review or similar state review, units are asked to report in the IR only the following information:

- State licensing test data for Element 1a (content knowledge for teacher candidates) and Element 1e (knowledge and skills for other school professionals)
- Assessment Data for Element 1c (professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills)
- Assessment data for Element 1g (dispositions)
- Results of follow-up studies of graduates and employers (all standards elements)
Because program standards do not generally cover general professional knowledge and skills nor professional dispositions, the unit must respond to all of the prompts in Elements 1c (Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates) and 1g (Professional Dispositions for All Candidates) regardless of whether programs have been submitted for national or state review.

The prompts for each element in the IR include reminders of when data for these programs need not be included. The term "similar state review" refers to state review processes that require institutions to submit assessments and assessment data for evaluation and/or approval. For more information on "similar state review," click on the HELP button at the top right corner of your screen.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1a.1. What are the pass rates of teacher candidates in initial teacher preparation programs on state tests of content knowledge for each program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 4 or upload your own table at Prompt 1a.5 below. [This information could be compiled from Title II data submitted to the state or from program reports prepared for national review.]

Table 4
Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Name of Content Licensure Test</th>
<th># of Test Takers</th>
<th>% Passing State Licensure Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Pass Rate for the Unit</td>
<td>Praxis I</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(across all initial teacher preparation programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education - All Subject Areas</td>
<td>Praxis I</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Art</td>
<td>Praxis I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Foreign Language</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Political Science</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary History</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Social Studies</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Geography</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary English</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Biology</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Chemistry</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Physics</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Math</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Period: 2007-2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Earth Science</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Physical Science</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary - BAE</td>
<td>Praxis I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary - BAE</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary - Post Bac</td>
<td>Praxis I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary - Post Bac</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1a.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]

Candidates in the secondary program have the opportunity to obtain an endorsement in Art. Although there is no SPA for art, and hence no national review, similar changes have been made to the program as to the other areas of endorsement requiring SPA reports. Originally, the entrance requirement for candidates seeking an endorsement in art consisted of successful completion of Praxis 2 along with other basic entrance requirements including a minimum GPA, subject area competence examined by a transcript review, candidate interview, letters of reference, etc. However, when additional competencies were recently added to other areas of endorsement to strengthen entrance requirements, they were likewise added to art. Candidates applying for licensure in the teaching of art must be rated at the Target or Acceptable level based on their subject area competence as reflected on the content admission checklist completed by faculty. Even though only a small number (6) of candidates have sought this endorsement in the past five years, it should be noted that while all of the current criteria were not in place for them when they applied and were admitted, a review of their files provides evidence that all candidates would have met these criteria. We have retroactively applied the new criteria to allow us to more accurately complete our data analysis. Data tables in the attachment "Secondary art endorsement data" related to content area knowledge were derived from the art candidates' "Admission Content Checklist," the "Art Content Observation Checklist," and Praxis 2 for Art (see tabs in Excel spreadsheet for data on different assessments).

Data is further disaggregated for "on-campus" (OC) and "distance delivery" (DD) candidates. The attached data show that all accepted candidates were at the target or acceptable level in the aforementioned assessment areas.

1a.3. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]

n/a

1a.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in the content area? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to content knowledge could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of
Standard 1.

The second document listed in the 1a5 exhibit list provides an overview of the follow-up studies that provide the data for prompts 1a4, 1b3, 1c4, 1d3 and 1g4, including the survey name, a brief explanation, the year(s) of data being reported, and the survey response rate. To summarize, there are six follow-up studies providing data on elementary and secondary teacher candidates. Each program completes a yearly program exit survey, where program completers are asked to provide their reflections on the quality and effectiveness of various program components. The elementary and secondary programs also both distribute a bi-yearly follow-up survey to individuals who have completed the program in the previous two years. The most recent elementary graduate follow-up survey was distributed using SurveyMonkey, but all prior ones and the most recent secondary survey was distributed using a paper survey with a SASE included. Both programs also complete regular employer surveys, which are sent to principals employing individuals who have completed the program in the prior two years. Survey data from all six sources are included in responses to Standard 1 prompts, and copies of the survey instruments along with complete data reports can be found as links in the 1a5 exhibit list.

A summary of follow-up survey data relative to content area knowledge can be found attached at 1a5. Responses from employers of graduates of both the elementary and secondary programs indicate that employers agree or strongly agree that UAF graduates appear competent about their content knowledge. Program completers also consistently feel confident in their content knowledge and 79% feel somewhat confident to confident their their ability to teach content areas effectively.

1a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

| 1a4 summary of follow up survey data relative to content knowledge initial preparation programs |
| 1a4 overview and explanation of available follow up surveys for initial preparation programs |
| 1a5 Exhibit List |
| Secondary art endorsement data |

See Attachments panel below.

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1b.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

Candidates seeking university endorsement in Art are required to complete a number of critical assignments at the Target or Acceptable level for successful completion of the program. Data represented in the attachment "Secondary art endorsement data" that speak to assessments of pedagogical content knowledge and skills include: the electronic portfolio, "form H" (both the portfolio and form H assess the 8 UAF/Alaska Teaching Standards), data from several units of study required of the clinical practice--the work sample, a comprehensive unit developed by candidates in their methods
classes and taught during the first semester of the clinical practice, two units developed and taught during the second semester of the clinical practice, and form K, the Art Observation Checklist (see tabs in Excel spreadsheet for data on different assessments).

All candidates were rated at the Acceptable or Target level for all of these assessments. Specifically, the electronic portfolio and "form H" assess all eight UAF/Alaska Teaching Standards, and all candidates must be rated at Target or Acceptable level for each standard. However, data from Alaska Standard 4 of each of these assessments, "A teacher knows the teacher's content area and how to teach it," speaks specifically to 1b1 and all candidates were at the Target or Acceptable level in their assessments of this Alaska Teacher standard.

Data have also been disaggregated further by distance delivery (DD) and on campus (OC) candidates. All candidates in both groups were rated at the Target or Acceptable level.

1b.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates know and apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, are able to use a range of instructional strategies and technologies, and can explain the choices they make in their practice. [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

n/a

1b.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

A summary of follow-up survey data relative to pedagogical content knowledge and skills can be found attached at 1b4. An overview of follow-up survey instruments and complete data reports can be found attached at 1a5. Responses from employers of graduates of both the elementary and secondary programs indicate that employers agree or strongly agree that UAF graduates can design instruction to help students meet content area performance standards, and successfully incorporate technology into their instruction. Program completers, after entering the workforce, report that, as a majority, they are confident or somewhat confident in their ability to develop meaningful and effective instruction in the content areas. Elementary program completers, at the end of their program, indicated that the most important program assignments contributing to their pedagogical content knowledge were the science instructional unit, the three week full time student teaching experience and documentation, the grade level year long math curriculum plan, the social studies unit and reflections and the week of teaching language arts. Information on these assignments can be found in the elementary ACEI SPA reports.

1b.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the pedagogical content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. (Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.)

| 1b3 summary of follow up survey data relative to ped content knowledge for initial programs |
| 1b4 Exhibit List |
See **Attachments** panel below.

### 1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

#### 1c.1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced teacher preparation programs demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

A summary of data from key assessments in the elementary and secondary programs pertaining to candidate ability to facilitate learning can be found attached at 1c5. Information and data relative to this area comes from two key assignments: the Full Time Student Teaching (FTST) experience and documentation in the elementary programs (described in the document Elementary Data and Information for 1c1), and the Teacher Work Sample assignment in the secondary program (described in the document Secondary Data and Information for 1c1). Both assignments were used as evidence in elementary and program SPA reports. Data from the elementary SPA report is included showing intern ratings for each component of the FTST experience.

An excerpt from the report data summary states that "Since candidates and mentors receive the FTST assignment early in the internship year, and since they have had the opportunity to receive formative and summative feedback on progress in relation to the criteria from faculty, mentor teachers and supervisors since beginning their internship, we fully expect them to be successful when they complete their full-time student teaching in the middle of spring semester. Our data show that only 1 candidate who began Full-time Student Teaching in the past 3 years has not been successful in meeting the criteria assessed in this assignment at the acceptable or target level. This individual was required to complete an additional semester internship and was successful during this second opportunity. If a candidate is assessed at the unacceptable level on a small number of these criteria, they are provided with a second opportunity to provide evidence that they can meet them within a short turnaround time."

The data summary for the secondary Teacher Work Sample assessment for the 2007/08 cohort indicates that 61% of secondary candidates were assessed at the target level and 31% were assessed at the acceptable level. 8% of candidates were initially scored as unacceptable, but were required to revise the work sample to an acceptable level prior to completion of the licensure program.

#### 1c.2. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs consider the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings? If a licensure test is required in this area, how are candidates performing on it? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

A summary of data from key assessments in the elementary and secondary programs pertaining to candidate ability in the multiple components of prompt 1c2 can be found attached at 1c5. Information and data relative to this area comes from a variety of assessments and program requirements outlined on the 1c2 Summary and Data. Information on assignments and assessments for 1c2 can be found in the documents Elementary assignment information for 1c2 and Secondary assignment information for 1c2.

To summarize the information in these documents, the first two components of 1c2 align with UAF/AK
standards 7, 3 and 8, and the final two are assessed in the context of critical assignments in program foundations courses. Assessments and data relative to UAF/AK standards 7, 3 and 8 come from a variety of critical assignments in the elementary and secondary programs (listed on the aforementioned documents). The data from assessments relative to these three standards have been aggregated into a summary assessment for each of the three standards. The data summary reports that 99-100% of elementary interns were assessed at an acceptable or target level in standard 7 assignments, 96-98% were assessed at the acceptable or target level in standard 3 assignments, and 96-100% were assessed at the acceptable or target level in standard 8 assignments. In the secondary program, 100% of interns were assessed at the target or acceptable level in both standard 7 and standard 8 assignments.

Two critical assignments in elementary and secondary foundations courses provide the data regarding knowledge of major schools of thought and ability to analyze educational findings. Elementary licensure candidates complete an in-class and take home exam as part of their ED 201 (undergraduate) or ED 624 (post-bac) foundations coursework. A description of both portions of this exam can be found in the document Elementary assignment information for 1c2. Secondary licensure candidates complete an exploratory paper in their Foundations of Modern Educational Practice course (ED 415). A description of this assignment can be found in the document Secondary assignment information for 1c2. Data from the elementary assignment indicates that undergraduates score an average of 44.9 out of 50 on the exam, while post-bac candidates score an average of 48.1 out of 50. Data from the secondary assignment indicates that 95-97% of candidates received an acceptable or target rating on the assignment.

1c.3. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates reflect on their practice; engage in professional activities; have a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work; collaborate with the professional community; are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices; and can analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their own practice and the profession? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

| n/a |

1c.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

A summary of follow-up survey data relative to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills can be found attached at 1c5. An overview of follow-up survey instruments and complete data reports can be found attached at 1a5. Responses from employers of graduates of both the elementary and secondary programs indicate that employers agree or strongly agree that UAF graduates use a variety of models or strategies when planning, implementing and assessing instruction; appear confident about managing the classroom; met the employers expectations for first year teachers. Program completers, after entering the workforce, report that, as a majority, they are confident or somewhat confident in their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, including their ability to operationalize a philosophy of teaching, use community resources in the classroom, use a variety of teaching and assessment strategies, effectively manage a classroom, enhance student critical thinking skills, and establish and maintain regular contact with families. (see 1c4 data report for detailed questions and survey results). Elementary program completers, at the end of their program, indicated that the most important program assignments contributing to their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills were the philosophy of education and connections to practice assignment, the three week full time student teaching experience and documentation, the literacy development profile assignment, the looking at student work
assignments, the parent handbook assignment, the classroom communication assignments, the philosophy of PE/health assignment, the log of collaboration with families and community, and the annotated bibliography of professional resources. Information on most of these assignments can be found in the elementary ACEI SPA reports.

1c.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1c1 summary and data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c2 summary and data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c4 summary of follow up survey data relative to prof and ped knowledge and skills initial programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary data and information for 1c1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary data and information for 1c1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary assignment information for 1c2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary assignment information for 1c2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c5 Evidence List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1d.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

Candidates seeking university endorsement in Art are required to complete a number of critical assignments at the Target or Acceptable level for successful completion of the program. Data represented in the attachment "Secondary art endorsement data" (attached in section 1a) that speak to assessments indicating that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn include: the electronic portfolio, "form H" (both the portfolio and form H assess the 8 UAF/Alaska Teaching Standards), data from several units of study required of the clinical practice--the work sample, a comprehensive unit developed by candidates in their methods classes and taught during the first semester of the clinical practice, and two units developed and taught during the second semester of the clinical practice (see tabs in Excel spreadsheet for data on different assessments).

Both the work sample assignment and the clinical practice units now require all candidates to specifically assess and graph student learning gains, reflect on the outcomes, and include recommendations for future changes that will positively impact student learning.
The electronic portfolio and "form H" assess the eight UAF/Alaska Teaching Standards and candidates must be target or acceptable for each standard. However, data from Alaska Standards 2 and 5 of each of these assessments speak specifically to 1d1. Alaska Standard 2 states, "A teacher understands how students learn and develop and applies that knowledge in the teacher's practice." Standard 5 states, "A teacher facilitates, monitors, and assesses student learning." All candidates were rated at the Target or Acceptable level in these two standards.

Data have also been disaggregated further by distance delivery (DD) and on campus (OC). All candidates were rated at the Target or Acceptable level.

1d.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning; regularly apply them in their practice; analyze student, classroom, and school performance data; make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning; and are aware of and utilize school and community resources that support student learning? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

n/a

1d.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to help all students learn? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to help all students learn could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

A summary of follow-up survey data relative to graduates' ability to help all students learn can be found attached at 1d4. An overview of follow-up survey instruments and complete data reports can be found attached at 1a5. Responses from employers of graduates of both the elementary and secondary programs indicate that employers agree or strongly agree that UAF graduates can design and implement lessons that are developmentally appropriate and that engage students. Program completers, after entering the workforce, report that, as a majority, they are confident or somewhat confident in their ability to differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of students from multiple development levels and learning styles; assess and teach to individual learning preferences, interests and ways of knowing; establish a positive and inclusive classroom environment; and incorporate interests and characteristics of the local culture to support student learning. Elementary program completers, at the end of their program, indicated that the most important program assignments contributing to their ability to help all students learn were the three week full time student teaching experience and documentation, the sense of place assignment, the local artist project and reflection, the literacy development profile, the classroom profile, the social studies unit and reflection and the looking at student work assignments. Information on most these assignments can be found in the elementary ACEI SPA reports.

1d.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]
See Attachments panel below.

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

1e.1. What are the pass rates of other school professionals on licensure tests by program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 5 or upload your own table at Prompt 1e.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Name of Licensure Test</th>
<th># of Test Takers</th>
<th>% Passing State Licensure Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all programs for the preparation of other school professionals)</td>
<td>There are no state required licensure tests</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1e.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that other school professionals demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for programs for other school professionals that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below.]

The M.Ed programs have established assessment systems that evaluate the knowledge, skills and dispositions of their candidates at four or five transition points. The assessments and assignments associated with each transition point have been aligned with the proficiencies articulated in the UAF/AK standards (in the conceptual framework) as well as (in the case of the counseling M.Ed. program) national CACREP standards (although the program has not yet applied for CACREP accreditation, as it is not required by the State of Alaska). An overview of M.Ed. program transition points, assessment strategies and scoring guides can be linked to in the 1e4 evidence list.

Knowledge and skills in the M.Ed. programs are evaluated through a variety of assessments. A summary of data associated with these assessments can be found in the attachment 1e2 data for counseling and other M.Ed. programs at 1e4. The counseling M.Ed. program assesses knowledge and skills upon admissions using GPA and transcript analysis, GRE scores (if necessary), evaluation of resume and letters of recommendation and a personal write-up. Assessments of knowledge and skills at transition points 2, 3, 4 and 5 in the counseling program consist of maintenance of an acceptable GPA and successful completion of several critical assignments and field-based assessments of skills. Candidates are also required to successfully complete a project or thesis and comprehensive exams. Other M.Ed. programs assess knowledge and skills upon admissions using GPA, GRE scores (if necessary), evaluation of resume and letters of recommendation and a statement of academic goals. Additional assessment of knowledge and skills occur through the successful completion of critical assignments in coursework specific to the focus of their program (transition 2), the development of a satisfactory project or thesis proposal, an associated literature review, and a successful completion and defense of the project or thesis, along with the maintenance of an acceptable GPA.
The data show that M.Ed. candidates in counseling and other M.Ed. programs are completing all program assessments of knowledge and skills at an acceptable or target level. Detailed data can be found on the aforementioned attachment. The assessment system for other M.Ed. programs has been recently implemented, so only one year of data is available in that area.

1e.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about the knowledge and skills of other school professionals? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]

The second document listed in the 1e4 exhibit list provides an overview of the follow-up studies that provide the data for prompts 1e3, 1f2 and 1g4, including the survey name, a brief explanation, the year(s) of data being reported, and the survey response rate. To summarize, there are two follow-up studies providing data on M.Ed. program graduates. The M.Ed. programs distribute a follow-up survey to individuals who have completed the program in the previous two to three years. The most recent M.Ed. follow-up survey was distributed in 2008 to 2007 and 2008 graduates of M.Ed. programs using a paper survey with a SASE included. The M.Ed. programs also complete regular employer surveys, which are sent to administrators employing individuals who have completed M.Ed. programs in the prior three years. Survey data from both sources are included in responses to Standard 1 prompts, and copies of the survey instruments along with complete data reports can be found as links in the 1e4 exhibit list.

A summary of follow-up survey data relative to M.Ed. program graduates' knowledge and skills can be found attached at 1e4. Responses from employers of M.Ed. program graduates indicate that they are confident or somewhat confident in their employees' ability to plan, organize, implement, and assess instruction in culturally responsive ways; base professional practice on knowledge of current education theory, research and best practice; and design, implement and assess instruction that addresses standards and elicits effective performances. M.Ed. program graduates indicate that they somewhat agree that they have acquired a variety of professional knowledge and skills as a result of their program (see 1e3 data summary for specific questions.)

1e.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the knowledge and skills of other school professionals may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

| 1e2 data for counseling M.Ed. and other M.Ed. programs |
| 1e3 summary of follow up survey data relative to M.Ed. knowledge and skills |
| 1e4 overview and explanation of available follow up survey data for M.Ed. programs |
| 1e4 Evidence List |

See Attachments panel below.

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

1f.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates can create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work? [Data for programs for other school professionals that
have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]

Please see 1e2 and documents listed on the 1e4 and 1f3 exhibit lists for an overview of the assessment system used in M.Ed. programs. The counseling M.Ed. program uses five critical assignments and assessments at four different transition points to evaluate their candidates' ability to create positive environments for student learning including a theory paper on childhood and adolescent development, a personal perspectives on cultural identity paper, the development of a comprehensive school counseling program, and two site supervisor evaluations of their field-based internship. A description of these assessments and scoring guides can be found in the linked document in the 1f3 exhibit list titled MEd_counseling_gate_assignments. A table summarizing the data related to these assessments as well as information on assessments of impact on student learning for other M.Ed. programs can be found in the document attached at 1f3 titled 1f1 data for counseling and other M.Ed. programs. This data summary indicates that counseling M.Ed. candidates score on average between 3.4 and 4.8 out of 5 on the above-listed assessments. A strategy for measuring candidate ability to create positive environments for student learning in other M.Ed. programs has recently been adopted, and an explanation of this strategy is described in the document 1f1 data for counseling and other M.Ed. programs. A copy of the M.Ed. Impact on Student Learning Form can be linked to in the 1f3 exhibit list. No data have yet been collected using this form.

1f.2. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to create positive environments for student learning? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to create positive environments for student leaning could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]

A summary of follow-up survey data relative to M.Ed. program graduates' ability to create positive environments can be found attached at 1f3. Copies of the survey instruments along with complete data reports can be found as links in the 1e4 exhibit list. Responses from employers of M.Ed. program graduates indicate that they are confident or somewhat confident in their employees' ability to base professional practice on the recognition that all individuals can learn; plan, organize, implement and assess instruction in culturally responsive ways; and support the rich cultural and linguistic heritage of rural and urban Alaskan communities. M.Ed. program graduates indicate that they somewhat agree that they have deepened their knowledge about teaching in an Alaskan context.

1f.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to other school professionals' creation of positive environments for student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates. [Indicate when the responses refer to the preparation of initial teacher candidates, advanced teacher candidates, and other school professionals, noting differences when they occur.]
1g.1. What professional dispositions are candidates expected to demonstrate by completion of programs?

A summary of professional dispositions expected of candidates in elementary, secondary, counseling M.Ed and other M.Ed. programs can be found attached at 1g5. Links to copies of individual program disposition assessments (referred to as Professional Characteristics Feedback Forms), information on how and when these forms are used in individual programs, and expanded data summaries can be found in the 1g5 exhibit list.

