



AAQEP Annual Report for 2021

Provider/Program Name:

University of Guam

End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or “n/a” if not yet accredited):

2027

PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

1. Overview and Context

This overview describes the mission and context of the educator preparation provider and the programs encompassed in its AAQEP review.

The University of Guam

The University of Guam’s mission is *Ina, Diskubre, Setbe* – to Enlighten, to Discover, to Serve. It is dedicated to the search for and dissemination of knowledge, wisdom, and truth. The University exists to service its learners and the communities of Guam, Micronesia and the neighboring regions of the Pacific and Asia. The University prepares learners for life by providing the opportunity to acquire knowledge, skills, attitudes, and abilities through the core curriculum, degree programs, research, and outreach. At the Pacific crosscurrents of the East and West, the University of Guam provides a unique opportunity to acquire indigenous and global knowledge.

The University of Guam is an open admission, land-grant institution accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) and is the major institution of higher education in the Western Pacific.

A central part of the Land-Grant mission requires the University of Guam to engage with the community, serve the needs of Guam and the Micronesia region, and provide knowledge-based research to the community. With a gorgeous view of Pago Bay and the Pacific Ocean, the University is a 161-acre campus on Guam's east coast. As the largest of some 2,000 islands that make up Micronesia, Guam is about three hours flying time from Tokyo, Manila, Taipei, Hong Kong, and Seoul and occupies a major strategic location for the United States that operates large U.S. Navy and Air Force bases.

The UOG School of Education

The mission of the School of Education (SOE) is to prepare teachers, professionals, and leaders in education to meet the multicultural educational demands of Guam and the region in the Pacific.

The Unit consists of all academic programs that lead to certification or licensure both at the initial and the advanced levels. SOE offers two bachelor's programs and seven master's programs, leading to careers in teaching, counseling, reading, school leadership, and other fields. SOE is organized into two academic divisions: 1) Foundations, Educational Research and Human Studies (FERHS); and 2) Teacher Education and Public Service (TEPS). FERHS provides foundations for undergraduate and graduate students and hosts two graduate programs in Administration and Supervision as well as Counseling. TEPS provides undergraduate programs in Elementary and Secondary Education and graduate programs in Teaching, Reading, Special Education, Secondary Education, and Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages (TESOL).

Summary data here provides the reader with information about the UOG School of Education's successes in terms of program enrollment, preparation, and completion. As well as satisfaction or recommendations for improvement provided by our completers and employers.

Public Posting URL

Part I of this report is posted at the following web address (accredited members of AAQEP must post at least Part I):

<https://www.uog.edu/schools-and-colleges/school-of-education/reports>

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows enrollment and completion data from the most recently completed academic year for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2020-2021

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution/organization	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates currently enrolled	Number of Completers in 2020-21
Elementary Bachelor's (BAE)	K-5	163	24
Secondary Bachelor's (BAE)	6-12, with license areas: Math, General Science, Fine Arts, Career & Technical Education, PE & School Health, English, History, Government,	135	27
Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT-ELEM or MAT-SEC)	K-5 or 6-12 in a content area.	34	13
MA in Counseling	School Counselor or Community Counselor	57	20
MEd in Administration and Supervision	Administrator	10	2
MEd in Reading	Reading Specialist PreK-12	40	24
MEd in Secondary Education	None	5	4
MEd in Special Education	Special Education PreK-12	17	8
MEd in Teaching English as a Second or Other Language	English as a Second Language (ESL)	8	7
	TOTALS:	469	129

Added or Discontinued Programs

Any programs within the AAQEP review that have been added or discontinued within the past year are listed below. (This list is required only from providers with accredited programs.)

N/A

3. Program Performance Indicators

The program performance information in Table 2 applies to the academic year indicated in Table 1.

Table 2. Program Performance Indicators

1. Total enrollment in the educator preparation programs shown in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals earning more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
469
2. Total number of unique completers (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
129
3. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.
Of the 129 completers, 97 would be recommended for certification but that doesn't mean all completers applied for a certificate. All initial program completers (65) go for certification immediately. For the advance programs, they may choose not to pursue certification. For example, Administration and Supervision program, although the two are recommended for a certificate, none of the two applied at this time. The MEd in Secondary Education completers do not qualify for an additional certificate.
4. Cohort completion rates for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program's expected timeframe and in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.
The timeframe for the expected undergraduate cohort completion is four years and 1.5 times that is 6 years. In an effort to track completion rates, we chose to work backward. That is we took the list of completers in 2020-2021 and determined their start dates.

The reason for this backward mapping for cohort completion is that many students declare education but have not been admitted or had no intention of staying with that degree.

