

## UAS – Anchorage School District (ASD)

### Student Achievement Comparison (2/3 UAS Teachers in Title I Schools; 1/3 ASD Overall)

Comparison of student achievement between the students (3<sup>rd</sup> – 9<sup>th</sup> grades) of the UAS cohort of teachers and the overall scores of Juneau and Anchorage students.

MAP Growth is a dynamic adaptive assessment that measures student achievement and growth in K-12 math, reading, language usage, and science.

<b>MAP Growth Mathematics, Spring 2023</b>	<b>UAS Cohort</b>	<b>ASD Averages</b>
Average MAP Score	209	207
% Students Meeting Benchmark	52%	52%
% Students Meeting Expected Growth Fall to Spring	54%	53%
<b>MAP Growth Reading, Spring 2023</b>	<b>UAS Cohort</b>	<b>ASD Averages</b>
Average MAP Score	209	211
% Students Meeting Benchmark	54%	56%
% Students Meeting Expected Growth Fall to Spring	46%	44%
<b>MAP Growth Language, Spring 2023</b>	<b>UAS Cohort</b>	<b>ASD Averages</b>
Average MAP Score	204	209
% Students Meeting Benchmark	45%	51%
% Students Meeting Expected Growth Fall to Spring	NA	NA

**UAS – Juneau School District (JSD)**  
**Student Achievement Comparison**

<b>MAP Growth Mathematics, Spring 2023</b>	<b>UAS Cohort</b>	<b>JSD Averages</b>
Average MAP Score	217	201
% Students Meeting Benchmark	60%	50%
% Students Meeting Expected Growth Fall to Spring	56%	48%
<b>MAP Growth Reading, Spring 2023</b>	<b>UAS Cohort</b>	<b>JSD Averages</b>
Average MAP Score	212	197
% Students Meeting Benchmark	59%	48%
% Students Meeting Expected Growth Fall to Spring	52%	44%
<b>MAP Growth Language, Spring 2023</b>	<b>UAS Cohort</b>	<b>JSD Averages</b>
Average MAP Score	213	204
% Students Meeting Benchmark	56%	52%
% Students Meeting Expected Growth Fall to Spring	45%	40%

Employers are asked to participate in the Supervisor Survey developed by the Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT). Supervising principals of first-year alumni complete the survey with questions probing the supervising principals’ perceptions of the novice teachers’ performance in several knowledge, skill, and disposition domains related to their teaching responsibilities measuring satisfaction in four main areas: Instructional Practice, Diverse Learners, Learning Environments, and Professionalism.

**Evidence of Employer (principals) Satisfaction**  
**NeXT Surveys: 2021 N=40, 2022 N=29, 2023 N=43**

Measure	Satisfaction Rate
Effectively teach subject matter	97%
Effectively teach diverse students	95%
Effectively connect content to students’ lives	98%

\*On a 1 – 4 scale rating completes’ effectiveness, Low area is “classroom management”. = 3.2  
 High area is “effectively teaches core content” = 3.8

**Evidence of Completer (graduates) Satisfaction**  
**NeXT Surveys: 2021 N=27, 2022 N=31, 2023 N=21**

Measure	Satisfaction Rate
Would recommend teacher prep. program	92%
Believe they were adequately prepared to teach	90%
Felt least prepared for classroom management	20%

**Program Strengths**  
**(Triangulated results from observations, surveys, and discussions)**

<b>Strength</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
Relationships	Relationships between faculty and students and among students in student cohort groups was the most frequently cited strength of the collective EPP programs, using both interview and survey data. Students repeatedly cited their appreciation for the individual attention, flexibility, and support of faculty, and the high degree to which they benefited from their student cohort groups throughout the duration of their teacher preparation programs.
Rigor	Rigor of program content and field experience (practicums and internships) was the second most cited strength of the collective program designs across the EPP.
Relevance	Relevance of course content and practicum coursework assignments, including the cross-program emphasis on culturally responsive pedagogies and “real world,” place based rooted curricular design, was the third most cited strength of each of the EPP’s initial licensure program.

**Program Opportunities for Growth**  
**(Triangulated results from observations, surveys, and discussions)**

<b>Opportunity for Growth</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
“Trauma-informed” pedagogical practices	Lack of information and preparation regarding “trauma-informed” pedagogical practices were the most frequently cited “gap” in our Completers’ teaching preparation.
Internships	Lack of specific program design support to accommodate the growing number of student interns and student teachers experiencing their internships while also serving as the teacher of record (i.e. student teaching in their own classrooms) was the second most cited area of need by our recent Completers, from both the survey and interview data.
Inter-program coordination and collaboration	Lack, at times, of inter-program coordination and collaboration between general and special education teacher programs, leading to students in both programs less than fully prepared to collaborate on overlapping professional responsibilities such as the creation of Individual Education Plans, (IEPs) was the third most cited area of deficiency.