1g.2. How do candidates demonstrate that they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

Each of the Professional Characteristics Feedback Forms used by individual programs include criteria specific to candidates demonstrating fairness and the belief that all students can learn. The attachment 1g2 summary and data extracts the components of each form relative to this area and provides data specific to those components. The data show that elementary and secondary licensure candidates score an average of 2.8 out of 3 in this area. M.Ed. candidates score an average of 4.3 out of 5 in characteristics related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn.

1g.3. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions listed in 1.g.1 as they work with students, families, colleagues, and communities? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

A summary of data from elementary, secondary and M.Ed. professional characteristics feedback forms (PCFFs) can be found attached at 1g5 (1g3 summary and data). These data summarize candidate performance on PCFFs during the 2007/08 academic year. The data show that candidates in all programs score at a high level in their professional disposition evaluations. Candidates in all programs are introduced to the expected dispositions of their profession prior to or upon admission to their respective programs. A variety of strategies are used to familiarize candidates with the characteristics they will be expected to demonstrate, including open-ended discussions of the characteristics listed on program PCFFs, written assignments asking candidates to reflect on themselves in relation to the characteristics, and assignments asking candidates to reflect on their growth relative to the characteristics. Most programs work to ensure that PCFFs are completed by individuals who work with the candidates in field experiences as well as in university contexts. All programs employ a system of looking for patterns of low ratings across multiple raters before initiating conversations with candidates regarding difficulties with professional dispositions. We have found our PCFFs to be a very effective tool in helping candidates to understand the characteristics expected of them in their future professions, and to help guide them in the development and shaping of these characteristics.

1g.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' demonstration of professional dispositions? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional dispositions could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

The second documents listed in the 1a5 and 1e4 exhibit lists provide an overview of the follow-up studies that provide the data for prompts 1g4 including the survey name, a brief explanation, the year(s) of data being reported, and the survey response rate. Copies of the survey instruments along with complete data reports can be found as links in the 1a5 and 1e4 exhibit lists. Responses from employers of graduates of both the elementary and secondary programs indicate that employers agree or strongly agree that UAF graduates recognize and affirm the diversity within their classrooms and communicate
effectively with students’ families and with community members around the classroom and the school. Responses from employers of M.Ed. program graduates indicate that they are confident or somewhat confident in their employees’ ability to be self-reflective, critical thinkers; take appropriate professional risks; be resilient and flexible in their professional practices and based professional practice on the recognition that all individuals can learn. Elementary and secondary program completers, after entering the workforce, report that, as a majority, they are confident or somewhat confident in their ability to recognize the legal and ethical responsibilities of their profession; develop positive, cooperative relationships with colleagues; communicate effectively with students’ families and with the community; and maintain membership in professional organizations. M.Ed. program graduates indicate that they somewhat agree that they understand the general ethical principles of doing research with humans; and know what an IRB is and why it exists. Elementary program completers indicated that the most important program assignments contributing to their growth in professional dispositions were the three week full time student teaching experience and documentation, the log of collaboration with families, community and colleagues and the development of a parent handbook.

1g.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to professional dispositions may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1g1 summary of professional dispositions assessed in individual programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g2 summary and data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g3 summary and data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g4 summary of follow up survey data relative to professional dispositions for all programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g5 Evidence List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 1?

2. What research related to Standard 1 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]
2a. Assessment System

2a.1. How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards?

Candidate proficiencies in all School of Education programs are evaluated relative to the Alaska and UAF School of Education Standards and Performances for Culturally Responsive, Effective Practitioners. As is described in our conceptual framework, the proficiencies used as the basis for all major program assessments reflect a merge of the proficiencies identified by School of Education faculty and those articulated in the Alaska Teacher Standards. Both the proficiencies identified in the conceptual framework and those delineated in the Alaska Teacher Standards were determined following multiple meetings among various members of the educational community and the community at large. Members of the UAF School of Education served on committees with teachers and other individuals from around the state to finalize the contents of the eight Alaska Teacher Standards which, in addition to providing a backbone for our programs, are also used throughout the state to assess the performance of practicing teachers in Alaska's public schools. The Guidelines for Preparing Culturally-Responsive Teachers for Alaska Schools, published by the Alaska Native Knowledge Network, also involved the input of School of Education faculty members, and were referred to extensively when determining candidate proficiencies in our conceptual framework. These “AK/UAF” standards provide the foundation for successful completion of all of our programs, and individual program assessment systems have been developed with these standards as the foundation. This cohesive foundation ensures that all programs fundamentally adhere to the shared vision of our conceptual framework. Over the last six years, all programs have worked through a "backwards mapping" system to develop a program assessment system that meets the needs of their program and adheres to the shared AK/UAF standards. Some programs chose to develop their own program-specific "performance standards" to articulate program expectations relative to the overarching AK/UAF standards (e.g. elementary program "competencies"), while others used the AK/UAF standards as stated. Individual programs looked at the AK/UAF standards, and then looked at the current program assessment strategies, and aligned their assessments with the AK/UAF standards. Where there were "gaps" additional assessments were developed. As a result of this gradual development of standards-based assessments, all UAF School of Education program graduates now have to demonstrate proficiency relative to a shared set of outcomes.

Candidates in all UAF programs, including initial licensure and advanced degree programs, are assessed at a minimum of four points as they progress through their respective programs. The 2a2 attachment at 2a6 shows the various transition points in the elementary licensure, secondary licensure and advanced degree programs. Information on program-level assessments administered at each gate can be found as links in the 2a evidence list and in Standard 1.

Within each program, faculty members have worked to ensure that major assessments â€” particularly those that determine successful completion of the program â€” are aligned with the UAF/AK standards and relevant professional standards. Documentation of the alignment of program assessments with AK/UAF standards and professional standards can be found in SPA reports and as links in the 2a exhibit list. Most notably, the major assessments at the final gate of each initial licensure program are directly based on demonstrating proficiency in each of the eight standards. This assessment is done in the context of preparation of an exit portfolio in the secondary program, and in the successful completion of the summative standards-based assessment system in the elementary programs. Both programs also use a summative fieldwork observation and feedback form that is based on the eight UAF/AK standards.

2a.2. What are the key assessments used by the unit and its programs to monitor and make decisions about candidate performance at transition points such as those listed in Table 6? Please complete Table 6 or upload your own table at Prompt 2a.6 below.
Table 6
Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Entry to clinical practice</th>
<th>Exit from clinical practice</th>
<th>Program completion</th>
<th>After program completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see attached document at 2a6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2a.3. How is the unit assessment system evaluated? Who is involved and how?

The unit assessment system is evaluated both internally and by external stakeholders in multiple ways. Internal evaluation (i.e. evaluation of assessment systems within the School of Education) occurs at the program and unit level on an ongoing basis. The critical assignments and assessments used to determine admissions to programs and to track candidate progress through program transition points are constantly being examined and evaluated. Program faculty meet regularly at faculty meetings and use myriad data sources to consider the efficacy of various program requirements. Examples of the types of data used for program improvements, information on the contexts for data evaluation, and examples of data driven program changes can be found in 2c. Unit level assessment strategies and coordination are considered and examined at monthly full faculty meetings, meetings of the Dean's council, and meetings of the faculty and staff directly involved in the organization and input of data on candidate proficiencies. At least three meetings related to improving overall coordination of data entry occurred in the spring of 2009, one outcome being a unit-wide decision to work collectively to streamline the amount of data currently being collected and aggregated in order to better meet the direct needs of our data reporting requirements.

A list of stakeholders and their role in the external evaluation of our assessment system follows.

- UAF program reviews are completed every 5-6 years. The elementary, secondary and graduate programs will be reviewed again during the 2009-10 academic year. The program review committees are comprised of members of the Fairbanks community, recent graduates, faculty members from other departments at UAF, and School of Education faculty members. The reviews culminate in the submission of a report examining all aspects of program operations, including the program assessment system, and offering a summary of the strengths of the programs and the areas in need of improvement. Program outcomes assessment plans must be approved by the Office of the Provost. Yearly reports are submitted with data on student progress relative to stated outcomes. Outcomes assessment reports ensure that all programs collect, aggregate, and interpret data on a yearly basis. External reviews of program outcomes assessment plans (by the Provost and external accreditors) provide programs with feedback on the quality of their program assessment systems.

- Follow-up surveys with mentor teachers and other fieldwork partners are used to identify program strengths and weaknesses relative to UAF/AK standards and identify areas that mentor teachers and fieldwork partners feel need more attention in preparation programs. Modifications to program assessment systems can be and have been made as a result of examination of these surveys.

- Program completer surveys give us excellent information on the strengths and challenges of our program assessment systems.

- SPA program reviews guide program assessment plan improvement based on development of report, aggregation of data and feedback from the SPA review.

- The 2006 report of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (regional UA accreditation review) highlighted the quality of the SOE's assessment systems.

- The rigorous 2007 State of AK Legislative Audit of the UAF School of Ed found that "the SOE has consistently followed its admission requirements for its student teaching programs."
2a.4. How does the unit ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?

Please see the attached document titled 2a4 Strategies to ensure fairness, accuracy, consistency and elimination of bias for a complete description of unit procedures to ensure fairness, accuracy, consistency and elimination of bias.

2a.5. What assessments and evaluation measures are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments of unit operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. UAF program reviews by internal and external examiners: Reports are submitted to the UAF Provost and then reviewed by faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (regional accreditation): Data compiled at unit level for regional accreditation review (last completed in 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Faculty annual reports and department head or dean response: All faculty members are required to complete an annual activities report, which is reviewed and responded to by the Dean or Dept Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Evaluations of Instruction (surveys): Data compiled bi-annually and reviewed at individual, program and unit level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Periodic evaluation of the Dean facilitated by the Office of the Provost (as directed by the UAF Faculty Senate): Completed by a committee of faculty and administrators under the auspices of the Provost's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. AACTE PEDS report: Submitted annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Title II report: Submitted annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. UA (statewide) Annual Unit Report and Enrollment Management Report: Dean generates reports using budget and enrollment data from SOE documents and UA Office of Planning and Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Accountability and oversight reports requested by the State of Alaska: Periodically, a review of unit operations is requested at the state level. In 2007, the SOE was audited by the Legislative Audit Committee. In 2008, the Alaska State Legislature passed Senate Bill 241 requiring the UA Board of Regents to deliver a report on &quot;Alaska's University for Alaska's Schools&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments of programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Specialized Professional Association program reviews: Comprehensive reviews of individual programs for NCATE accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. UAF program reviews by internal and external examiners (completed every 5-6 years): Reports are submitted to the UAF Provost and then reviewed by faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Annual &quot;Outcomes Assessment&quot; reports submitted to the UAF Office of the Provost for each program: Outcomes assessment plans are approved by the Office of the Provost. Yearly reports are submitted with data on student progress relative to stated outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Candidate admissions and transition point data on knowledge, skills and dispositions: Program level data from admissions and individual program assessment plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Program follow-up survey for UAF SOE graduates in the workforce: Electronic survey sent out to previous two years' of program completers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Survey of program graduate employers: Electronic survey sent out to administrators at schools that are currently employing program graduates from the previous two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Follow-up surveys with mentor teachers and other fieldwork partners or supervisor/ liaisons: Paper or electronic surveys relative to program quality, organization and effectiveness distributed to mentor teachers and other K-12 fieldwork partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Program completion/ exit survey: Paper or electronic survey distributed to all program completers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Analysis of hiring data from State DOEED: Acquired from DOEED on an annual basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2a.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's assessment system may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a2 Table of Transition Points and Key Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a4 Strategies to ensure fairness, accuracy, consistency and elimination of bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a6 Exhibit List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

2b.1. What are the processes and timelines used by the unit to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, unit operations, and program quality?

- How are the data collected?
- From whom (e.g., applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty) are data collected?
- How often are the data summarized and analyzed?
- Whose responsibility is it to summarize and analyze the data? (dean, assistant dean, data coordinator, etc.)
- In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? (reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)
- What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?

The first two documents attached at 2b4 provide a comprehensive response to the multiple components of this prompt. The first of the two documents is the result of a year-long effort to systematically document "what we are keeping track of in the School of Education and how we keep track of it." The UAF SOE Data Collection Table provides detailed information on the data we are systematically collecting, who is responsible for the collection of the data, how often it is collected, aggregated and summarized, where the data are stored (server location, physical location, etc.), what form it is in (e.g. Excel spreadsheet, hard copy, etc.), who typically uses the data, what it is used for, approximately how many years worth of data we have easy access to, and the name and job title of the individual to contact for access to the data. The data has been categorized (first column) by level (candidate, program, unit, faculty), program (elementary, secondary, counseling M.Ed., other M.Ed.), and purpose (admissions, to monitor candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions (KSD), evaluation of programs or unit, operations of programs or unit).

The second document, Timeline for Collection and Review of Data, provides a summary of the primary types of data collected, the strategies for collection of that data, who is responsible for collecting the data (which programs), when it will be collected, the time frame and context for a systematic review of the data (e.g. what meetings and when), and the years in which data collection will occur.

Several information technologies are used to maintain our unit assessment system. Individual program data, and most other data are maintained in Excel spreadsheets. Summaries and pivot tables are used to generate aggregated data reports. Several follow-up surveys of program completers, graduates in the workforce, and fieldwork partners have been disseminated and summarized using SurveyMonkey. We have recently begun developing new and improved program level databases using an off-the-shelf...
version of FileMakerPro as an alternative to the many Excel spreadsheets that each program now uses. We are working to develop and share templates for our data (e.g., gates/transition data from each of our programs), and we have already had several workshops with faculty and staff to allow us to take more ownership in using FileMakerPro in ways that will meet our program and unit data needs. We had hoped to have a comprehensive database designed to manage almost all of our program and unit data fully operational by 2009, but despite multiple attempts over the past seven years and a great deal of financial investment, we do not yet have the comprehensive database we had hoped for. For a description of our efforts and challenges to develop a comprehensive database please see the document linked in the 2b4 evidence list titled Comprehensive Database Development Challenges.

2b.2. How does the unit disaggregate candidate assessment data for candidates on the main campus, at off-campus sites, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs?

All data collected for initial licensure programs (elementary and secondary) is keyed at the individual (candidate) level as "on campus" (i.e. in Fairbanks) or "off campus" (i.e. completing program via distance delivery). Aggregated data for initial licensure programs is separated by on campus and distance delivered cohorts. All SPA report data was disaggregated into on campus and distance delivered cohorts. When data are examined at elementary and secondary program faculty meetings, the data are presented disaggregated by on campus and distance delivered cohorts. For the purposes of simplicity, some of the initial licensure candidate data presented in standard one (e.g. data on candidate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills) has been aggregated and a summary is shown for the elementary and the secondary programs as a whole. This was done because the individual numbers in some cohorts (e.g. distance delivered BAE candidates) are quite small and there was no statistically significant differences between the on campus and distance delivered data. If it is requested, it would be simple to disaggregate those data in to on campus and distance delivered data because, as was noted, it was initially designated as such when entered at the individual level.

All data collected for the counseling MEd program is keyed at the individual level as "on campus" or "distance delivery." Comprehensive data reports for the counseling MEd program reflect data that is aggregated for on campus and distance delivery and for the program as a whole. Data from other M.Ed. program graduates is not disaggregated as other M.Ed. candidates have the option of completing some of their courses via distance delivery, but there is no distinction between an "on campus" and "off campus/distance delivery" cohort.

2b.3. How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?

We are fortunate in the UAF School of Education to have programs that are small enough to allow us to know each one of our program candidates on an individual basis. The familiarity and ongoing contact with our students allows us to typically circumvent difficulties before they occur. Concerns and complaints about all aspects of our programs are most often dealt with and resolved at an informal level. When concerns arise, program candidates typically contact the instructor or fieldwork supervisor most closely related to the concern. If the issue cannot be resolved at that level, the concern is then taken to the level of the program head or department chair, who meets with the individual and typically another faculty member who is familiar with the concern. If the concern goes beyond this level, it is then addressed by the dean, who meets with the candidate and faculty member involved. In the past five years, all but a handful of concerns have been successfully addressed within the School of Education.

When a candidate's concerns are not adequately resolved within the School of Education, the candidate has the option of then filing a formal complaint, which is done in the context of the policies set out in the UAF student handbook. Approximately four such complaints have been filed in the past five years from School of Education candidates. 3 were resolved within the SOE and one was resolved through a judicial hearing facilitated by the UAF judicial officer. Records of complaints that include the
department chair and reach the level of the dean are kept in the individual files of the candidates, along with documentation of their resolutions. Records of complaints that enter the UAF formal complaint system (and their subsequent resolutions) are kept in the Office of Student Affairs for UAF as well as in candidate files in the Dean's Office in the School of Education. See the 2b Evidence list for a link to the UAF Grade Appeals Policy.

2b.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit’s data collection, analysis, and evaluation may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UAF SOE Data Collection Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline for collection and review of data in the UAF School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b4 Exhibit List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

2c.1. In what ways does the unit regularly and systematically use data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences?

The document 2c1: Use of Data for Program Improvement (attached at 2c5) summarizes the ways in which the School of Education uses data to evaluate and initiate changes in courses, programs and clinical experiences. The document Timeline for the Collection and Review of Data (attached at 2b4) indicates the time frame and context for data review.

2c.2. What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years?

Please see the attached document "2c2 summary of data driven changes in the last three years"

2c.3. What access do faculty members have to candidate assessment data and/or data systems?

A comprehensive chart attached at 2b4 (UAF SOE Data Collection Table) was compiled this year detailing what data is being collected in the School of Education, who is collecting it, how often it is collected, where the information is stored, what form the information is in (hard copy, data base, etc.), how many years worth of data are available, and the person (name and job title) to contact for access to data. This document has been shared with faculty at full faculty meetings, has been made available to all faculty on the shared server, and has been distributed electronically to all faculty. Faculty members within individual programs are regularly provided with data relative to program operations, quality and evaluation in the context of program faculty meetings. Faculty members submit data on individual coursework and assignments to program coordinators for entry into program candidate assessment systems. Aggregated data and assessment reports are available to faculty on the UAF School of Education shared drive.

2c.4. How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders to help them reflect on and improve their performance and programs?

Programs in the UAF School of Education strive to make their assessment procedures as transparent as possible. Candidates know the criteria on which they will be assessed for critical assignments, and the
results of their assessments are typically returned to them directly. Candidates can keep track of their progress through their respective programs using the program transition point documents and rubrics, which are made available to candidates either on the School of Education website or in the program handbooks. Candidates are notified if remediation is required in relation to critical program requirements and the initial licensure programs have documented systems to develop plans of improvement to address areas of difficulty during the internship year.

As described in 2c3, program faculty are provided with summarized data reports relative to admissions, candidate performance and follow-up surveys at program faculty meetings, and have access to disaggregated candidate data on an as-needed basis. Data relative to unit operations (e.g. information such as that described in 2a5) are shared with faculty at full faculty meetings, or with the Dean's Council meeting as the reports are made available and as the need arises.

Data on unit and program performance are shared with and made available to a variety of other stakeholders, including the Office of the Provost (in yearly outcomes assessment reports), the State of Alaska (e.g. in the SB 241 report and the Legislative Audit mentioned in 2a5 and 2c1), the Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER), and the local school district.

2c.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the use of data for program improvement may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2c1 Use of data for program improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2c2 Summary of Data Driven Changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 2?

2. What research related to Standard 2 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

STANDARD 3. FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]
3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

3a.1. Who are the unit's partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?

The unit collaborates and responds to both rural remote areas with majority Alaska Native populations and urban areas with diverse populations. We are committed to preparing professional educators who are culturally responsive, effective practitioners regardless of the location. Such collaboration is evident in the relationship that has been developed with our many school partners ranging from the Fairbanks schools where the University is physically located to the remaining school districts around Alaska. Collaboratively we design, deliver, and evaluate candidates in initial licensure programs and advanced programs.

Throughout the elementary undergraduate, the elementary and secondary post-bac programs, and the counseling program our partners regularly provide written and oral feedback that is used to design and develop programs. At the end of the internship year, mentors identify program strengths and weaknesses. Informal feedback is received on an on-going basis during seminars with mentors, phone calls or electronic communications. Such feedback has resulted in changes to the fieldwork requirements, internship calendars and schedules, assessment procedures, and specific program guidelines. For example, in response to the need for substitute teachers in Fairbanks and other districts, candidates are permitted to substitute for pay in the schools where they are placed. Employers of our former students who are surveyed also provide feedback. We have also worked with school partners so that candidates can access district resources/materials and participate in electronic communications. Another example of working with our partners to design and evaluate programs resulted in negotiated release time for elementary mentor teachers to work with faculty in a daylong workshop.

At the secondary level, principals devote an evening to conduct candidate interviews. As interns, candidates may spend a week in a remote community during which time they observe, teach, and dialogue with educators, students, and community members. The unit works with Alaska school districts during the Alaska Teacher Job Fair where candidates are interviewed and where the exchange of informal feedback with administrators provides ongoing assessments and suggestions. Recognizing that successful observations of and interactions with professional educators and counselors enable the unit to prepare highly qualified professionals who are able to help diverse learners to be successful, all programs closely support our cadre of exceptional teachers and mentors.

Candidates in the counseling program learn from and with highly regarded and qualified faculty supervisors and site supervisors who guide the internship in either a school or an agency setting. Informal and formal feedback provides direction for modifications.

Data found in our program SPA reports and in Standard 1 provide evidence that we work with our school partners to design and evaluate programs.

3a.2. In what ways have the unit's partners contributed to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?

In response to feedback from our school partners and former candidates, our field and clinical experiences are designed to provide teacher candidates with structured and sequential opportunities to work with students in authentic educational settings or in the case of some students in the counseling program, with community agencies. While enrolled in each of the eight elementary BAE education foundation courses, education candidates must devote 15-20 hours per course over the span of the
semester engaged in activities permitting one to apply theoretical content to actual practice. Candidates work under the supervision of a qualified educator to observe and participate in pedagogically sound practice. Undergraduate elementary candidates must successfully complete at least 114 hours of fieldwork experiences in order to pass the foundation courses. Specific requirements are described in our criteria for advancement (Transitions) for each program.

As the culminating clinical practice, undergraduate and post-bac elementary and secondary candidates complete a comprehensive yearlong internship working under the direct supervision of a mentor teacher in an elementary classroom or in the appropriate content area for the secondary endorsement. Candidates follow the teacher's calendar and work closely with mentor teachers and university faculty to develop and refine effective teaching skills. Assessments completed by the mentors, faculty, and university supervisors track the candidates success toward demonstrating that they have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed. Elementary mentor teachers are required and secondary mentor teachers are encouraged to enroll in a yearlong professional development class with interns and internship coursework instructors where mentors provide oral and written feedback to the interns and university faculty. The university supervisors and the Director of the Office of Fieldwork regularly visit with school administrators, mentors, and interns and therefore are privy to additional feedback. All mentors are surveyed regarding what they consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the program and as a result, changes are instituted.

In the counseling program input regarding internship design and delivery has been gathered from site supervisors via evaluation forms and interviews. Based on this feedback additions have been made to the internship manual regarding the clinical placement of candidates to include an interview with the site supervisor.

Candidates at the advanced level complete fieldwork experiences usually within the school or agency where they are employed. Changes to the M.Ed. programs result from input from the candidates, employers, and university faculty. The M.Ed. Handbook details many of these changes. Data found in our program SPA reports and in Standard 1 provide evidence that we engage our school partners at all levels in the design and assessment of programs.

3a.3. What are the roles of the unit and its school partners in determining how and where candidates are placed for field experiences, student teaching, and internships?

The Director of Fieldwork with faculty input works with school partners in rural and urban sites to ensure that candidates have opportunities to work with diverse populations in a variety of fieldwork settings. Selections are based upon recommendations from the building administrators, teacher willingness to participate, prior experiences working with education students, grade level/content area expertise, and the location and accessibility of the school site. The Criteria for Site Selection and Criteria for Selection of Mentor Teacher include specific criteria used by each program. Students are surveyed prior to placements as to the type of school setting to which they have not been exposed during earlier fieldwork. Data included in the Summary of BAE Fieldwork Placements indicate that 92% have completed fieldwork in at least 4 different sites. The remaining 8% consists of candidates in rural communities where accessibility to alternate school sites is not available. Many candidates have opportunities to work with different teachers with the exception of very small schools with little teacher turnover and are also able to network and interact with peers and instructors from around the state. A letter from the instructor defines the coursework expectations.

Mentors for the yearlong internship for both the elementary BAE candidates and the Post-bac elementary and secondary licensure candidates are selected based upon all of the criteria described
above with the addition of feedback from former interns. The mentor must have the appropriate teaching license and the professional and pedagogical skills and dispositions to serve as an effective role model.

Prior to recommendations for placement, faculty review each applicant’s file, individual preferences, and program/course availability in schools. The Secondary Department Chair and/or the Director of Office of Fieldwork visit with building administrators to negotiate placements. Discussions focus upon strengths/weaknesses of the mentor teachers, course load for the coming year, and extraneous factors that might impact the intern’s placement. Each prospective administrator and mentor teacher is given an intern packet that includes a letter of introduction or autobiography/resume from the intern and/or a copy of the intern’s preparatory coursework at the secondary level. Once consensus is reached the candidate meets with the potential mentor.

Counseling faculty meet with the candidate to discuss his/her main interest area before talking with potential site supervisors to determine site eligibility. After meeting with all candidates and site supervisors, UAF faculty match candidates and site supervisors to determine the best fit. Candidates meet with their respective site supervisors to ensure the appropriateness of the placement. Procedures are described in the handbook for each program.

3a.4. How do the unit and its school partners share expertise and resources to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice?

The unit works closely with its school partners to ensure that all candidates have the opportunity to learn from experienced practitioners in the field as well as from faculty with expertise in content, most of whom have teaching experiences in the areas in which they are teaching. Orientation for university faculty, mentors, and interns is scheduled face-to-face or via audioconference where protocol, expectations, formative and summative assessments, and other similar items are shared. Faculty also meet with mentors and interns during the required (elementary) or optional, (secondary) professional development course for mentors (ED 593) to share techniques and strategies to increase student learning. Working collaboratively with the Fairbanks school district, candidates are provided access to the Media Center, Art Center, Electronic Resource Library and are given an e-mail address for inclusion in district communications and to request specific resource materials. All candidates regardless of location participate in professional development activities, in service programs, and occasionally participate in professional development courses for teachers developed by University faculty or school district personnel and offered for educators at rural remote sites. Manipulatives including science materials are provided to candidates at distance sites to further ensure that all candidates have access to the same instructional resources. Our technology faculty provide assistance and support services to all candidates and faculty. Many resources are available to share with interns for their use in the individual classrooms ranging from sets of classroom computers, to electronic microscopes and digital musical software.

Candidates at the advanced level including counseling work with faculty and their employers or site supervisors who share expertise and collaboratively plan how to best meet the needs of the student and adult learners with whom they work. Several times throughout the internship, the supervisors, site supervisors, and candidates meet as a group to discuss the experience and share information, resources, and expertise. Candidates are also granted access to school district materials through the site supervisor, the school district lending resource library, and/or through the resources of the community agency where the candidate is placed.

3a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to collaboration between unit and school partners may be attached here. [Because BOE members
3a5 Exhibit List

See Attachments panel below.

3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3b.1. What are the entry and exit requirements for clinical practice?

The unit has systematically developed clinical practice experiences to adhere to professional standards established by UAF, Alaska, and national professional associations. Entrance and exit criteria are delineated in our transition plans for each program and included in each program handbook. Criteria strongly support and reflect our mission to prepare effective educators who can help all students learn. The capstone clinical experience for the elementary and secondary programs is a yearlong internship during which time the candidate is placed in a classroom at the appropriate level or content area with a qualified and licensed mentor. Applicants complete comprehensive application packets, meet with the admissions committee and receive a Preliminary Guide for the Internship year including pertinent information for the particular school district where the intern is placed. To complete the internship and the respective programs, candidates must meet all competencies at an acceptable or target level, receive summative assessments that document successful completion, and successfully fulfill all coursework requirements that provide evidence that the candidate meets the established professional standards.

The Counseling candidates must have completed the core Counseling classes and have permission from the faculty supervisor to begin the internship. The faculty supervisor reviews the candidate’s file and meets with the candidate to discuss their main interest area in order to find a corresponding site placement. A final meeting is conducted at the end of the internship to review the placement, the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses, and discuss any changes that may be needed in the future. The site supervisor completes an evaluation of the intern as well as a PCFF, which is then reviewed with the intern. The candidate completes all paperwork including a log of hours and must receive a grade of B or higher in order to graduate from the Counseling program.

Candidates in advanced programs must be admitted to the Graduate School, successfully complete all coursework, and defend either a research-based thesis or an action research project. Because the majority are employed, required clinical experiences usually take place in the school or work site where employed.

All transition points are described in the criteria for advancement in each of the program handbooks with data included in the SPA reports and in Standard 2 of the IR.

3b.2. What field experiences are required for each program or categories of programs (e.g., secondary) at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels, including graduate programs for licensed teachers and other school professionals? What clinical practice is required for each program or categories of programs in initial teacher preparation programs and programs for the preparation of other school professionals? Please complete Table 7 or upload your own table at Prompt 3b.9 below.

Table 7
Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Field Experiences</th>
<th>Clinical Practice (Student Teaching or Internship)</th>
<th>Total Number of Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education BAE for initial licensure K-8</td>
<td>Field experiences required for 8 foundation ed courses include observations, work with individual learners, and small and large group activities in diverse settings. Total: 115 Hours minimum</td>
<td>Year-long internship including a two week school/grade/mentor exchange, and participation in all inservice activities. Total: ~900 hours</td>
<td>~1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education Post Baccalaureate for initial licensure K-8</td>
<td>Field experiences or documentation of having worked in schools or with young learners required prior to admission. Total: 20-30 hours</td>
<td>Year-long internship including a two week school/grade/mentor exchange, and participation in all teacher work/inservice activities. Total: ~900 hours</td>
<td>~900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education Post Baccalaureate for initial licensure in content endorsement</td>
<td></td>
<td>One Year-long internship consisting of Fall Semester at part-time in the school, and Spring semester full-time in the classroom. Total: ~800 hours</td>
<td>~800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year long internship consisting of two internship placements required, each with a minimum of 300 hours each.</td>
<td>600 minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other MED's</td>
<td>Structured fieldwork experiences required to complete multiple coursework assignments in candidate's classroom, work place, or related setting. Specific number of hours varies.</td>
<td>Master's Project ~250 hours</td>
<td>250 minimum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3b.3. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards through field and clinical experiences in initial and advanced preparation programs?

The unit works collaboratively across programs to develop expectations and assessments of field and clinical practice that closely reflect and support the vision and mission as laid out in the Conceptual Framework. All programs are designed to incorporate and follow the recommendations and standards that Alaska has established for teachers, standards from the national professional organizations as outlined in the SPA reports, while integrating content standards established for Alaska’s students. For example, the ESSAP assessment system integrates UAF, State and ACEI standards.

During the required fieldwork experiences prior to the internship year, elementary candidates systematically complete university coursework and fieldwork progressing from shadowing an intern to working with students with exceptional needs. Instructors and mentors complete a Professional Characteristics Feedback Form (PCFF) assessing the dispositions of the candidate. Candidates must meet all criteria set forth in the Criteria for Advancement (i.e., the Transitions) to begin the internship.

Candidates as elementary or secondary interns work with a mentor teacher, while also completing professional coursework that focuses on the integration and application of theory, research, and practice in real school settings. Candidates are matched with teachers who not only have the appropriate teaching certifications, but also the professional and pedagogical skills and dispositions to serve as effective role models and mentors. Mentors and supervisors provide oral and written feedback and complete specific assessment instruments at designated times. University supervisors, all experienced teachers, conduct formal and informal classroom observations and maintain regular contact with candidates through school visits, email, phone, etc. Individual conferences are scheduled as the need arises and may result in a plan of improvement or removal from the program. Because of the caliber of mentor teachers, supervisors, and instructors candidates not only see effective teaching modeled, but are also able to learn.
from and with professionals who base their instruction upon adhering to the standards that form the framework for our programs.

Rubrics for assessments of proficiencies are specific and aligned with content, pedagogy, and professional behaviors. All candidates must meet critical assignments at the target of acceptable levels in order to successfully complete program requirements. Assessment instruments are included in the Elementary and Secondary Internship Year Handbooks provided to interns, mentor teachers, and supervisors. Orientation sessions where expectations and responsibilities are discussed are conducted at the beginning of each internship year.

Counseling candidates are evaluated in the internship placements by their site supervisors and university supervisors regarding their proficiencies and development. PCFF forms and additional assessment forms are found in the handbook for counseling and are completed by UAF faculty and site supervisors for each candidate. The American Counseling Association Code of Ethics establishes professional standards that the candidates must follow throughout the internship.

Candidates at the advanced level are also required to meet state and professional standards while adhering to the mission of the unit. Assessment forms and policies are found in the handbook for M.Ed. candidates.

3b.4. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences and clinical practice?

The unit is committed to preparing candidates to work successfully with contemporary learners in today's schools. To this end technology is integrated into all coursework at the elementary and secondary levels. Post-Baccalaureate candidates are required to demonstrate proficiency prior to beginning the internship year either through testing out of or successfully completing ED 237 Technology Tools for Teachers, which consists of modules focusing on such areas as PowerPoint, developing websites, Excel and spreadsheets, Inspiration, etc. Elementary BAE candidates must also complete ED 329 Teaching with Technology as a prerequisite for ED 237. All candidates must have a laptop computer with specific capabilities to use for instructional purposes in university course work and in the internship classroom. Lesson plans must document the use of a variety of websites and technology based instructional strategies to reinforce and enhance student learning. Many instructors are "paperless" and require that all assignments be submitted electronically. Several course instructors utilize E-Live, BlackBoard, and Blogs to support class delivery.

Technology is emphasized in nearly all facets of the secondary candidates' clinical experiences and university coursework. In addition to successful completion of ED 237 Technology Tools for Teachers, candidates must successfully complete an electronic portfolio and include required technology elements in several of the standards. As a major component of the rural practicum experience, interns who spend a week at a remote rural school establish and maintain a blog documenting their experiences for instructors and classmates who did not participate.

Not all counseling students are required to use technology in their field placements. However, secondary school counselors are required to utilize course scheduling and registration tools that vary depending on their site placement. UAF faculty regularly use videoconferencing for class instruction and candidate presentations throughout the internship. Candidates at the advanced level participate in seminars and classes utilizing videoconferencing and audioconferencing technology and compile research and project presentations that utilize technology to both analyze and present data. Because candidates are usually working within a school or an agency, the frequency and depth of the use of technology may be dependent upon the availability and support from the site.
University faculty are provided laptops with appropriate software and professional development workshops (We Teach, Using Blogs, Working with E-Live, etc.) specifically designed for educational instruction. One member of the technology staff splits his time between the SOE and the SOE computer lab every day so assistance is easily accessed by faculty and staff. All candidates and faculty have access to the expertise and resources of the SOE technology lab and the UAF Office of Information Technology.

3b.5. What criteria are used in the selection of school-based clinical faculty? How are the criteria implemented? What evidence suggests that school-based clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals?

Our university supervisors are faculty members who work with university instructors to implement our elementary and secondary programs. Mentors and cooperating teachers are not designated as clinical faculty, but function as our school-based partners.

In the elementary and secondary programs and in the counseling program, supervisors and most of the faculty who work with candidates during the internships are highly qualified, experienced former classroom teachers and/or counselors. Supervisors are required to observe and conference with interns and mentors regularly and as needed. For this reason, educators are selected based upon their prior service as teachers, as mentors for former candidates, and their willingness to work with university faculty to promote the development of highly qualified future educators. They participate in weekly and/or monthly program faculty meetings, contribute to the design, revision, and implementation of program features, observe and assess candidates in the classroom, and serve as members of admissions and assessment committees. Interns and mentors complete assessments of the quality of supervision at the conclusion of the internship.

On-site supervisors of counseling candidates work closely with the university counseling faculty to share supervisory responsibilities on a regular basis. The on-site supervisor must have a Master’s level degree and certificate in counseling or a closely related discipline (i.e., Social Work), 2 years experience at the site and must be willing and able to provide opportunities for the candidate to practice required competencies.

Candidates at the advanced level are licensed teachers or work as educators in related fields. Required clinical experiences usually take place in the school or work site where employed. Faculty instructors and advisors and employers collaborate with the candidate when specific adjustments are needed, such as visiting another classroom or another school or work site.

3b.6. What preparation do school-based faculty members receive for their roles as clinical supervisors?

Supervisors and site supervisors for counseling work in partnership with instructional faculty in the preparation of teacher and counselor candidates. We realize that as the teacher preparation program, we bear the responsibility to ensure that each candidate is proficient in the skills necessary to be an effective educator, however through collaboration with our mentors and supervisors we can enable our candidates to develop skills and understandings for becoming the best educators possible. University faculty provide details of assignments and invite comments and questions. Through formal and informal sharing of techniques and strategies mentors and university faculty are better able to assist the candidates.
Orientation sessions are conducted for mentors, university faculty, and candidates near the beginning of the internship year. Handbooks are distributed to all participants and are available on the internship year Blackboard site. University faculty meet with mentor teachers and administrators to discuss and share responsibilities and expectations throughout the year. Sessions that encourage collaboration also tend to quell confusion and misunderstandings, and permit us to respond to ideas and suggestions.

The unit provides professional development for supervisors and instructional faculty through program orientation sessions, monthly program-level faculty meetings, regular communication via e-mail, and audioconferences, or face-to-face conferences. Through the unit's travel fund, supervisors and faculty may apply for grants to attend state and national conferences, statewide education summits, and local agency conferences. Additional professional development activities include technology workshops, participation in school district in-service activities, Brown Bag series where research is shared, and participation in university presentations and activities.

3b.7. What evidence demonstrates that clinical faculty members provide regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing graduate programs, and other school professionals?

The unit is committed to guiding and directing the growth and development of each candidate to ensure that our graduates are professionals who are culturally responsive effective practitioners. Because we are a small unit, we are able to individually assess each candidate’s progress from the beginning of the internship year until the conclusion. Elementary, Secondary, and Counseling university faculty meetings regularly include a time to discuss the ongoing assessment of each intern with special attention given to any individual requiring additional attention. Through shared responsibility, each faculty member is able to respond to the needs of the candidates. Supervisors provide regular and continuous support to the intern and mentor.

Assessments are an essential component of the internship year in all programs. Many assessments are completed collaboratively by university faculty and mentors or site supervisors and consist of formative and summative assessments. Each program specifies the minimum number of assessments and visits to be completed, regularly scheduled contact such as e-mail, telephone, audio or video conferencing, and face-to-face conferences with the supervisor and mentor teacher. At each step of the assessment process, provisions are made for the intern to demonstrate competency. Often, this may result in a plan of improvement with specific instructions to be met or in some instances, it may result in an extension or cancellation of the internship. Evaluations are shared with the intern, as the intent is to collaboratively provide the assistance needed.

Candidates in the advanced programs work under the guidance of their graduate committees and university coursework faculty. Building administrators or site administrators work closely with the candidate to determine that the candidate has the support needed to complete tasks and a research or action research project.

3b.8. What structured activities involving the analysis of data and current research are required in programs for other school professionals?

The counseling program prepares candidates to function as school counselors or as counselors working with a variety of agencies. It is offered both on campus and by distance delivery to all areas of the state. All candidates are required to complete a specific set of varied research-based activities throughout the program and must demonstrate that they can function as both a scholar and as a practitioner. Each
A counseling course requires candidates to successfully complete a critical assignment such as a research-based theory paper on childhood development as a part of Counseling 628. Candidates must include a critical analysis of a minimum of 10 current sources to complete the assignment. For the culminating experience in Counseling 646, candidates design and present a comprehensive school counseling program. As a part of the transition to exit from the program, candidates must complete a comprehensive exam addressing nine required fields from theories to application. To further provide opportunities for the analysis of current research data, candidates complete a required research project or a thesis. Data specific to the research project or thesis is found in the Counseling Graduates Gate Table in standard 3.c. Summaries of the data are found in Standards 1.e. All transition points are listed and defined in Standard 2.a.

3b.9. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

3c. Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

3c.1. On average, how many candidates are eligible for clinical practice each semester or year? What percent, on average, complete clinical practice successfully?

Over the past 3 years, an average of 33 elementary candidates were eligible for clinical practice each year. Of the total 99 eligible candidates, 16 did not begin the internship, withdrew during the year, or did not finish for a completion rate of 85%. Candidates must meet all requirements at a target or acceptable level in order to proceed. Using a developmental approach permits us to work with individual candidates who do not meet expectations through either providing a specific plan of improvement or exiting from the program.

The secondary program admitted an average of 40 candidates who were eligible for clinical practice per year for the last 3 years. Of the total 119 eligible candidates, 24 did not complete for a completion rate of 80%. Candidates may choose to complete either a one or two year option.

The counseling program had an average of 32 candidates eligible for each internship year during the last 3 years. Of the total admitted, 94% completed successfully and 34 graduated. Candidates must meet all competencies at an acceptable level, complete a written comprehensive, and prepare and defend a research project/study. Candidates’ progress in the advanced program is tracked by marking their fulfillment of the Graduate School’s admissions requirements and subsequent completion of the degree within the 7-year time frame. Although all candidates do not proceed at a consistent pace, an average of 59 candidates per year were admitted and an average of 27 candidates per year were granted a degree over the last 3 years for an average of 46% completers.

3c.2. What are the roles of candidates, university supervisors, and school-based faculty in assessing candidate performance and reviewing the results during clinical practice?
Accountability is essential to prepare candidates who are culturally responsive effective practitioners as set forth in our Conceptual Framework. Candidates, university supervisors, and school-based partners share responsibility for continuous and on-going assessments. Candidates in the elementary and secondary programs participate in self-reflection, establish personal goals, and share feedback with peers through peer assessments. University supervisors and mentors observe the candidates in the classroom and complete a specific minimum number of formative and summative evaluations beginning in the first semester of the internship and concluding during the spring semester. University supervisors meet with candidates to debrief following each observation during which time they discuss their feedback, complete the appropriate evaluation instrument, and provide a non-threatening forum for self-reflection. If schedules permit, the mentor also participates as a part of the post-conference. Three-way conferences are required at the beginning, middle, and end of the internship year. Information gathered through faculty assessments and school-based assessments are shared with the university faculty, often through e-mail conversations or during monthly faculty meetings. If difficulties arise, all faculty involved and the university supervisor are consulted to see if a pattern is occurring across the program. A conference with the candidate, the university supervisor, university faculty, the Department Chair, and the Director of Fieldwork may be scheduled. At this time a plan of improvement may be designed to address the difficulty or, if deemed necessary, the candidate may be advised out of the program. The goal of all assessments is to provide feedback and suggestions so that the candidate is able to target weak areas in order to improve.

Site supervisors who work with counseling candidates on a daily basis are able to continuously observe and discuss feedback. UAF faculty supervisors meet 4 times per semester at internship placement sites with candidates and site supervisors in addition to meeting with candidates during weekly class sessions. The university supervisor is dedicated to being responsive to all concerns that the site supervisor may have regarding a candidate in a clinical placement. Candidates provide weekly logs to UAF faculty supervisors regarding their internship activities. Site supervisors collaborate with university faculty to complete formative and summative assessments.

In the advanced degree program, candidates work closely with their university faculty, particularly members of their graduate committees, to determine their advancement through the required coursework and ultimately the direction of their research or action-based research project. Although candidates are not required to fulfill traditional clinical practices experiences, they are responsible for evaluating practices within their classrooms or exploring issues to improve the quality of schooling for the learners with whom they work. The focus of their work is determined by the specific courses in which they are enrolled at any given time. University faculty provide on-going feedback during course instruction, conduct evaluations, and grant a grade based upon criteria established by the instructor.

3c.3. How is time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty incorporated into field experiences and clinical practice?

Being able to accurately assess one's own strengths and weaknesses permits the candidate to design curriculum that positively influences the learners with whom he/she works. BAE Elementary candidates reflect upon field experiences with faculty and classmates during class discussions, written reflections and logs documenting experiences. During the internship year for BAE and Post-Bac elementary and secondary candidates reflection is emphasized as an integral part of every course, critical task, and classroom experience. All lesson plans include a written reflection. Candidates review and provide suggestions and comments to one another during structured peer assessment class sessions. Mentors who work with candidates on a daily basis provide continuous oral and written feedback and complete formative and summative assessments requiring the intern to engage in self-reflection on a daily basis. All assessments are shared with the candidate, with the exception of the PCFF.
Candidates in the counseling program are evaluated on the manner in which they effectively interact with the entire staff as well as other professionals they come in contact with (not just the site supervisor.) Compilation of the evaluation data is shared with the candidate and influences the candidate's overall performance in the internship course. Candidates are expected to evaluate and test philosophies and attitudes within the appropriate context, to assess strengths and weaknesses, and to experience the realities of the counselor role. Candidates must demonstrate the ability to self-reflect during journaling, conferences with supervisors and site supervisors, and class discussions with university faculty and peers. Advanced level candidates reflect as they plan, conduct, analyze, and formally present the impact of their research upon their classroom or agency.

3c.4. What data from multiple assessments provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field experiences and clinical practice?

A multitude of assessments in all programs are used to systematically monitor candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions prior to admission and throughout each program relative to the Alaska, UAF, and the SOE standards. Candidates are assessed at a minimum of three transition points that are described in the Criteria for Advancement Plan for each program.

All programs consider performance-based assessments integral in determining the success of candidates to be positive influences on the learners with whom they work. Data gathered from the elementary FTST Binder review provide further evidence of the individual candidateâ€™s ability to develop and implement instructional materials, teacher work samples, and evaluations of student work that impact on student learning.

Additional data is aggregated from the Elementary SOFF in the ACEI reports under assessment 4. For the secondary program, data collected from the use of Form H is found in the content area SPA reports. Elementary and Secondary candidates submit portfolios as further evidence of the impact of their work. Faculty in the SOE promote and support the belief that a highly qualified educator is one who not only has a deep understanding of academic and pedagogical knowledge, but also has a deep understanding of the cultural, environmental, and emotional context of the students/clients for whom they share responsibility with the family and the community. Rubrics that assess candidatesâ€™ ability to build upon these proficiencies are used by all programs and also used to adapt and modify university curriculum as needed.

Counseling data is included in Standard 1.f.1

At the advanced level the use of research projects, case conceptualization studies, interaction logs, on-site evaluations and the PCFF by faculty, mentor teachers and supervisors document impact on student/client learning. All programs assess candidatesâ€™ ability to help all students learn through the PCFF. Data is found in Standard 1g.2.

Candidates at the advanced level are encouraged by faculty to analyze current educational and content area questions in their work sites and to work with and facilitate student learning through the pursuit of projects that apply and analyze the importance of applying academically sound, research-based and culturally responsive practices. A recent addition to the assessment completed at the candidateâ€™s research defense will provide further evidence of the impact on student learning.

3c.5. What process is used to ensure that candidates collect and analyze data on student
learning, reflect on those data, and improve student learning during clinical practice?

The School of Education strives to ensure that all candidates document their ability to assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and have a positive effect on learning for all students. As a result of using a developmental approach it is expected that all candidates will demonstrate their ability to help all students learn by the time they complete their programs. Much of the focus during the yearlong internships is on the candidates’ ability to design and implement teaching and learning environments that are meaningful and appropriate for the specific population of students. By capitalizing upon the varied and often unique lives and cultural experiences of the students, candidates are able to make strong and lasting impacts on student learning.

All teaching and counseling candidates provide documentation related to their impact on K-12 students. Elementary candidates prepare the ESSAP assessment portfolio that documents work throughout the year. They also complete a Full-Time Student Teaching Binder completed during 3 weeks of spring semester, a Looking At Student Work binder systematically developed during the year that includes student work samples with an analysis by the candidate. Secondary candidates assess students prior to and after instruction as part of their initial work samples including graphs of student growth. In their spring submission units, secondary candidates include samples of student work in response to their instruction. The electronic portfolio further documents the influence of their work with students.

Counseling candidates maintain weekly logs and case notes where they reflect upon the impact of their interactions with students/clients and complete a case conceptualization requiring an in-depth analysis of interactions with a student/client in the field. Due to confidentiality and the nature of the work, candidates do not collect specific work samples from their students/clients; instead, they rely upon observations/perceptions from their supervisors.

At the advanced level, candidates who are licensed and practicing teachers are also expected to use their site to conduct or apply research. Through development of the research project, candidates are encouraged to gather and analyze data reflecting the impact of their work with students. Impact on student learning is required as a component of the project or research defense prior to completion.

3c.6. How does the unit ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice that includes students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups?

The unit is fortunate to be able to place candidates in schools and agencies with diverse populations. The Demographics of Sites for Clinical Practice found in 3.a evidence provides an overview of the districts with whom we work. All of our programs include components that focus directly on issues related to teaching responsively and effectively in a wide variety of cultural and linguistic contexts, with a focus on Alaska Native rural environments.

Fieldwork is structured in such a way that candidates work one-on-one with students, work with small groups, work with individuals with exceptional needs or with other diverse populations, work with different grade levels, and when possible work within different schools. In some rural areas, this is not an option since there is only one K-12 school in the community. However, all candidates, through participation in distance-delivered courses, share information and reflect on their experiences with candidates from all across the state through audio conferences, Blackboard, and e-mail. Candidates at rural sites are encouraged to spend time in other rural and urban communities if possible. Fieldwork experiences, in particular, are designed to ensure that such experiences are meaningfully incorporated into the courses and not merely an additional requirement to be completed. As a part of the elementary and secondary internships, candidates may choose to participate in a week-long rural fieldwork experience. Elementary candidates also complete a 2-3 week exchange with a candidate in a different
Candidates in post-bac initial licensure programs have limited opportunities for fieldwork, but are assessed on their prior experiences with children and experiences in school settings. Candidates who have little or no experience with children or schools are required to complete 20-30 hours of fieldwork with a mentor.

Candidates in advanced programs are most frequently teachers who are currently working in classrooms or with students in school settings and are able to complete fieldwork-based assignments in their own classrooms.

Counseling candidates participate in the yearlong internship working with schools/agencies with diverse populations.

During the past three years, candidates in all programs were placed in a total of 71 schools in 26 school districts. An analysis of the data indicate that each candidate had the opportunity to work with students from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, students with special needs or ELL, as well as students from different ethnic or racial heritages. In setting up placements, a survey of prior placements is used to ensure opportunities to work with students in diverse settings. Over 72% of BAE candidates were placed in at least six different sites.

3c.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 3?

We are pleased with several facets related to Standard 3. Perhaps foremost among these is the success that we have experienced with initiating a yearlong internship for elementary, secondary, and counseling candidates. This structure has elicited positive comments from school districts and from professionals in the field. Our candidates follow the calendar of the school districts and are thus able to experience the school year from start to finish and especially to track the progress of the students with whom they work over the course of an entire school year.

BAE candidates, mentors, building administrators, and university instructors comment favorably on the extensive amount of fieldwork required prior to admission to the internship year.

All programs have designed and implemented fieldwork and clinical practice experiences to be developmental in nature, so that candidates who need additional guidance or time are provided opportunities for improvement. Candidates know precisely what the expectations are for the specific program and understand the criteria used to assess progress through the program. To this end, rubrics have been developed and/or modified to more closely reflect AK, UAF, SOE, and national professional standards, as well as our conceptual framework.
One of the outstanding components of all of our programs is the high quality of the educators with whom we have the opportunity to work. Although placements are sometimes problematic in specific content areas, the majority of our candidates are placed with mentors who willingly agree to work with our candidates. Many of our former graduates are recognized as excellent models for preservice candidates.

Because we are a small unit, we have the privilege of getting to know our candidates well and are better able to match the candidate with a mentor and to work with the candidate to reinforce strengths and overcome challenges.

2. What research related to Standard 3 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

Place-based research is informed through field experiences by current practitioners and interns. The relationship of place, culture and educational experience is an integral component of the UAF SOE mission. Beginning with the emphasis on the uniqueness of Alaskan communities and continuing through field site visits and subsequent employment choices, the connection to place and culture is reinforced throughout our candidates' SOE experiences.

The site of faculty member Laura Henry-Stone's (2008) study, the Effie Kokrine Charter School that opened in 2005 in Fairbanks, was designed within a place-based philosophical and pedagogical framework. Several SOE faculty have collaborated with the Effie Kokrine Charter School. Several supervised field experiences for elementary and secondary education students take place there. Other faculty have been involved in curriculum design, and another serves on the school advisory board and played a crucial role in developing the school's overarching philosophy and curriculum.

Tightly woven into the constructs of place-based, student-centered learning, and learning as a social process, is the equally important construct of culturally responsive education which provides the basis for much of the interest and instruction conducted by the SOE faculty.

STANDARD 4. DIVERSITY

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty; candidates; and students in P-12 schools.

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

4a.1. What proficiencies related to diversity are candidates expected to develop and demonstrate?

Proficiencies related to diversity are embedded in the UAF SOE/AK Teacher Standards. This document
is included with Std 4a exhibits.

Candidate proficiencies related to diversity are listed below.

From Standard 2:
- Providing opportunities for all individuals to learn, no matter their age, race, ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, ability, or exceptionalities
- Assessing and teaching to individual learning preferences, interests, and ways of knowing

From Standard 3:
- Incorporating characteristics of the student's and local community's culture into instructional strategies that support student learning
- Identifying and using instructional strategies and resources that are appropriate to the individual and special needs of students
- Applying knowledge of Alaska history, geography, economics, governance, strategies, materials, and resources
- Demonstrating and promoting respect for cultural, ethnic, racial, and linguistic diversity
- Supporting the rich cultural and linguistic heritage of rural and urban Alaskan communities in their professional lives
- Providing opportunities for all individuals to learn, no matter their age, race, ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, ability, or exceptionalities
- Assessing and teaching to individual learning preferences, interests, and ways of knowing

From Standard 4:
- Applying content within and across disciplines in culturally responsive ways

From Standard 6:
- Demonstrating personal responsibility for the individual's learning
- Striving for equitable outcomes and success for every individual

From Standard 7:
- Connecting, through instructional strategies, the school and classroom activities with students' homes and cultures, work places, and the community.

Individual programs have also developed assessments of professional dispositions (Professional Characteristics Feedback Forms or PCFFs). Complete PCFFs for each program are in the exhibits for Std 4a. The following characteristics from each program's PCFFs are related to diversity:

From the Elementary and Secondary PCFF:
- Promoting equity in learning environment
- Incorporating the diverse backgrounds, knowledge and learning styles of the students into the classroom
- Respectful of colleagues, children and families, and the professional with whom he/she works

From Counseling PCFF:
- The student respects the fundamental rights, dignity, and worth of all people
- The student respects cultural, individual, and role differences, including those due to age, gender, race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, physical ability/disability, language, and socioeconomic status.

From Graduate PCFF:
- Strive for equitable outcomes and success for every student
- Demonstrate respect for students, colleagues, and community members
- Recognize that all individuals can learn, no matter their age, race, ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, abilities or exceptionalities
- Build on the local knowledge within Alaska, particularly those of the Alaska Native communities
- Demonstrate and promote respect for cultural, ethnic, racial and linguistic diversity.

In addition to the above diversity proficiencies, the AK Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools, AK Cultural Standards for Students, Educators, Schools, Curriculum & Communities, (in exhibits for Std 4a) are used in many SOE courses to guide candidates on how to best meet the needs of all students.

4a.2. What required coursework and experiences enable teacher candidates and candidates for other school professional roles to develop:

- awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning; and
- the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to adapt instruction and/or services for diverse populations, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities?

The majority of required education courses include readings and assignments that help prepare candidates for the diverse contexts in Alaska and United States classrooms today. Faculty make a concerted effort to use place-based, culturally appropriate curriculum, pedagogy, and assessments in course and program requirements, and we expect our candidates to do the same in classrooms with their students.

In the undergraduate elementary program, (BAE degree), candidates complete several courses outside the School of Education which focus on issues of diversity (12 credits). Students can also choose to take two semesters (8 credits) of an Alaska Native language to fulfill BAE degree requirements, and can select a diversity focus class for their three-credit upper division English literature requirement.

Undergraduate candidates complete eight courses (22 credits) of foundation education courses before beginning their professional internship year. Three of these courses focus directly on content relative to diversity, and the other five address issues of diversity. Two courses (EDSE 422 and EDSE 482) are special education courses that focus on students with exceptionalities. Candidates can choose from three options for the third diversity content course: ED 350, Communication in Cross-Cultural Classrooms; ANS/ED 420, Alaska Native Education; or ANS 461, Native Ways of Knowing. All of the other required undergraduate foundation courses (Teaching in the 21st Century, Introduction to Education, Literature for Children, Assessment of Learning, and Foundations of Literacy Development) integrate readings and assessments relative to diversity.

When undergraduate elementary candidates begin their professional internship year in the fall, they merge with interns in the elementary post-baccalaureate program and their coursework requirements become identical (except a math and a science course that the post-baccalaureate students can choose to complete at a graduate level). Several critical assignments, summative assessments, portfolio requirements and readings related to diversity during the internship year require candidates to apply what they have learned relative to diversity to classroom practice.

Of the 30 credits of required education courses for secondary licensure, several courses focus specifically on diversity issues. EDSC 414/614, Learning, Development, and Special Needs Instruction,
includes a strong special education component. EDSC 471, Secondary Teaching and School Internship I, requires a special education assignment. In EDSC 457/657, Multi-Cultural Education and School/Community Relations, candidates learn how to adapt instruction and/or services for diverse populations, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities. In EDSC 402, Methods of Teaching in Secondary Schools, lesson plans and work samples require accommodations for special needs students. For EDSC 472, Secondary Teaching and Internship II, units require accommodations for special needs students and evidence of a variety of instructional strategies to accommodate learning styles. Issues of diversity are also addressed in EDSC 458/658, Class Organization and Management, where strategies for creating a positive and equitable learning environment for all students are explored.

Our M.Ed. degree offers an emphasis in Cross-Cultural Education and in Language and Literacy. We work closely with other UAF units to offer several courses with a cross-cultural focus and collaborate with Alaska Native Language Programs, Alaska Native Studies, and the Center for Cross-Cultural Studies. For example, graduate students in the School of Education choose between ED 601, Introduction to Applied Social Science Research, and CCS 601, Documenting Indigenous Knowledge Systems, for one of their required research courses. For the M.Ed. programs (C&I, Language & Literacy, Cross-Cultural Ed.) one approved course (3 credits) in cross-cultural foundations is required. Many graduate students' major projects or theses are related to diversity. Currently 44 projects out of 205 relate to diversity based on the title alone.

The Alaska Native Knowledge Network (ANKN) website is a valuable resource frequently used in education courses throughout all SOE programs. ANKN is designed to serve as a resource for compiling and exchanging information related to Alaska Native knowledge systems and ways of knowing. It is included in the attachments for 4a and the exhibits for standard 4.

In addition to UAF requiring initial licensure and advanced candidates to meet curriculum requirements related to diversity, the state of Alaska requires all prospective teachers to complete three credits in cross-cultural or multicultural coursework and three credits in Alaska studies. Approximately 10 SOE courses meet the state's cross-cultural/multicultural criteria, and other units at UAF offer courses that meet the Alaska studies requirement.

4a.3. What key assessments provide evidence about candidates' proficiencies related to diversity? How are candidates performing on these assessments?

In the elementary program the Professional Characteristics Feedback Form (PCFF) allows individuals who interact with candidates to evaluate their overall professional dispositions using a 3-point scale. Mentors, supervisors and SOE faculty complete PCFFs each semester. Characteristics on the form are directly related to diversity. 2006-2008 PCFF data show the average score for the diversity section was 2.85, meaning the majority of candidates are typically respectful of and committed to meeting the needs of individuals from diverse backgrounds.

In addition to the PCFF, a synthesizing reflection for SOE/AK Std 3, which focuses on respect for students' individual and cultural backgrounds, is another assessment used by the elementary program. For their summative portfolio, candidates include 4 pieces of evidence which demonstrate how they have met each of the 8 SOE/AK Teacher Stds followed by a written reflection relative to their evidence. A review of completed synthesis papers and rubrics for the past 2 yrs shows that all candidates were at an acceptable or target level for their synthesis reflections on all standards. Any candidates receiving an
"unacceptable" rating on any part of this assignment have the opportunity to redo their work to meet the "acceptable" level criteria. The majority of candidates' responses to prompts for Std 3 demonstrated a strong understanding of how to connect instruction to their students' experiences and cultures.

The secondary program uses the same PCFF form as elementary during the internship. Analysis of secondary program 2006-2008 PCFF data shows the average of scores for the diversity section was 2.9 on a 3-point scale. Another assessment in the secondary program, which includes diversity proficiencies, is the final assessment of the fieldwork experience (Form H). This form assesses candidates' performance in all 8 UAF SOE/AK Stds at a target, acceptable, or unacceptable level. Std 3 focuses on respect for students' individual and cultural backgrounds. Supervisors and mentors complete Form H at the end of the last semester and share results with the candidate in a three-way conference. Analysis of Form H Std 3 data from 2006-08 shows 77% at a target level and 23% at an acceptable level.

Throughout the Counseling Program, candidates are evaluated every semester by SOE faculty and site supervisors using a PCFF with a 5-point scale. Several items focus on candidates' skills and abilities working with students/clients from diverse groups. PCFF data shows the vast majority of candidates scoring high on the diversity section with an average score of 4.3 for 2006-08. The Perspective on Cultural Identity paper is another key assessment related to diversity. The purpose of the paper is to have candidates openly reflect upon their own identity development and current worldview to determine its possible impact on their work as a prospective counselor. Data on this assessment from 2006-08 show an average score of 4.3 on a 5-point scale, meaning the majority of candidates were able to openly reflect on their own belief systems and the effect on their work.

The M.Ed. program is in the process of drafting a PCFF assessment, so no data for candidates' performance relative to professional dispositions is available yet. However, all M.Ed. candidates are required to take one multicultural/cross cultural course. 2006-2008 data on grades for these courses show that 83% received an A, 23% a B, and 3% a C or lower.

4a.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to diversity proficiencies and assessments may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

4b.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with higher education and/or school-based faculty from diverse groups?

Our SOE unit and program policies provide opportunities for all UAF candidates to interact in Fairbanks Campus and distance classroom settings, and in school and community settings, with higher education faculty and school and community personnel who are diverse relative to ethnicity, race, socio-economic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area. Undergraduate students, by default, have more opportunities than others because of the significantly longer period of time required for completion of their BA course and fieldwork requirements. They enroll in approximately 26 content courses with faculty from a wide variety of UAF units, and they complete eight fieldwork experiences in diverse school and community contexts from their freshman
year on as described in Standard Three.

Although the student population in the urban and rural schools where our initial and advanced candidates complete their fieldwork and clinical practice requirements is very diverse, there is not a parallel representation among Alaska’s teachers and administrators. The large majority of educators are white, and the largest subgroup is Alaska Native educators at approximately five percent. SOE does recognize the lack of racial and ethnic diversity in educators with whom many of our candidates work, and we continue to work with schools and with Alaska Native and other minority educators to find ways to improve this. In the process of identifying and selecting mentor teachers and counselors, we give priority to those who come from diverse backgrounds and who have had experience in both rural and urban Alaska schools. Many of the school personnel who work with Fairbanks campus candidates have had experience in rural Alaska Native communities.

Distance/off-campus candidates who live in off-the-road rural villages complete their coursework, fieldwork, and clinical practice in school or community settings where there are large percentages of Alaska Native people employed as bilingual instructors, tribal administrators, curriculum developers, bilingual and classroom aides, administrative support staff, librarians, etc. In terms of geographical diversity, all of the school settings in off-the-road communities provide our candidates with opportunities not available anywhere else in the United States. Nearly half of all of our Fairbanks Campus initial licensure candidates participate in a week-long rural practicum in a rural and remote Alaska Native community. The majority of Alaska Native undergraduate candidates who are from small, rural villages come to the Fairbanks campus for at least one year of their program. We purposely designed our BA in Elementary Education degree program to allow for, and encourage, this seamless movement between rural and urban areas because it provides rural Alaska Native candidates with the opportunity to also learn in larger and more diverse urban school settings.

4b.2. What knowledge and experiences do faculty have related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups?

SOE faculty do have both knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups. The KNOWLEDGE is documented in the table listing faculty publications and presentations, and in the development of curriculum materials for applied Alaska school contexts (e.g., development of a Yupiik-based math curriculum, a science and social studies curriculum for small, rural K-12 schools, and a place-based, standards-based 7-10 curriculum for an AK Native charter school). The focus of School of Education faculty scholarship is on teaching, learning and living in situated contexts of Alaska and The North, with special concern for issues of indigeneity, place, identity, culture, language, rural schooling, geographic location and gender. The knowledge base that has developed from the research and experience of current and previous SOE faculty has been instrumental in defining our mission and goals as described in our Conceptual Framework.

In addition to knowledge, SOE faculty have an impressive breadth and depth of EXPERIENCE in diverse school and/or community teaching and learning contexts as documented in a table in 4b.5. Our initial licensure faculty have helped the SOE gain, and maintain, a high level of credibility and accountability with schools and districts throughout the state because of the wide range of experience that faculty have in highly diverse classrooms and because of their ability to link their practice with theory for candidates in licensure programs.

There is a significant number of faculty in other units whose research and publications about diversity issues are recognized nationally and internationally. We work collaboratively with many of these faculty, and some teach courses required for us. For example, the SOE is one of the participating units in
the new Indigenous Ph.D. Our newly-approved M.Ed. in Special Ed is another example of our effort to prepare candidates to work with students from diverse groups.

4b.3. How diverse are the faculty members who work with education candidates? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 8 can also be presented and/or discussed, if data are available, in response to other prompts for this element.] Please complete Table 8 or upload your own table at Prompt 4b.5 below.

Table 8
Faculty Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)</th>
<th>Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Advanced Programs n (%)</th>
<th>Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach in Both Initial Teacher Preparation &amp; Advanced Programs n (%)</th>
<th>All Faculty in the Institution n (%)</th>
<th>School-based faculty n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>2 (7.6%)</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (28.5%)</td>
<td>35 (3.5%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
<td>86 (8.5%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
<td>14 (1.4%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 (1.8%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>24 (92.3%)</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td>5 (71.4%)</td>
<td>854 (84.3%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6 (0.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26 (100%)</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
<td>1013 (100%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20 (77%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
<td>436 (43%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
<td>577 (57%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26 (100%)</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
<td>1013 (100%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4b.4. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain a diverse faculty?

The SOE has worked diligently in its efforts to hire a more ethnically diverse faculty that better represents the population in AK. Over the past 5 years SOE has conducted multiple searches for full-time tenure-track faculty. Each search has been advertised in the Chronicle, at national conferences including AERA and AACTE, on UA websites, and in several AK newspapers. Advertisements in the Chronicle and at national meetings have not been very productive either in numbers of applicants or in applicants who would add more diversity. We have been more successful in attracting applicants through our efforts in the AK context. The distance from the Lower 48 states, long, cold and dark winters, and salaries that are not competitive with those in most school districts, discourage many from applying for faculty positions at UAF.

We have many highly qualified faculty members working in our unit who have extensive experience and expertise in the AK educational context, but who do not qualify for our tenure-track positions and there is no education unit in the state that offers a doctoral degree. Since there are a very limited number of AK Native faculty with doctoral degrees in educ or related fields, the SOE used other strategies to tap into the deep knowledge of many AK Native educators without a doctoral degree through the development of a Visiting Professor for AK Native & Minority Education position. This was filled by AK Native educators for 2 yrs, and then in 2007, the UA president approved a President's Professor
position in the SOE. Dr. Bryan Brayboy, a nationally recognized American Indian researcher holds this position. With the recent approval of a new Indigenous Ph.D. by the Board of Regents, we anticipate that there will be an increase in the number of AK Native/American Indian applicants for tenure-track positions within the next several years. Efforts to retain diverse faculty are directly related to SOE efforts to recruit and retain diverse candidates.

4b.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty diversity may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

4c.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with candidates from diverse groups?

The UAF School of Education includes students from many different age and religious groups and with different types of exceptionalities. A high percent of students in our undergraduate programs grew up in Alaska and graduated from an Alaska high school. Students in post-baccalaureate licensure programs and those in other M.Ed. advanced programs come to Alaska from many different geographical regions throughout the United States. We typically have a large number of nontraditional older returning students in our programs. The largest group of minority candidates in the School of Education is, by far, Alaska Native, which is representative of the population in our state. Candidates from other racial or ethnic backgrounds often come to Alaska with the military, and we always have candidates who are in Alaska temporarily as members of a military family.

With the diversity of our candidates, and with the types of small group, collaborative, hands-on teaching and learning experiences used in nearly every one of our courses and programs, School of Education candidates have multiple and ongoing opportunities to interact with peers who are different from themselves. Our diverse group of candidates allows us to tap into the experience and expertise of people in our programs who come from diverse cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic backgrounds, religions, and exceptionalities. Since candidates located throughout the state in our distance delivery programs connect weekly, they have many opportunities to learn from and with peers who are physically located in very diverse settings. Whenever possible, we arrange for our Fairbanks campus and distance candidates to interact through Blackboard discussion groups, E-live, video conferencing and audio conferencing. Our assignments and assessments build upon this diversity and provide excellent opportunities for candidates to learn about the wide range of schooling and community contexts that exist in Alaska.

4c.2. How diverse are the candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 9 can also be presented and discussed, if data are available, in other prompts of this element.] Please complete Table 9 or upload your own table at Prompt 4c.4 below.

Table 9
Candidate Demographics
### 4c.3. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups?

The SOE has historically attracted a much larger number of AK Native students for its teacher preparation programs than other programs in AK. This has occurred for many reasons, including (1) excellent resources at UAF for AK Native and rural students and the offering of many courses and programs dealing specifically with AK Native issues; and (2) the 45-year commitment of UAF ed faculty to the delivery of undergrad/grad degrees to rural students despite significant added expense to SOE. Evidence clearly indicates that if UAF wants to increase teachers for rural areas and AK Native teachers, it must provide programs in rural areas, rather than requiring candidates to come to FBsks. A subsistence lifestyle, practiced for cultural and economic reasons in rural communities, is not an option in FBsks. By providing program delivery to rural areas, candidates can continue subsistence activities, maintain responsibilities to extended family and community, and continue work in their village schools as aides while pursuing a teaching degree.

The SOE also recruits and retains diverse candidates by funding a full-time position for a rural academic advisor; recruiting at state conferences (e.g. AK Bilingual, AK Federation of Natives); meeting informally with students and teachers in rural schools where SOE faculty supervise candidates; securing significant national grant funding for the past 5 yrs to support AK/AI students, supporting the AK Native Ed Student group, and by providing an unusually high level of individual support for undergraduate students who are first generation college students. In addition to recruitment for initial licensure programs, the SOE has increased its recruitment of rural candidates for M.Ed. programs. As a result of our 45-year focus on preparing culturally responsive effective practitioners and because of aggressive recruitment and retention efforts, UAF is the leader in the state in the preparation of rural educators and Alaska Native educators.

### 4c.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to candidate diversity may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]
4d.1. How does the unit ensure that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical practice?

Schools in the Fairbanks North Star Borough include students from varied ethnic/racial, linguistic and socioeconomic backgrounds. More than 50 different languages are represented among our bilingual population. Two military bases within the school district also contribute to the diverse makeup in the schools. Fairbanks is a hub for Interior Alaska and as a result, schools in Fairbanks frequently work with Alaska Native students who move between Fairbanks and rural communities. Every school has students with exceptional needs, most of whom spend the entire day in a regular classroom. Our candidates, therefore, have multiple opportunities to work with students from very diverse backgrounds and with exceptional students with diverse needs.

Elementary undergraduate candidates take two special education courses prior to admission to their internship year. These require at least 35 hours of fieldwork in an intensive resource classroom (EDSE 482) and in either a resource classroom or within an inclusive classroom (EDSE 422). Post-baccalaureate candidates begin the yearlong program during the summer so are unable to complete similar coursework, however, they must complete a special education course (ED 625) with follow up observations of students with special needs during the internship year.

Secondary candidates enroll in EDSC 414/614, Learning, Development, and Special Needs Instruction. As a critical assignment in EDSC 471, candidates select one of their students who is on an IEP and follow directions to complete a case study.

The only group of candidates in our advanced programs who participate in a formal clinical practice are those in the Counseling Program. They too have a well structured set of activities, assignments, and assessments relative to demonstrating competency with students and clients from diverse backgrounds. Nearly all candidates in our other advanced programs are already working in classrooms and schools with diverse populations of students, and their major research projects typically involve action research and/or curriculum development for these populations of students.

Many candidates in remote communities are place-bound with families and responsibilities that prohibit them from observing in a variety of schools. Some candidates, however, opt to study on campus during some of their undergraduate coursework. All are encouraged to spend time at other school sites if possible.

4d.2. How diverse are the P-12 students in the settings in which candidates participate in field experiences and clinical practice? Please complete Table 10 or upload your own table at Prompt 4d.4 below. [Although NCATE encourages institutions to report the data available for each school used for clinical practice, units may not have these data available by school. If the unit uses more than 20 schools for clinical practice, school district data may be substituted for school data in the table below. In addition, data may be reported for other schools in which field experiences, but not clinical practice, occur. Please indicate where this is the case.]

Table 10
Demographics on Sites for Clinical Practice in Initial and Advanced Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of school</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White, non-</th>
<th>Two or more</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Race / ethnicity</th>
<th>Students receiving free / reduced</th>
<th>English language</th>
<th>Students with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4d.3. How does the unit ensure that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups?

In the elem and secondary programs, 3-way conferences with candidates, supervisors, and mentors are held twice each semester and candidates are evaluated relative to the 8 SOE/AK Teacher Stds. Diversity proficiencies are embedded throughout the stds, particularly in std 3. Supervisors and mentors also evaluate candidates' professional dispositions using a PCFF each semester. If there is a pattern of low scores on a candidate's PCFFs, a plan of improvement is created with the candidate. After fulltime student teaching, elem candidates trade classrooms with a candidate in a different sch/grd level for 2-3 wks, and a formal observation is completed and shared with candidates. In the secondary program, candidates do peer observations the 1st semester, then discuss and give feedback to each other. In ED457 (Multicultural Ed & Sch-Community Relations), candidates create a lesson that they share with peers to receive feedback before teaching the lesson.

In the M.Ed. program, peers informally give feedback in course discussions and more formally through focused questions on Blackboard. Since diversity is embedded throughout the program, candidates have several interactions and discussions about issues of diversity and encourage each other to reflect on their skills, attitudes and beliefs about working with diverse groups.

In the Counseling Program, candidates receive input from peers and the univ supervisor in the Individ Practicum course (COUN 634) and in internship courses (COUN 636/690). In these courses candidates receive feedback from peers and instructors in response to their counseling sessions working with clients from a variety of backgrounds with diverse counseling needs and course assignments which specifically address issues of diversity in counseling contexts. PCFFs are also used to assess and provide feedback on dispositions. These are completed by faculty as a group and the site counseling supervisor. Candidates read and respond to the evaluation.

4d.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the diversity of P-12 students in schools in which education candidates do their field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

| Table 10: Demographics on Sites for Clinical Practice in Initial and Advanced Programs |
| Criteria for Site Selection |

See Attachments panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 4?

Part of UAF’s mission is to provide an education for and with the AK Native population. This means that it must provide courses that are meaningful to AK Native people and deliver education to small populations of students in remote and rural areas of the state. To further this goal, the mission of the SOE is to prepare professional educators who are culturally responsive, effective practitioners for AK Schools. Our Conceptual Framework defines the term, culturally responsive, as educators who have an understanding of, and respect for, the children, families, and communities they serve as professionals.
They respond to students and candidates' communities in ways that demonstrate that the schools honor
the communities' cultural and linguistic heritages and they participate in the schools and communities in
ways that are most likely to result in the personal and academic success of the communities' children.

As a result of SOE's long commitment to preparing culturally responsive, effective practitioners, UAF
continues to be a leader in the state in the preparation of rural and AK Native educators. At least part of
this success can be attributed to providing high quality distance delivery courses and a high level of
individual support for AK Native students. Due to advances in technology, we now offer distance
courses using more interactive delivery systems such as e-live, video conferencing, streamed videos,
podcasts and blogs. SOE professional development workshops are regularly offered to help faculty
effectively integrate current technology into their courses. In addition to high quality delivery systems, a
place-based approach to teaching and curriculum development is used in the majority of our courses,
especially the distance delivery classes. As aspects of small rural community cultures and environment
are woven into course content, students find their ed classes more meaningful and also learn how to do
the same in their future classroom teaching practices.

2. What research related to Standard 4 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

The following research is being conducted by faculty who teach education courses for the School of
Education.

Barnhardt, Ray
Center for Ocean Science Education Excellence (COSEE) research project related to developing
ocean science education curriculum resources that attract underserved student populations. "The need
for locally/culturally relevant educational opportunities is great in all locations. The need for Elder
guidance is not limited to rural towns and villages."
www.ankn.uaf.edu/cosee (2008 - present)

Brayboy, Bryan
Can I Do Research in My Community and Still be Native?: An Exploration of the Role and Nature
of Research in Alaska Native and Indigenous Communities. UAF Research Fund (2007 - present)

Morotti, A.
This research project utilizes an art-based and storytelling approach to identify the Alaska Native
child's perception of self in relation to family, school, and community (2007 - present)

Rickey, M. J. & Silcox. C.
 Culturally responsive practice and collaborative research in a primary Alaska classroom (2008 -
present)

Rickard, Anthony
(2004 - present)

STANDARD 5. FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and
teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate
performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit
systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

[In this section the unit must include the professional education faculty in (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

5a. Qualified Faculty

5a.1. What are the qualifications of the full- and part-time professional education faculty (e.g., earned degrees, experience, and expertise)? Please complete Table 11 or upload your own table at Prompt 5a.5 below. [Professional Education Faculty information compiled by AIMS from earlier reports submitted for the national review of programs and updated by your institution (see Manage Faculty Information page in your AIMS workspace) can be imported into Table 11. For further guidance on completing this table, see the directions provided below (select link "click here") as well as in the Help document (click on "Help" in the upper right corner of your screen.).]

Table 11
Faculty Qualification Summary

FacultyInfo_2329_1157_29435.xls
See Attachments panel below.

5a.2. What expertise qualifies professional education faculty members who do not hold terminal degrees for their assignments?

The group of faculty in the UAF School of Education who do not hold terminal degrees includes three general categories: 1) faculty who teach just 1 or 2 classes per year—usually full-time currently practicing professionals; 2) faculty who have a 49% workload—typically retired teachers; and 3) faculty who have workloads varying between 75% and 100%. Many of the faculty in the 2nd and 3rd categories have been with the School of Education for over 10 years in the elementary and secondary licensure programs.

We feel very fortunate to have such a high level of professional and content area expertise and experience in these groups of faculty.

\(i_{0.5}\) Nearly all have had teaching or supervisory experiences in both urban and rural Alaska schools with very diverse groups of students.

\(i_{0.5}\) Virtually all continue to be meaningfully involved in schools in multiple ways.

\(i_{0.5}\) Four faculty in category three are actively pursuing interdisciplinary doctorates at UAF.

\(i_{0.5}\) Two faculty members are National Board Certified Teachers.

\(i_{0.5}\) Many faculty in categories two and three have applied for and received funding to attend state and national conferences to enhance their content and professional knowledge.

\(i_{0.5}\) The integration of technology into their teaching and into their course requirements is clearly cutting-edge.

\(i_{0.5}\) They have a strong record of participation in professional development activities sponsored by the SOE.

\(i_{0.5}\) Many had established a working relationship with the SOE as cooperating teachers or mentors.
before being hired.

Their on-going and long-term involvement and commitment to the SOE has allowed them to develop in-depth knowledge of state, institution, and professional standards and this is clearly represented in their practice.

This group is a vibrant and contributing component of our cohesive elementary and secondary initial licensure teams. Their willingness to learn from and with one another provides a high level of energy that supports on-going program development.

5a.3. How many of the school-based faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or are supervising? How does the unit ensure that school-based faculty members are adequately licensed?

The NCATE glossary defines school faculty as “practitioners in P–12 schools who provide instruction, supervision, and direction for candidates during field-based assignments.” Our SOE works closely with many practitioners in P-12 schools, but we do not refer to them as school-based faculty. As described in Std 3, the primary role of the practitioners with whom we work is to serve as year-long mentor teachers for initial licensure candidates in our elem and secondary programs. Practitioners also serve as cooperating teachers for sophomore, juniors and seniors who are completing fieldwork for a variety of ed foundation courses in our BA in Elem Ed degree. School counselors provide support for counseling candidates during their fieldwork and clinical practice.

One of the most important criteria for selecting practitioners to work with our candidates is that they are licensed in their area. As is evident in the table entitled “Elementary & Secondary Mentor Teacher Qualifications & Characteristics,” we have had only one mentor teacher in the past four years who was not licensed in the area in which he was teaching (see note at end of table). Data in our table also provide evidence that a high percent of our mentor teachers have master’s degrees, many years of teaching and supervision experience, and all have worked with students from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

In the elementary programs, 79% of faculty who teach a course that requires fieldwork or clinical practice or who do supervision hold a current Alaska license in the area in which they are teaching or providing supervision. In the secondary programs, 80% of the faculty do. Most faculty who don’t have a current teaching license have just recently let it lapse.

SOE hiring criteria requires current, or recent, licensure for all faculty hired to teach or supervise in our initial licensure programs.

5a.4. What contemporary professional experiences do higher education clinical faculty members have in school settings?

The UAF School of Education does not have faculty that we refer to as "clinical faculty." Although we typically need to hire one or two recently retired teachers to assist with supervision during the internship year for elementary initial licensure candidates, the large majority of supervision is completed by School of Education faculty members who are part of our professional faculty and who also have teaching and service responsibilities. Supervision for fieldwork and clinical practice requirements in Counseling are also completed by our professional counseling faculty.

We are fortunate that we are able to use so many of our "regular" faculty members to do supervision because this assures us that our faculty are in rural and urban schools on an on-going basis and it greatly facilitates communication among university faculty and colleagues currently in the schools. It holds us
accountable in the real world of schools and forces us to make strong connections between theory and practice.

In addition to being in schools several times each semester in supervisory roles, faculty members have contemporary professional experiences in school settings in multiple other roles. They provide a significant amount of service to schools by serving in leadership or participatory roles in the following types of school events or programs:

- In-service workshops and presentations
- Formal and informal guest presentations in school
- Project Citizen
- Board members for local charter schools
- Volunteer teachers of other languages
- Kids Voting Program
- Civic Education Project
- Fairbanks History Day
- Speech Contest Judges
- Science Fair Judges
- Alaska Native Future Teacher Clubs
- Research projects that are based in school settings
- Accompanying candidates during the week of Rural Practicum

We also have faculty who work at a 49% level who work at temporary jobs in schools such as serving as official testers for federally-funded reading and mathematics programs twice a year.

5a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty qualifications may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

| Elementary and Secondary Mentor Teacher Qualifications and Characteristics |

See Attachments panel below.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

5b.1. How does instruction by professional education faculty reflect the conceptual framework as well as current research and developments in the fields?

Although we, as SOE faculty, intuitively knew that our instruction reflected our Conceptual Framework and also reflected current research and developments in our fields, we found it very useful to spend time early in the spring semester doing an inventory at our department or program meetings to help us clearly identify and document ways in which this is actually occurring. This collegial activity at the graduate, counseling, secondary and elementary program meetings prompted meaningful discussions and generated lists that we have included as attachments for this section. This exercise, along with the syllabi for our courses and the design and infrastructure of our programs provide evidence that our instruction does reflect our Conceptual Framework as well as current research and developments in our fields. There is no disconnect between what we practice in our programs and what we say we do in our Conceptual Framework.

Although there are differences in the ways that faculty in each program honor our mission and our
Conceptual Framework as culturally responsive effective practitioners, there are some common themes that are evident in most of the program inventories. We strive to do the following:

- Build communities of diverse learners in our courses and programs by structuring coursework and the classroom environment to allow candidates to learn from and with one another;
- Integrate and meaningfully utilize, in our instruction, students' cultural, ethnic, linguistic and geographic differences, and facilitate this by using place-based, culturally responsive strategies for instruction;
- Affirm diversity and not simply recognize it particularly with respect to the AK context and with Alaska Native people;
- Provide choices to candidates that provide options for relevance and that support different learning styles while not reducing rigor;
- Integrate technology into coursework and fieldwork in meaningful ways that support candidates and that increase student learning (i.e., using blogs, Blackboard, Elluminate, video-conferencing, streaming videos, Skype, iChat);
- Use the professional, state, and institutional standards identified in our Conceptual Framework as the basis for program and course design and as the basis for assessments on all key assignments.
- Make the alignment between theory and practice prominent;
- Include high quality, recent, scholarly work in our syllabi and in our courses, and in fieldwork and clinical practice requirements.

5b.2. How do unit faculty members encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions?

SOE faculty members encourage development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving and professional dispositions in virtually all required SOE coursework. Each is an area in which candidates must demonstrate competency if they are going to be able to become effective, culturally responsive, professional educators.

Standard 8 of our AK/UAF Stds for Culturally Responsive Educators is the std that most directly aligns with these competencies, and candidates in all programs are assessed relative to this set of standards.

AK/UAF Std 8 "A teacher participates in and contributes to the teaching profession. Performances that reflect attainment of this standard include:

A. Maintaining a high standard of professional ethics.
B. Maintaining and updating knowledge of both the teacher's content area(s) and best teaching practices.
C. Engaging in instructional development activities to improve the quality of or update classroom, school, or district programs.
D. Communicating, working cooperatively, and developing professional relationships with colleagues.

UAF School of Education additional performances:

- Recognizing the legal and ethical responsibilities of a culturally responsive practitioner.
- Incorporating technology effectively in professional settings.
- Demonstrating high motivation and commitment to the profession.
- Demonstrating intellectual curiosity and a commitment to ongoing professional development.

Each of the 4 programs completed an inventory relative to 5b.2, just as they did for 5b.1, and their responses are included as an exhibit. A common theme across all programs was the recognition that
meaningful self-reflection is one of the key components in the lifelong process of becoming a better educator and that our candidates must demonstrate a capacity to engage in thoughtful self-reflection. Evidence that 5b.2 is integral to our programs can be found in course syllabi, in our nat'l program reports, and in samples of candidate work.

5b.3. What types of instructional strategies and assessments do unit faculty members model?

Just as we did with 5b.1 and 5b.2, faculty in all programs developed an inventory of the types of instructional strategies and assessments that they used. It is evident, once again, that School of Education faculty instructional strategies and assessments support our Conceptual Framework and provide evidence that we model for our candidates the type of instructional strategies and assessments we expect them to use with their own students or clients.

The following are central to each of our programs:
• A recognition that multiple instructional strategies must be utilized in order to respond to the wide range of interests and learning styles of our diverse candidates and to model the range of strategies that will be necessary to be effective, culturally responsive educators in the very diverse school contexts in Alaska. Some of the instructional strategies used by faculty in all programs for both on-campus and distance delivery include the following:
  o Student-centered, participatory, discussion-based classrooms for both face-to-face and distance-delivered courses
  o Small group or partner collaborative/cooperative learning
  o Minimal use of lectures
  o Inquiry-based learning
  o Focus on higher order, critical thinking through authentic, real-world, tasks
  o Differentiation based on interest and student choice, offering choices and options
  o Use of the community as a resource
  o Collaborative team-teaching
• A recognition that multiple types of formative and summative assessments must be used on an on-going basis to provide feedback to instructors, to candidates, and to evaluate the quality of our programs relative to the standards we are using.

Some of the types of assessments used by faculty in all programs include the following:
• Performance assessments that focus on real world authentic tasks
• On-going informal, formative assessments
• Rubrics: primarily task specific analytic rubrics prepared by instructors
• Self assessment
• Peer assessment
• Short answer questions, short essays
• Oral presentations
• Group presentations and projects
• Checks for understanding
• Class discussion

Most written assignments are submitted to faculty electronically and assignments are also returned electronically using the comment and track changes options available on Word. Many instructors use the Gradebook options on Blackboard to post candidates scores.
**5b.4. How do unit faculty members incorporate the use of technology into instruction?**

SOE Faculty have been well supported in efforts to dramatically increase the use of technology in instruction. One of our exhibits describes the high level of professional development that faculty have received relative to preparing us to more effectively infuse our teaching with technology. In addition to scheduled and formal tech workshops, faculty have regular access to, and support from, 3 tech assistants. All have been teachers themselves and they have been able to bridge the gap that too often exists between technology and teaching. Our SOE has also made a substantive investment in "learning facilities" ranging from software for science and music education to video conferencing equipment in 3 of our classrooms.

We have a tech committee with a representative from each of the 3 depts which makes recommendations on the use of tech funds. All SOE faculty have laptops that are up-to-date and the 3 classrooms that are "dedicated" to the SOE have mounted projectors, SmartBoards, VCRs, printers, scanners, Ethernet ports and phone lines that support off-campus instruction.

In the spr semester, one of our tech committee members conducted a survey to help us better understand how we were using technology in our instruction—relative to the tech standards that we had previously developed. Our survey provided evidence that we are using technology in multiple ways, but that we need to do a better job of developing assessments that help us determine how well our candidates are using technology.

Many faculty originally believed that the most important reason to incorporate technology was to better serve our off-campus candidates. However we discovered that many can be equally beneficial to our Fairbanks candidates. The list below provides a sample of the technology tools used most frequently by faculty.

- **î half Blackboard â€”** in addition to posting nearly all course documents, faculty and candidates make frequent use of the Discussion Board for communication, the Grade Center option that allows faculty to post grades and candidates to check their grades;
- **î half Elluminate Live (E-Live) â€”** Many faculty who teach distance courses are using this regularly because it provides a wide variety of options not available if courses are being taught only with audio conference. The visual options available with E-Live and the increased candidate interaction with one another and with the instructor make this a highly desirable new technology;
- **î half Video Conferencing â€”** This option became available to faculty in some courses this year and although it is still not an option for all because of obstacles in some remote and rural AK villages, it has great potential for coursework and for additional supervision of interns in rural areas.
- **î half Other technology instructional tools used include:** developing and using podcasts; streaming videos, science and music software; clickers; class sets of laptops that candidates can take to classrooms; and a variety of digital video and still cameras.

**5b.5. How do unit faculty members systematically engage in self-assessment of their own teaching?**

Our informal inventory exhibit, with input from faculty in each of our programs (see "Std 5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching"), provides multiple examples of ways in which faculty members systematically engage in both formal and informal, on-going self-assessment of their own teaching.

In the formal and mandatory UAF Annual Faculty Activities report, all full-time faculty are required to provide a Narrative Self-Evaluation following these guidelines.
In each of the following categories which constituted part of your workload in the period covered by the report, briefly assess your own efforts. Focus your comments on 1) how your effort "made a difference" and 2) frustrations/shortcomings and how you intend to address them.

A. Teaching
B. Research, Scholarly and Creative Work
C. Service

Not all SOE faculty are required to complete the formal UAF Report template. However, our own SOE policies require that all faculty who have taught for us for more than 2 years, regardless of their tenure-track or term-funded status, must complete some form of self evaluation on an annual basis. This alternate self-evaluation can be based on the formal UAF template or it can simply be a narrative in which faculty provide a self-assessment of their own teaching and develop goals for themselves for the next year. Examples of these types of self-assessments are provided as exhibits in 5e.

Faculty gather data for self-evaluation of their teaching in multiple ways. All faculty use feedback from the course evaluations completed by candidates, and although there is no formal requirement that they respond in writing to these evaluations, most faculty do include an self-evaluation of these data in their annual reports.

In classroom settings, faculty regularly reflect upon their own practices with their candidates and seek written and oral feedback from candidates. Most SOE faculty do this on an on-going basis throughout the semester to allow them to make changes midway if self reflection provides them with an indication that changes should be initiated prior to the beginning of the next semester.

In program meetings, faculty regularly reflect orally upon their own pedagogy and instructional practices and use this as an opportunity to receive feedback from peers. These settings provide a safe place for faculty to share personal reflections about what's working and what's not and to do so within their own community of learners.

5b.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty teaching may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

5c.1. What types of scholarly work are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and unit's mission?

Scholarship, as defined in the NCATE glossary, is "Systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school professionals. Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation."

Each type of scholarly work described above is expected of SOE faculty. The level at which faculty are
expected to meet these criteria, however, depends upon their responsibilities and position assignment within the SOE. Tenure-track faculty at UAF must meet all of the criteria included in the above NCATE definition in order to receive tenure and promotion. They are also expected to meet the SOE's Unit Criteria for Promotion & Tenure which includes requirements that scholarship respond to the unique conditions of the AK, Circumpolar and AK Native contexts. Non tenure-track faculty are expected to participate in scholarly work that is directly related to the UAF Mission to prepare graduates who can respond to state, circumpolar, and AK Native needs and interests. They are also expected to participate in scholarly work that is directly aligned with the SOE Conceptual Framework, i.e., preparing effective, culturally responsive educators for Alaska's schools and communities. The scholarly work of non-tenure-track faculty is expected to provide additional depth and breadth in their particular fields of specialization (assessment, secondary social studies, science ed, special ed, etc.).

The range of scholarly work expected ranges from the preparation of a myriad of formal reports for the institution and for state entities to the development of new curriculum for schools in Alaska.

In summary, all SOE faculty are expected to do scholarly work, but not everyone is expected to do the same types of scholarly work.

5c.2. In what types of scholarship activities are faculty members engaged? How is their scholarship related to teaching and learning? What percentage of the unit's faculty is engaged in scholarship? (Review the definition of scholarship in the NCATE glossary.) [A table could be attached at Prompt 5c.3 below to show different scholarly activities in which faculty members are involved and the number involved in each activity.]

All SOE faculty who have a service component in their workloads (i.e., faculty responsible for about 90% of SOE programs) are actively engaged in scholarship activities as defined by NCATE as "systematic inquiry into areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school professionals." SOE faculty meet these criteria because they must independently, collectively (as members of an academic dept and a unit), and systematically review assessment data for courses and programs that are directly related to their academic responsibilities. This type of systematic inquiry results in individual and group analysis and synthesis of data, and changes are made to courses, programs, and the unit, based on these assessments.

The majority of SOE faculty are also actively involved in self and dept-level examination of pedagogy and in our application of current research findings in new settings. Faculty decisions to use new strategies and new approaches (e.g. Understanding by Design, implementation of a year-long internship, team/collaborative teaching, inquiry-based strategies, place-based instruction) are made only after serious reviews of existing pedagogy and of new research.

SOE faculty who are engaged in "traditional" research and publication and who submit their work for professional review and evaluation are almost always those in tenure-track positions because it is required for promotion and tenure and because they have a component in their workloads (typically 20% or more) that provides necessary time for research and publication. The exhibit list of recent publications of faculty provides evidence that tenure-track faculty are meeting these criteria. All tenure-track faculty are included on the list.

Faculty who are not in tenure-track positions are also directly involved in scholarly work related to their fields of specialization. Scholarly work of term faculty ranges from active involvement in a Ph.D. program to the process of renewing certification of National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to the development of new curriculum for AK schools. In addition, nearly every non-tenure-track term faculty member has been actively involved in the research and development and writing required to
prepare national program reports and to prepare for NCATE review. They will also be active participants in preparing upcoming UAF Program Review Reports due every five years.

Both tenure-track and term faculty are involved in research. Three faculty have recently applied for federal funding and several faculty have received seed funding for research from the SOE Research Fund designed for this purpose.

Although only tenure-track faculty can serve as chair of graduate committees, many term faculty serve as committee members. The range of faculty scholarly interests is evident through a review of the exhibit that lists the titles of research projects of all candidates who have received graduate degrees since 2000.

5c.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty scholarship may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

5d.1. What types of service are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and the unit's mission?

In UAF's required Annual Activities Report, faculty are asked to provide evidence of the "activity, duration and role" of their service in three arenas: public, university and professional.

1. Public service is defined as: organized, non-remunerative, educational and consultative activities which devolve from a unit member's professional expertise and further the interests or prestige of the University.

2. University service is defined as: dep't head, program director, or governance officer; service on administrative and governance committees; service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office; and other tasks as deemed necessary by the Univ.

3. Professional service is defined as serving: on grant, journal, or accreditation review boards, or as an ad hoc reviewer, in the unit member's area of expertise; as an officer in a professional society; organizing and/or chairing conferences, symposia, seminars, etc.; teaching short courses, seminars, etc. that are not regular academic courses; editing journals, books, special volumes of papers, etc.

Service in these areas is a required component for promotion and tenure for tri-partite tenure-track faculty members.

Our SOE mission and Conceptual Framework also requires that faculty provide service especially in areas directly related to education. As documented in our Standard 5d exhibit, SOE faculty participate in a wide range of activities.

5d.2. In what types of service activities are faculty members engaged? Provide examples of faculty service related to practice in P-12 schools and service to the profession at the local, state, national, and international levels (e.g., through professional associations). What percentage of the
School of Education faculty members are involved in a wide variety of service activities at each of the following levels:

- Department
- School/Unit
- University
- K-12 Schools & Communities
- State
- National
- International

A table prepared for 5b provides a comprehensive view of the different types of service activities at each of these levels. The table also includes data on the number and percentage of School of Education faculty involved in each type of activity. It is included as an exhibit for 5b and is labeled "Table Showing Professional Practices of UAF School of Ed Faculty Relative to SERVICE."

We are a small unit in a relatively small community with a highly motivated and professional group of faculty. Therefore, our faculty receive, and respond to, many requests for ed-related services. These range from requests by districts for special short courses in rural areas to requests for professional development at in-service workshops.

We are also a small state and our faculty agree to serve on a range of statewide groups ranging from the Alaska Writing Consortium to Alaska Department of Education & Early Development groups that review teacher standards, new reading programs, develop goals and priorities for the state's education programs, etc.

Some of our tenure-track faculty serve in leadership roles in highly regarded national and international education groups. These range from roles on the Council on Anthropology and Education in the American Anthropological Association to serving as grant reviewers for reputable national professional organizations to assisting in the development and design of curriculum for three charter schools in Fairbanks.

Please refer to the table in our exhibit for a more complete response to this prompt.

5d.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty service may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

5e.1. How are faculty evaluated? How regular, systematic, and comprehensive are the unit evaluations of adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching
assessants?

Faculty who teach for the SOE are evaluated on a regular, systematic and comprehensive basis by department chairs and by the dean. Although our institution does not require that faculty with less than a 50% position be evaluated, our own unit policies do require this as described below (see 1st exhibit in 5e).

All faculty are included in the evaluation process after the first year of service, although there is a difference in the reporting form you are asked to use. The following faculty should use the standard Annual Activities Report Form, available from the Provost's webpage.

1. Tenured faculty, except those completing comprehensive post-tenure reviews
2. Untenured, tenure track faculty, except those completing 4th year reviews
3. Half-time and above, tenure-track or non-tenure track (term).

The following faculty may submit a 1-2 page self-report. You may want to look at the standard Annual Activities Report Form to identify reporting areas applicable to you, but you do not have to use the form itself.

1. 49% faculty, after the first year of service
2. Adjunct faculty teaching one or more courses per year, after two consecutive years of service.

Evaluations prepared by dept chairs and by the dean provide feedback to faculty relative to the data and narrative provided to them in faculty annual activities reports. The SOE Dean's evaluation form states that "the following comments are offered with input from (name of dept. chair) for: teaching, research (for tenure-track faculty), service, and overall."

TENURE-TRACK faculty are evaluated at the institutional level at multiple times. Reviews are completed at the following levels: tenured faculty from within the unit; faculty from other UAF units; and the Provost. The guidelines below come from the UAF Provost's website.

4th Year Review
All faculty in a tenure-track position undergo retention review in their 4th appointment year. The criteria by which they are judged are parallel to those in place for faculty undergoing promotion and tenure review at UAF.

Tenure & Promotion Review
Faculty initially appointed to the rank of assistant professor shall be reviewed for tenure and concurrent promotion to associate professor no later than during the 7th year of service.

Post-Tenure Reviews
All faculty at UAF will be reviewed post-tenure on a 3-year cycle. The first 3-year cycle will result in a Dean's Review, which is a process outlined by the respective dean. Faculty will submit to the dean or director activities reports for the past 3 years, a current curriculum vita and a self-evaluation.

At the end of the second 3-year cycle, or in the 6th year, faculty will participate in a comprehensive post-tenure review whereby a file is prepared and reviewed by the various levels of reviewers as outlined by the schedule.

Graduate teaching assistants are evaluated by the faculty member(s) with whom they are working. There
5e.2. How well do faculty perform on the unit's evaluations? [A table summarizing faculty performance could be attached at Prompt 5e.4 below.)

SOE faculty are performing well on the unit’s and the institution’s evaluations. We have prepared a table that documents our unit’s tenure-track faculty performance and status relative to UAF and SOE’s promotion and tenure criteria. The table provides evidence that SOE faculty are meeting these promotion and tenure criteria because all faculty who have sought tenure and/or promotion have been successful. The comprehensive six-year post-tenure reviews of two School of Education faculty were also successful.

During this current academic year, two SOE faculty members sought and received promotions. Dr. Tony Rickard, who has a joint appointment with SOE and the College of Science, Engineering and Mathematics, (in the Dept of Mathematics) was promoted to full professor rank. Dr. Patrick Marlow, who has a joint appointment with SOE and the College of Liberal Arts (in the AK Native Language Program and in the Linguistics Dept) was promoted to associate professor with tenure.

Non-tenure track faculty members are not reviewed for promotion and tenure. Dean Madsen, however, provided us with the following statement in response to the question in this prompt. Except for a few minor suggestions particularly to new faculty all faculty evaluation comments were at least satisfactory and most stressed some significant contribution. If requested, paper copies of faculty evaluations can be made available to the review team during the site visit.

It is important to note that faculty members are also evaluated at the end of each semester by candidates in their courses. Although these are an institutional level evaluation and not one specific to our unit, we have included a document that provides an overview of the product and process used by UAF for course and instructor evaluation. This is the final exhibit in 5e. Based on feedback from candidates, the large majority of faculty who teach School of Education courses are valued for their instructional practices.

5e.3. How are faculty evaluations used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service?

Faculty evaluations formal and informal, summative and formative are used to improve teaching, scholarship and service in several ways. Although the formal annual summative evaluations are an important and critical component in the faculty evaluation process, we also know and understand how essential it is to provide regular feedback based on the use of multiple, on-going, less formal evaluations. These include practices such as peer review in our classroom settings, on-going assessment of our teaching, scholarship and service in department meetings based on candidate and program data, and frequent sharing of new course and program documents to allow for input from colleagues. This type of on-going collegial assessment allows us to make modifications to our teaching, scholarship and service at multiple times throughout the year if warranted.

The annual formal summative evaluations are used in a variety of ways by individuals, by programs and by the unit.

Individual faculty use the feedback provided by department chairs and the dean to provide guidance relative to adjusting professional goals for the following year to allow them to meet the needs of the unit and to meet tenure and promotion criteria.
Programs and departments use evaluations to identify common challenges and strengths at the program and department level. Recommendations at this level include changes relative to workload unit distribution, types of faculty service expected, graduate committee work, etc.

The Unit itself uses evaluations in multiple ways. When patterns emerge in a review of the evaluations of all faculty members there is evidence that changes need to be made at the unit level. These types of changes include: developing additional professional development workshops in areas identified on evaluations, such as assessment, technology, and grant preparation; advocating for additional resources for one or more programs; and providing additional mentoring for tenure-track faculty.

5e.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's evaluation of professional education faculty may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

5e4 Exhibit List

See Attachments panel below.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

5f.1. How is professional development related to needs identified in unit evaluations of faculty? How does this occur?

The UAF SOE provides support for professional development for faculty that is directly aligned with the needs and interests identified by faculty themselves in their annual activities reports and identified by the dean and department chairs in their annual evaluations of faculty.

For the past three years, our unit has provided a great deal of support for professional development related to technology. Our goal has been to enhance our abilities to facilitate our own professional work and to help our very diverse set of candidates learn. This is a critical component for our unit because all our programs are available by distance delivery. Since options for improving instruction through new and improved technologies are changing so rapidly, our faculty (and our support staff) have requested, and been provided with, excellent professional development to support our delivery of distance courses and degree programs. In addition to learning how to improve our ability to better meet the needs of candidates in rural and remote areas of AK, we have also strengthened the services to our Fbks students through the use of new technologies. This would not be possible without the on-going technology professional development that is available to faculty.

Our SOE encourages faculty to be continuous learners in multiple areas directly aligned with the priorities of our Conceptual Framework (e.g. culturally relevant pedagogy and curriculum, standards-based assessment, content related to our specific teaching and research responsibilities, AK Native and indigenous issues) by providing and also supporting several different types of professional development, ranging from support for term faculty to pursue a Ph.D. to supporting a travel fund to allow faculty to attend conferences. A listing of several different types of professional development activities available to, and utilized by 100% of SOE faculty who are hired at 49% or above is included in 5f.2 and in several of our exhibits.

5f.2. What professional development activities are offered to faculty related to performance assessment, diversity, technology, emerging practices, and/or the unit's conceptual framework?
The primary types of professional development activities offered to SOE faculty in 2008-09 are listed below. The focus for professional development sponsored by our own unit has been technology. The focus of professional development in all of the other categories listed below aligns well with our Conceptual Framework and is equally distributed among assessment, diversity, and emerging practices.

Sponsored by SOE
- Rich Media Training (Spring Semester 2008)
- iTeach Training (May 2008, January 2009)
- Excel and FileMaker Pro Workshops (Spring 2009)
- Colloquium Series (on-going)
- Seminars by Finalists for Tenure-Track Positions (4 in 2009)
- Seminars by Visiting Native Hawaiian Univ Faculty

Sponsored by the UAF Faculty Development Office
- See 5f exhibit entitled "UAF Office of Faculty Development, List of Professional Development Workshops/Seminars, 2008-09"

Supported by UAF SOE
- See 5f exhibit entitled "SOE Professional Development Fund Activities, 2006 to 2008"
- Other professional development funded by SOE
  - Participation by several faculty in AACTE and NCATE confs and workshops
  - Several faculty supported for 2008 Anchorage Ed Summit sponsored by AK Dept. of Ed & Early Development

Supported by UAF Office of Faculty Development
- Four new SOE faculty supported for participation in Lilly West Institute on Innovations & Excellence in Teaching (see 5a exhibits on Lilly Conference)
- SOE Faculty supported for national technology conference

Participation in Ph.D. Programs
- Four SOE term faculty are currently pursuing an interdisciplinary Ph.D. at UAF (supported by workload reduction and/or by tuition waivers)

Enrollment in Univ Coursework to Keep Teaching Licenses Current
- Faculty in Elem and Secondary Licensure programs enroll in coursework to maintain their AK Teaching Licenses

Supported by Other Professional Entities
- Center for Civic Ed.
- AK Dept of Ed & Early Development (e.g., RTI and Special Ed, Reading for AK Teachers)

Supported by Individual Faculty
- A wide range of training workshops for Counseling faculty (e.g., Substance Abuse Subtle Screening Inventory, Behavioral Health Alliance Childhood Mental Health Training)
- World Indigenous Peoples Education Conference
- Nat'l Board for Professional Teaching Standards
- American Educational Research Association
- Fairbanks North Star Borough Teacher In-Service Conferences
- Elm and Secondary faculty participate in a variety of the in-service presentations provided by the Fbks School Dist.

5f3. How often does faculty participate in professional development activities both on and off campus? [Include adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants.]

One hundred percent of faculty in the School of Education who have a 49% or higher workload participate, at some level, in professional development sponsored by the School of Education. Faculty who are hired at less than 49%, and who teach a small percentage of courses and supervise a small
percentage of candidates, are typically employed full-time by a school district or other professional entity and therefore are not often able to participate in SOE professional activities. Their CVs provide evidence, though, of professional development in the areas in which they are teaching or providing supervision. There is virtually no difference in the participation rate for tenured and non-tenured faculty. School of Education graduate assistants and support staff often participate in professional development activities sponsored by the School and by the institution.

The UAF Office of Faculty Development provides a wide range of excellent on-campus and distance-delivered workshops and seminars for all UAF faculty. They also provide special support for most new faculty to attend a national conference (the Lilly Conference) and there are workshops designed specifically for first year faculty. All new SOE faculty participated in several of workshops in 2008-09.

All SOE faculty participate in off-campus professional activities that range from local school district activities to state and national activities. Support for these is provided by the SOE and by individual faculty members.

5f.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's facilitation of professional development may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 5?

2. What research related to Standard 5 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

STANDARD 6. UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

6a.1. How does the unit manage or coordinate the planning, delivery, and operation of all
programs at the institution for the preparation of educators?

Management and coordination of planning, delivery, and operation of SOE programs occurs through regular faculty meetings, the unit Dean’s Council, and ad hoc and formal faculty work groups, operating primarily on a consensus model.

Scheduled faculty meetings occur once per month during the academic year and as needed during the summer. Special, single-topic meetings occur as needed. Because the unit also holds faculty research colloquia each month, the regular faculty meetings focus almost exclusively on faculty topics and program coordination. Approximately 25% of SOE faculty half-time and above teach or supervise interns in more than one SOE department, and many SOE courses—e.g. reading, research, special education, instructional technology—serve students in multiple departments. Therefore, SOE faculty frequently work in both ad hoc and formally appointed cross-departmental workgroups for program planning and coordination purposes.

Regular members of the unit Dean’s Council include the chairs of the SOE’s three departments, the Director of the Office of Field Experiences, and the dean. Other SOE staff and faculty members, UAF personnel, and representatives from partner organizations participate as appropriate. The Dean’s Council meets twice each month during the academic year and typically meets once each month during the summer.

At the institutional level and beyond, the unit coordinates planning and delivery of educator preparation programs through leadership and participatory roles on the UAF Faculty Senate and its committees, and through active collaboration with other academic units at UAF and the UA system and with partner agencies throughout Alaska.

Three full-time SOE faculty members hold joint appointments in the SOE and other UAF academic units (CNSM and CLA) and receive service workload units to participate in faculty meetings and workgroups in both units, thus enhancing program coordination and delivery between the SOE and its academic partners. Another faculty member teaches one course each year for an education-related program in another college, and several others collaborate with colleagues in other schools and colleges to write grant proposals, conduct research, and provide research and professional development opportunities for candidates. SOE faculty also lead and/or participate in inter-departmental workgroups to manage campus-level accreditation and program review processes.

The unit holds formal seats on institutional level bodies. Two SOE faculty members hold voting seats and the dean holds an appointed, non-voting seat on the UAF Faculty Senate. The faculty members, by virtue of Senate membership status, also sit on Senate committees that they and their SOE colleagues identify as important to the interests of SOE students and programs. The SOE dean is a member of the Provost’s Deans Council (deans of academic units), and the Provost’s Council (academic deans and research institute directors) that each meet once per month, helping facilitate the exchange of institutional information across academic units.

Within the UA system, the three deans of education meet approximately six times each year. Beginning with the FY10 planning process in 2008, the UA system administration formally established the Educator Preparation Planning group, which includes the three deans, a UA Statewide staff facilitator, and a chancellor level chair. The purpose of the group is to improve planning and coordination of educator preparation within the UA system, and to strengthen the presentation of educator preparation needs to the University Board of Regents and the Alaska State legislature.

Beyond UAF and the UA system, the SOE educator preparation programs maintain strong ties to
professional organizations at the state and national levels, and close working relationships with colleagues in public school districts and education-related entities such as Future Teachers of Alaska and the Alaska Native Educators Association. For example, the Elementary and Secondary programs hold twice-yearly meetings that involve all faculty members, all interns, and all teacher mentors. The immediate focus of these meetings is the current year's internship arrangements, but longer-term benefits derive from these opportunities for inter-agency collaboration.

Because Alaska is a relatively small state in terms of population, members of professional communities have many opportunities to work together. Most statewide planning and coordinating activities are initiated by one of three entities: the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, professional organizations, or units within the UA system. They focus on curriculum planning and program coordination in all of the content areas, special education, counselor preparation, student achievement, educator recruitment and retention, and P-16 articulation. Many are open meetings; some are task forces, workgroups, or summits by invitation.

6a.2. What are the unit's recruiting and admissions policies? How does the unit ensure that they are clearly and consistently described in publications and catalogues?

Student recruiting and admissions policies are established and implemented by SOE Departments for programs within each department.

To be admitted to the SOE Elementary and Secondary Departments, applicants must be recommended for admission by a faculty admissions committee based on:
- passing scores set by State of Alaska for Praxis I
- passing scores set by State of Alaska for relevant Praxis Content tests
- minimum GPA (2.75 for undergraduate and 400 level programs; 3.0 for post-bacc programs)
- UAF Application
- admission essay
- letters of recommendation
- appropriate program application form (BAE or Post-Bacc)
- an extemporaneous writing sample
- evidence of technology competency

To be admitted to the SOE Graduate Department, applicants must be recommended for admission by a faculty admissions committee based on:
- evidence of GPA above 3.0
- all transcripts
- resume
- letters of recommendation
- statement of academic goals

The unit publishes brochures at the School, Department, and program levels, ensuring clarity through committee review of each brochure prior to publication. SOE academic advisors monitor changes in state regulations and other school's and college's course descriptions or offerings that may impact educator preparation candidates.

The institution retains authority to publish semester course catalogs and annual University catalogs. The Registrar's office is responsible for statements about University policy, and also reviews unit's catalog language for adherence to Board of Regents policy. The Registrar's office notifies units with regard to
publication deadlines in time for programs and departments to review and update changes in descriptions of admissions procedures. SOE academic advisors, faculty, and Department chairs meet to review updates to catalog language before they are submitted to the Registrar's Office, which in turn creates and returns proof sheets for final review by departments before publication.

6a.3. How does the unit ensure that its academic calendars, catalogues, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current?

Web-based SOE calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising are regularly updated as internal changes are made. In addition to IT faculty and tech support personnel, at least one person within each department has the skills and is authorized to update departmental information. Print versions are updated on a formal, regularly scheduled basis, except when changes are sufficient in number or importance to justify an immediate reprinting. In all cases, multiple individuals or workgroups review working and final drafts before posting or printing. UAF maintains a calendar identifying when institutional changes are due, and personnel send regular reminders about upcoming deadlines.

The SOE's historical commitment to serving candidates in rural Alaska required us to establish careful procedures for confirming and disseminating critical information. These procedures have served us well as all candidates, including those who live near campus, increasingly rely on mediated forms of communication.

6a.4. How does the unit ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling?

The primary mechanism for ensuring that candidates have access to academic advising is through the SOE's team of professional advisors. Each advisor has one primary responsibility to rural/distant, elementary, secondary, or graduate candidates, although each is willing and able to advise other candidates when needed. The elementary, secondary, and rural advisors are full-time professionals who specialize in their respective fields. Post-bacc elementary and graduate advisors are part-time professionals who assist with advising in addition to their program support roles.

All SOE advisors are available by phone, email, appointment, and on a drop-in basis. They work closely with advisors in other UAF centers, such as Rural Student Services and the UAF advising center. However, advisors in these other centers generally recommend that candidates talk with the SOE advisors because of the latter's expertise regarding SOE curricula, admissions requirements, transcript analyses, and the reasonability of academic petitions that candidates may be contemplating.

The institution maintains an active Student and Enrollment Services (SES) division whose professional staff members provide academic, medical, social, and personal advising and counseling. SES provides information about their services to all UAF students, staff, and faculty through regularly scheduled and invited workshops. The SES entry in the UAF directory (attached) concisely shows the range of services. The SES homepage is located at: http://www.uaf.edu/ssd/index.htm

The Counseling program within the SOE, and the Psychology program within the College of Liberal Arts, collaborate to maintain a counseling service staffed by Counseling and Psychology interns. The service is available to all UAF students at a charge of $5.00 per visit. Contact is voluntary and is initiated and terminated by students.

6a.5. Which members of the professional community participate in program design,
implementation, and evaluation? In what ways do they participate?

Members of the professional community who participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation include experienced mentor teachers; school district superintendents, HR directors, and central administration staff; education officers within corporate and business organizations and non-profit education-related entities; members of state and national professional organizations; and state education department personnel.

Below, we illustrate some of the mechanisms through which members of the professional community participate:
- roundtables sponsored by the University, local schools districts, and local municipalities that involve members of the business and corporate communities
- topic-specific workgroups sponsored by non-profit entities and the Department of Education and Early Development
- annual surveys of program completers at first, third, and fifth years after completion
- formal local meetings sponsored by SOE Departments, e.g. twice yearly Elementary and Secondary Department mentor/candidate/faculty work sessions
- formal statewide meetings such as the periodic Education Summits sponsored by the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
- annual conventions sponsored by organizations such as Future Educators of Alaska, Alaska Federation of Natives, Tanana Chiefs Conference, Alaska Native Education Association, and Association of Interior Native Educators
- SOE faculty members’ membership on numerous advisory and policy boards at the local, state, and national levels, for example, state and national professional associations for content and specialty educators
- monthly planning meetings among the education deans at the three UA campuses, bi-annual meetings of the deans and the Alaska Association of School Administrators, and the UA Statewide Teacher Preparation Planning Group.

6a.6. How does the unit facilitate collaboration with other academic units involved in the preparation of professional educators?

SOE staff, faculty and the dean play important leadership roles in facilitating collaboration with other academic units across the UAF campus and throughout the UA system.

Three faculty members hold joint appointments that help link the School of Education with the College of Natural Science and Mathematics and the College of Liberal Arts. All three faculty members teach special sections of courses and/or labs that help assure candidates not only become expert in the relevant content but also become expert in relating that content to learners. These three faculty members actively participate in teaching, research and service activities in both of their academic units, which serves to increase understanding and collaboration between the units.

Many SOE faculty members who do not hold joint appointments nevertheless actively engage with colleagues in other units to construct courses, participate in professional development activities, conduct research, and write proposals to support candidates’ involvement in research and professional development activities. A number of SOE faculty members collaborate with colleagues across the campus in support of specialized content areas, for example, art, music, and foreign languages.

At the administrative level, the SOE dean participates in monthly planning meetings among the education deans at the three UA campuses, bi-annual meetings of the deans and the Alaska Association of School Administrators, the UA Statewide Teacher Preparation Planning Group, and periodic invited meetings sponsored by the Department of Education and Early Development for education-related
entities.

6a.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit leadership and authority may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a.4 Student &amp; Enrollment Services Directory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a Exhibit List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

### 6b. Unit Budget

6b.1. What is the budget available to support programs preparing candidates to meet standards? How does the unit's budget compare to the budgets of other units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other institutions?

A. The budget available to support UAF SOE programs preparing candidates to meet standards is presented below for the past three years with the three year average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Budget Title FY06 FY07 FY08 FY06-FY08 Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Receipts $0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund - Match Appr 100.4 18.8 $39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund - State Appr 2,131.9 2,389.1 2,393.8 $2,304.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Recovery 180.7 43.5 1.5 $75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Receipts 5.9 $2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Tuition/Fees/Serv 932.8 935.3 909.5 $925.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of A Receipts 172.6 516.3 550.4 $413.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA Intra-Agency Transfers 2.6 $0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF School of Education Total 3,527.0 3,903.0 3,855.1 $3,761.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Comparison.

For this response, we compared the unit's FY06-08 three year average budget, enrollment, student credit hours, and program completers with parallel data from the other two education units in the UA system, both of which have clinical components. We used only budget categories employed by all three campuses, and removed data related to federal grants that vary significantly year-to-year as grants begin and end and that may or may not directly benefit candidates. Given the differences in the ways data are kept, it would be unwise to attempt overly precise analyses. However, in general, the UAF SOE had slightly more than 30% of the three units' total revenue and expenditures, while producing slightly less than 30% of the enrollment, SCH, and completers. The ratios of revenue and expenditures for UAS and UAA are similarly in line with their enrollment, SCH, and numbers of completers. Thus, the budgets available to the three UA education units appear equitably distributed in relation to the sizes of their programs.

6b.2. How adequately does the budget support all programs for the preparation of educators? What changes to the budget over the past few years have affected the quality of the programs offered?

The unit budget is adequate, and no changes have significantly affected the quality of our programs.
Post-secondary education in Alaska operates under tight budgets and there are many competing priorities. Within that reality, both UA and UAF support the SOE at levels proportional to other units, and we have been awarded allocations that allow SOE faculty and programs to play leadership roles across the campus and in P-12 education. When the Legislature declined to fund a high priority FY10 request for a second special education faculty member, the administration resubmitted the request for FY11 and offered to arrange bridge funding to support a faculty member during FY10 if we can recruit a well-qualified candidate. The Chancellor also supported the SOE's new role as statewide fiscal agent for the Alaska State Writing Consortium, which colleagues in school districts value highly and which provides additional opportunities for P-12 / post-secondary collaboration. Similarly, the Provost and the Chancellor both supported the SOE's FY10-12 renewal request to President Hamilton for continuation of a President's Professor in Education position supported by funds from the UA Foundation.

Partially in response to budgetary pressure, and partially to strengthen the clinical components of our programs, the SOE over the past decade hired steadily increasing numbers of well-qualified term and adjunct faculty. More recently, we have recruited new four tenure track faculty to achieve a healthy overall balance of faculty experiences and expertise.

In FY08, the Alaska State Legislature enacted legislation requiring the UA Board of Regents to report annually on what the University is doing to increase the pool of licensed educators available to Alaska school districts. While the legislation dramatically increases the data collection burden on UA education units, it has already increased attention to educator preparation in Alaska and may therefore also offer opportunities.

6b.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's budget may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

6c. Personnel

6c.1. What are the institution's and unit's workload policies? What is included in the workloads of faculty (e.g., hours of teaching, advising of candidates, supervising student teachers, work in P-12 schools, independent study, research, administrative duties, and dissertation advisement)?

The institution's policies regarding Job Assignments for adjunct faculty and Workloads for term and tenure/tenure-track faculty are codified in Articles 11 and 13 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between United Academics (UNAC) and the University of Alaska (UA) [Exhibit 6c1].

Within the SOE, "teaching" includes instructing numbered courses, supervising practicum experiences and internships, and serving as a chair or member of M.Ed. and/or Ph.D. committees, including thesis/dissertation advisement.

Adjunct faculty are responsible for up to 15 credit hours (49% FTE) per academic year (CBA 11.1 and 11.2). SOE adjunct faculty workloads may consist of 100% instruction, 100% supervision, or some combination.

SOE term faculty are responsible for 15-30 credit hours (50-100% FTE) per academic year, which may consist of up to 27 workload units (90% FTE) instructing courses, supervising interns, or some combination. All SOE term faculty receive at least 3 workload units (10% FTE) for service to the department and/or the unit.
Tenure-track faculty are responsible for "thirty (30) workload units (WLUs) per academic year--with one WLU equal to one credit of teaching or equivalent research or service effort" (CBA 13.3.3). SOE tenure-track faculty workloads for the nine-month academic year consist of 50% teaching assigned by the dean in consultation with the department chair and faculty member. Faculty determine the distribution of the other 50% between research and service.

"Work in P-12" schools typically appears in workloads under service, except for supervision which appears under "teaching." "Independent study" appears under teaching.

"Administrative duties." SOE allocates 6 WLUs per year to department chairs for administrative responsibilities, either within the regular load or as an overload, at each chair's discretion. Additional WLUs are allocated for contract extensions to coincide with the local school district calendar, and for work during the summer.

In FY07, FY08, and FY09, the SOE allocated additional workload units for work related to accreditation preparation.

6c.2. What are the faculty workloads for teaching and the supervision of clinical practice?

Exhibit 6c2, "Faculty Teaching and Supervision Workloads," shows faculty workloads for teaching and supervising clinical practice for adjunct, term, and tenure-track faculty, expressed as workload units (WLUs) and percentage of each individual's total workload.

Most occasional adjuncts, 49% adjuncts, and 50-100% term faculty either supervise interns or teach courses, according to their particular experiences and expertise, although some both teach and supervise interns. Most tenure-track and tenured faculty both teach and supervise interns in addition to chairing/serving on graduate committees and conducting their own research.

SOE tenure-track faculty rarely teach more than 2 courses per semester (12 WLUs, 40% FTE), with an additional 3 WLUs (10%) under "teaching" for supervising interns and/or chairing and serving on graduate committees. Faculty exercise a great deal of personal discretion as to the number of graduate committees they feel they can chair in a quality manner based on the topic, their familiarity with the candidate's needs, and their other commitments. Exhibit 6c11 shows faculty committee chair assignments for AY08 and AY09.

Exhibit 6c9, "SOE Elementary & Secondary Intern Supervision Policies" explains the guidelines regarding expectations, compensation, and workload units assigned to faculty for supervising interns who are local, somewhat distant, and very distant.

6c.3. To what extent do workloads and class size allow faculty to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service (including time for such responsibilities as advisement, developing assessments, and online courses)?

Workloads and class size allow SOE faculty to devote full attention to effective teaching, scholarship, and service.

In regard to workloads, tenure-track/tenured faculty rarely teach over 15 WLUs per year, and then only voluntarily. The SOE considers "teaching" to include numbered courses, supervising interns, and chairing and serving on graduate committees. Thus, most tenure-track/tenured faculty devote 50% of their nine-month contract time to scholarship and service. Also, SOE faculty do not have formal
advising responsibilities as do faculty in other UAF academic units, which offers multiple advantages. For example, Department Chairs work very closely with the unit’s academic advisors, thus assuring program integrity while allowing staff, faculty, and the unit to use time and expertise appropriately and effectively. Similarly, the SOE’s highly skilled academic advisors allow faculty to spend more time supervising interns, advising candidates who face unusual challenges, and guiding candidates’ work on projects and theses.

SOE class sizes are typically small, as demonstrated in an analysis of the fall 2007 semester conducted by the UA Statewide Office of Institutional Research in April 2008 (linked). After deleting special topics courses and others for which the SOE has only courtesy responsibility, the analysis identified:
- no courses with more than 19 students
- 6 courses with 19 ½ - 15 students
- 30 courses with 14 ½ - 10 students
- 27 courses with 9 ½ - 5 students
- 44 courses with 4 ½ - 1 students

Class sizes are occasionally, but rarely, larger. While small class sizes are admirable in some ways, all SOE personnel understand that large number of courses with extremely low enrollments compromise our ability to do other things we value and we have regular constructive conversations about how to achieve a sustainable balance.

6c.4. How does the unit ensure that the use of part-time faculty contributes to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the unit and its programs?

All SOE programs pay close attention to ensuring that part-time faculty fully understand both the programs to which they contribute and the importance of their roles to the overall integrity, coherence and quality of the unit and its programs.

There are three primary avenues through which this integration occurs. First, part-time educator preparation faculty are allocated service workload units to attend departmental and unit faculty meetings. They are particularly encouraged to attend meetings or portions of meetings dealing with curriculum integration, program coherence, and candidate experiences within the relevant program. Second, part-time faculty are expected to attend the beginning and end-of-semester meetings that the educator preparation programs hold with interns, mentor teachers, and SOE faculty members. These meetings focus on ensuring that all participants share a common understanding about the internship experience and its target level objectives. They also provide an opportunity for broadly-based conversations about the programs and their continuous improvement processes. Third, SOE adjuncts are compensated for teaching courses at a rate above the norm at UAF, and the SOE further offers adjuncts an increment for each year of service up to three years in the belief that they contribute more to the candidates and to the programs with increasing experience. Similarly, the SOE voluntarily offers non-represented part-time faculty an annual increment equal to the across-the-board increment offered to represented faculty. Part-time faculty teaching at the 49% level and above are also eligible to apply for SOE Professional Development and Faculty Research funds.

6c.5. What personnel provide support for the unit? How does the unit ensure that it has an adequate number of support personnel?

The following personnel provide support for the unit:
- 2.0 FTE undergraduate student workers
- 2.0 FTE graduate student workers
- 3.0 FTE academic advisors
- 2.0 program support staff
- 5.0 FTE general support staff, including receptionist, special topics coordinator, fiscal officer, personnel/payroll assistant, and administrative assistant. Exhibit 6c4, "Personnel," identifies SOE support personnel by name and role. Exhibit 6c10, "SOE Organizational Chart of Programs and Program Support," shows support roles in relation to SOE programs.

Although our budget is fixed, the SOE has the authority to create, revise, or eliminate positions within University guidelines. For example, in 2004 we reactivated the staff position of rural academic advisor to provide rural students an advisor with specific expertise related to their needs. Similarly, we have several times adjusted a technology support position to variously include database development, data management, tech support for software and hardware needs, and professional development. Some of these adjustments have been in response to specific needs, and some have been to take best advantage of the particular expertise of the successful applicant.

SOE staff are widely regarded as among the most professional personnel on campus. Because we are a relatively small unit and staff turnover inevitably causes a disruption, we are fortunate to have a number of staff members who have served the SOE and/or the University for long periods of time and we try to show our appreciation through formal mechanisms such as merit increases and annual staff appreciation awards, and through regular, informal office activities.

**6c.6. What financial support is available for professional development activities for faculty?**

The SOE maintains two professional development funds for faculty. Faculty committees review proposals and recommend to the dean which proposals should be supported. RFPs for these funds are in Exhibits 6c5 and 6c6.

The Faculty Research Fund (FRF) provides "seed money" to help new faculty establish research agendas and continuing faculty to begin new lines of inquiry. For the past few years, the FRF has been funded at $50,000 per year with a maximum individual research award of $12,000 for one project. All SOE faculty half-time and above are eligible to apply. Exhibit 6c7 summarizes FRF Projects, AY07-09.

The Faculty Professional Development Fund (FPDF) is intended to support a broad array of professional development opportunities, from purchase of specialized equipment to registration for web-based conferences. In practice, most applicants request support for travel to traditional conferences. For the past few years, the FPDF has been funded at $15,000 per year with a maximum annual award of $1200 to any one individual. Exhibit 6c8 shows faculty activities supported by this fund AY06-08.

Other UAF offices also offer faculty professional development opportunities. The Faculty Development Office sponsors 8 - 10 events on campus each year; offers small, discretionary, competitive awards; and occasionally offers registration and/or travel to specific conferences identified by the Development Office Director.

The Summer Sessions Office offers faculty an incentive to teach summer courses in the form of a $500 bonus for discretionary professional development activities. The Provost's Office occasionally offers registration and/or travel to specific activities beneficial to the campus. And numerous offices and academic units sponsor lectures, training sessions, and professional conferences in the Fairbanks area that are typically at no cost to UAF personnel. A variety of high profile awards are given to UAF faculty
each year on a nomination-and-review basis.

6c.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to personnel may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Workload Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6c Exhibit List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

6d. Unit facilities

6d.1. How adequate are unit--classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, the technology infrastructure, and school facilities--to support teaching and learning? [Describe facilities on the main campus as well as the facilities at off-campus sites if they exist.]

Physical space on the UAF campus is crowded, particularly office space, although classroom space is heavily used at certain hours of the day, and technology-equipped classroom space is in high demand. About ten years ago, the University reclaimed control of nearby property it had leased to the local school district and placed several University programs in what had been an elementary school (OUP). Within OUP, the SOE enjoys sole occupancy of two classrooms and one media lab, and shared use of several other spaces in the building. While the unit has had to internally fund some necessary upgrades to the classrooms, the site has proven to be an asset because it provides convenient access for candidates and mentor teachers who teach all day and then quickly transition to University activities in late afternoon and early evening. These classrooms have also permitted faculty to create instructional spaces similar to those in which candidates perform their internships and those they will be entering upon completion of their programs.

Through a variety of grant proposals and internal reallocations, the SOE has been very successful in increasing infrastructure and maximizing the usefulness of the space it controls. Technology infrastructure at OUP includes 2 sets videoconferencing equipment, 3 SmartBoards, 3 ceiling mounted LCD projectors, access to wireless network, and multiple sets of audioconferencing equipment. In addition, the media lab at OUP houses high-end computers for onsite editing of videos and portfolios, plus sets of digital microscopes, midi keyboards, laptop computers, and digital still and videocameras that interns check out for use in their classrooms.

Two IT faculty members have offices in the OUP computer lab, and many Elementary and Secondary faculty use the two OUP classrooms as work areas because their curriculum materials are housed there and because their classes take place there. A recent report on the SOE’s use of the Old University Park facility is attached.

The SOE also controls scheduling for a small, 260 s.f. conference/classroom near the SOE offices with audio and videoconferencing equipment, and a 360 s.f. conference room with audioconferencing equipment.

As described in 6e.4, Rasmuson Library is an excellent facility in terms of space, and human, physical, and electronic resources. Rasmuson personnel are keenly aware that almost half of UAF students do not reside in the Fairbanks area and they deploy resources accordingly. As described in 6e.2, the SOE has supplemented technology resources provided by the campus through active proposal writing and
through allocation of year-end funds. SOE staff and faculty are campus leaders not only in using technology to support instruction, but in stimulating dialog among their University and P-12 colleagues about how and when technology constructively supports teaching and learning.

6d.2. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit facilities may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Report on the School of Education’s use of Old University Park School to the UAF Campus Master Planning Committee, July 9, 2009

See Attachments panel below.

6e. Unit resources including technology

6e.1. How does the unit allocate resources across programs to ensure candidates meet standards in their field of study?

In general, SOE fiscal resources are allocated across programs by consensus, and sharing of faculty expertise across departments is the norm. For example, in FY06, the Counseling Program within the Graduate Department presented a case for a new faculty position to the SOE Dean's Council and Council members supported their request, resulting in an internal reallocation. Less dramatically, but much more regularly, Departments share faculty expertise to meet needs. One faculty member regularly accepts workloads units in the Elementary and Graduate Departments; in FY10 another will accept workload units in all three departments; and three faculty members regularly support the occasional art and foreign language candidates the Elementary and Secondary Departments provide as a service to districts, upon request.

All Departments have budget for specific activities that have become "traditional," for example, beginning and end-of-year meetings that involve interns, mentor teachers, and SOE faculty. Some activities are supported through a pool budget, such as the annual Rural Practicum that supports a one-week experience in a rural school and community for interns who choose to participate. In the past few years, all interns who wanted to participate were able to do so through a process of sharing budget between departments, allocating additional funds, and/or choosing destinations based on cost and available budget. Although it is not always easy to reach consensus on these items, the model allows us to maintain academic integrity as the primary objective, and staff and faculty are constructive in finding ways to address each other’s needs.

6e.2. What information technology resources support faculty and candidates? What evidence shows that candidates and faculty use these resources?

Over the past few years, the SOE has assembled from internal and UAF competitive funds an impressive array of technology resources and opportunities that enrich both candidates’ learning experiences and faculty professional development. These include an SOE-supported technology lab; numerous faculty professional development opportunities supported by internal and external resources; two faculty positions and one staff position devoted to providing technology support and to encouraging an ongoing conversation about ways that technology does and does not support teaching and learning; and a SmartBoard/Videoconferencing system used for teaching and for supervising interns. In addition, SOE faculty have actively pursued professional development opportunities related to information technology offered on invitational and/or competitive bases by various UAF offices. Campus-level offices have invited several faculty members who are known for being active information technology users to attend
professional development conferences as representatives of the campus.

Beginning in approximately 2005, the SOE began tentatively setting aside budget to upgrade most staff and faculty computers on a three to four year cycle. Although these purchases typically come from end-of-year funds, we have so far been able to maintain this objective. Several times each year, a technology committee composed of staff and faculty reviews needs and resources, determines which machines to replace, and redirects older-but-usable machines to appropriate purposes. For example, some of the older laptops have become "class sets" that interns use with students in public school classrooms that may not have such resources.

In spring 2007, the SOE contracted with the UAF Center for Distance Education to provide a five-day information technology workshop for SOE faculty. In spring 2008 and again in spring 2009, two SOE IT faculty and one IT staff person sponsored similar three day (\(i_{i\;i_{2008}}\)) and two day (\(i_{i_{i_{2009}}}\)) workshop for their SOE colleagues. In addition, over the past three years, these IT staff and faculty have presented approximately 25 day-long and half-day single topic workshops for SOE personnel.

The participant counts in Exhibit 6e1, "SOE Information Technology Resources," illustrate that these technology resources and professional development opportunities related to information technology are well utilized by candidates and faculty.

6e.3. What resources are available for the development and implementation of the unit's assessment system?

| Human resources. All faculty, including part-time faculty, are allocated service workload units to contribute to program and department assessment activities. For example, over the past half-dozen years, a significant amount of faculty and academic advisor time has been devoted to identifying relevant standards and professional characteristics and "backward mapping" to the admissions and transition criteria that will help candidates achieve them. Support staff have devoted significant hours to the logistical support of this process. As a result of active nurturing of professional relationships with P-12 and professional colleagues, the unit also benefits from a significant number of hours they contribute to our programs, many of which focus on refinement and implementation of the assessment system.

Most of the financial resources devoted to the assessment system in recent years have focused on moving data from various departmental databases into a more coherent relational database that will improve storage, retrieval, and analysis. During FY05 and 06, a .5 FTE staff person attempted to clean up a database begun by a previous faculty member. With advice from internal and external consultants, a broad group of staff and faculty members decided to abandon that model. Since FY07, the unit has paid an external contractor slightly more than $25K to develop a new database. This does not include staff and faculty time working with the contractor, nor the UAF Banner Student Data Coordinator's time assisting development and population of the new database. We expect population to be complete before the end of the fall \(i_{i_{i_{2009}}}\) semester, and incremental migration to occur thereafter. Over the past 16 months, a capable faculty member has been allocated 10 workload units to support unit-level integration of the assessment system. Since June \(i_{i_{i_{2007}}}\), the SOE has supported a full-time staff person with a dual role of technical support and data management.

6e.4. What library and curricular resources exist at the institution? How does the unit ensure they are sufficient and current?

| SOE faculty and candidates have access to exemplary materials, as illustrated by Exhibit 6e2, which lists "Library and Information Resources Available to SOE Personnel." Broad access to UA students and Alaska residents is assisted through electronic materials license sharing with sister libraries at UAA and |
UAS, along with "The Digital Pipeline," an Alaska-wide program to make electronic library materials available to all Alaskan citizens. However, even those materials that are restricted to UAF students are available to all UAF students, no matter where they reside.

Resources about education and teacher preparation include approximately 22,000 books, videos, audios and links to electronic materials. The Library subscribes to approximately 1000 journals on a variety of education topics; almost all are electronic, and include such major collections as JSTOR, Professional Development Collection, and ProQuest Education Journals [Exhibit 6e3]. The Library also holds the complete collection of ERIC documents on microfiche to supplement those not yet available full-text in the ERIC database.

Other special online tools include the Testing and Education Resource Center (with practice tests for Praxis and others), the Teacher Reference Center, current ebooks from the Gale Virtual Reference Library, and citation management software (both EndNote and RefWorks).

The Alaska materials collection features a wealth of specialized information and curriculum materials for use in bilingual instruction, science instruction, and many other content areas [Exhibit 6e4]. The Library also offers resources to support the School of Education's counseling program.

To ensure that these materials are sufficient and current, Rasmuson Library personnel:
- Provide a subject librarian to work specifically with faculty and candidates in the School of Education to identify and address needs, including assessing the collection when new programs are developed or existing programs are revised;
- Solicit requests for books, journals, and other materials in-person, through email, and through a web page suggestion form;
- Meet with students in education courses (both face-to-face and distance courses) to ensure they are knowledgeable about resources and library services;
- Review lists of books purchased, and lists of books and journal articles requested through interlibrary loan, to identify any insufficient areas and make adjustments in the materials budget to address weaknesses;
- Utilize multiple strategies to help with book selection, including: Choice Reviews, Noteworthy University Press titles, other book reviews and notices of new publications, lists of awards and nominations for children's books, and a profile of purchasing interests for an "approval plan";
- Offer ways for faculty and candidates to stay current through online alerts from all library databases as well as our library catalog; and
- Participate in orientations for new students and new faculty.

6e.5. How does the unit ensure the accessibility of resources to candidates, including candidates in off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, through electronic means?

In addition to the strategies to ensure accessibility of resources to all candidates mentioned in Response 6e.4, the UAF Rasmuson Library offers:
- IP authentication for all electronic information resources, supplemented by authentication of all off-campus candidates/faculty through their UA username or UAF email userid so that resources are available anywhere that they have web access;
- Interlibrary Loan which is free to all candidates and faculty, and which utilizes current technologies to deliver electronically as much material as possible for quick response and convenient access;
- An Off-Campus Library Services unit, with a librarian dedicated to helping distance candidates/faculty/staff with any subject or access needs; integrated with staff support from our Interlibrary Loan/Document Delivery office;
Document Delivery services which will scan materials physically in our main or branch library (within copyright restrictions) and make them available to candidates/faculty on a secure web server, or will mail books from our collections to candidates/faculty beyond the Fairbanks area; Individualized reference help either face-to-face, by phone, by email, or by live chat software.

School of Education faculty make frequent use of "eRes," an electronic documents reservation system established by the Rasmuson Library that supports broad access of published and faculty generated material to all students, regardless of location. Within copyright restrictions, faculty post material to BlackBoard, and they regularly use podcasts, blogs, wikis, and the SOE Moodle server to make their own video, audio and print materials available to students. Through creative use of videoconferencing and SMART Boards, faculty synchronously share even protected material in ways that allow students to read and discuss it without capturing or printing the material for reuse, maintaining compliance with copyright rules.

6e.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit resources, including technology, may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 6?

Through hard work, dedication, and innovation, SOE staff and faculty have steadily enhanced the quality of SOE programs in the face of growing options from online and other providers, an increasingly complex educator-preparation environment in Alaska, and level funding for the institution while costs rise steadily.

By virtue of their experience in the institution and commitment to individual students, SOE academic advisors play a valuable role in assuring that candidates get clear, accurate academic advising. Their work also permits faculty to spend more time supporting coursework, practica, internships, theses and advanced advising. Several other staff members have served the SOE for long periods, allowing them to understand—and often anticipate—faculty and program needs.

IT support staff and IT faculty have been highly successful in obtaining grants that augment other resources to make the SOE a technology-rich teaching and learning environment. SOE faculty have thoughtfully adopted and creatively adapted technology tools in their teaching and communicating with candidates, as evidenced by frequent requests to present workshops and invitations to share their work with colleagues in the institution and the profession. As their CVs and activity reports reveal, SOE faculty play leadership roles in a broad variety of state and national professional organizations.

Department chairs are educational leaders in Alaska, primarily because of their depth of experience in their fields and their ongoing scholarship, but also because of their regular practice of collaboration with partners in P-12 schools, education-related agencies, and other academic institutions both within and beyond the UA system.

SOE staff and faculty have regularly supported expenditure of internal funds that might have been
directed elsewhere to upgrade facilities that enhance the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

2. What research related to Standard 6 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

Several faculty members are conducting classroom-based and formal research projects to explore ways of using technology to enhance candidates' preparation to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Operating under a shared belief that candidates from diverse backgrounds have much to offer the learning environment and each other, SOE faculty combine diverse groups of students in learning activities whenever possible. However, in regard to geographical diversity, access to the same technology resources, particularly bandwidth, is sometimes a challenge.

Consequently, several SOE faculty members are actively investigating ways to combine relatively new hardware (e.g. SmartBoards and videoconferencing), utilize low-bandwidth software (e.g. EluminateLive), and interface publicly available video resources (e.g. Skype, GoogleChat) with the University-sponsored VideoConferencing Services to allow diverse students to fully and equitably participate in discussions, and share and reflect on their experiences.

Another faculty member (Kaden) was recently awarded an institutional grant to investigate ways to provide STEM professional development to P-12 teachers using Vernier real time data collection computer-based probeware. And another faculty member (Roehl) is mid-way through a very promising project to learn more about the best software, hardware, and logistical strategies to enhance the number and quality of supervision observations and debriefing conversations during candidates' practica and internships.

Through activities such as these, SOE faculty demonstrate their leadership in both educational practice and research related to Standard 6.