Declared Program	Head Count	Percent (%) Graduated in 4 years	Percent (%) Graduated in 6 years
Elementary	24	37.5%	50%
Secondary	27	59.3%	29.6%
SOE	51	49%	39.2%
UOG First-time, Full-Time Freshmen Cohort	490	11.6%	41.2%

5. Summary of state license examination results, including teacher performance assessments, and specification of any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) was below 80%.

The following data is provided by ETS Data Manager. If there are less than five scores in a particular area, the data is not aggregated to show cumulative pass rates. The teacher performance assessments are administered by Praxis and based on data from the previous year up to September. The following scores had enough test takers (5 or more) to show the pass rate percentage.

Test #	Test Name	Total #	Total Pass	Pass Rate
5018	Elementary Ed: Content Knowledge	41	27	65.85%
5038	English Lang. Arts: Content Knowledge	19	15	78.95%
5081	Social Studies: Content Knowledge	9	6	66.67%
5169	Middle School Mathematics	9	7	77.78%
5622	Principles of Learn Teach: Grades K-6	57	54	84.62%
5624	Principles of Learn Teach: Grades 7-12	39	33	94.74%
5435	General Science	9	3	33.33%
5857	Health and PE	7	5	71.43%
5440	Middle School Science	6	5	83.33%
5421	Professional School Counselor	7	5	71.43%
5301	Reading Specialist	6	5	83.33%
5354	Special Ed: Core Knowledge & Application	7	7	100%

5362	ESL	6	6	100%
------	-----	---	---	------

The School of Education also had test takers in multiple areas including School Leaders Licensure Assessment, Mathematics (5161), Business Education (5101), Music (5113), and Art (5134). It is important to note, that some students may choose to challenge the content tests without the requisite education in the field. For example, the MAT requires that students complete the Praxis Subject Assessment prior to admission. Students with a degree they feel is aligned to math or science may choose to challenge the Mathematics or General Science Praxis. This attempt to challenge it affects our overall pass rate. Students who are prepared by our programs have a higher pass rate than demonstrated above. All initial educator test takers must pass the Praxis content and PLT in order to participate in student teaching or internship. The difference with the data provided by ETS is that this data is inclusive of anyone who chooses to identify UOG as a score recipient. Praxis data is shared with the content faculty across the university campus and this has led to changes in programs to offer courses that would better prepare students for the district curriculum and the Praxis exam. Additionally, it is important to note that although we have several areas below an 80% pass rate, we have had improvement in Elementary Ed: Content Knowledge, English Language Arts, and Middle School Math. We will continue to monitor score reports and work with the content areas to review potential gaps in instruction.

6. Narrative explanation of **evidence available from program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

Graduates from the initial educator preparation and advanced programs were surveyed in the Summer of 2021 asking how classes and field experiences at the SOE gave them ample opportunities to learn or extend their teaching expertise in five categories. While we surveyed completers who exited the program both 4 years out and 1 year out, the data provided here is for the end of the respondents' year 1. There were eighteen (N=18) out of 61 initial completers who responded for a 29% response rate. The breakdown of the 18 respondents by the grade level they were teaching was: 6 elementary and 10 secondary, with the 2 remaining not indicating a specific grade level. In the advanced programs there were seventeen (N=17) out of 91 advanced completers who responded for a 18.6% response rate. The breakdown of the 17 respondents by program was: 6 counseling , 5 reading, 4 secondary education, and 2 from the TESOL program. The scale for both initial and advanced surveys were Not Applicable (0), Strongly Agree (4), Agree (3), Disagree (2), and Strongly Disagree (1).

The Initial Educators were surveyed on their planning, classroom management, incorporating diversity, utilizing assessment, and embodying professionalism. Based on the averages ranging from 3.05-3.8, completers agreed to strongly agreed that they were adequately prepared in all areas assessed. However, in reviewing the standard deviations, more attention needs to be given to

those areas with a standard deviation of .7 or higher. That means attention needs to go toward the common core, special education, and communicating with parents.

The advance program completers were surveyed on planning, management, incorporating diversity, utilizing assessment, and embodying professionalism. The respondents overwhelmingly agreed to strongly agreed that their programs prepared them for all areas with average scores ranging from 3.5 to 3.8. There was consistently one student respondent who was not satisfied with their program. It is difficult to determine which program that might be. Being consistent with the initial programs, giving attention to those areas with a standard deviation greater than .7 means that there needs to be further guidance on using technology and responding to those with special needs.

INITIAL PROGRAM: Based on the courses and experiences in your teacher preparation program (including courses in your major and education), how well can you do the following:	Mean	SD
A. Plan		
A.1. Align content standards to lessons.	3.75	0.444
A.2. Align common core to lessons	3.70	0.733
A.3. Connect lesson across content areas	3.65	0.489
A.4. Develop lesson plans	3.80	0.523
A.5. Design lessons with a variety of teaching methods	3.70	0.470
A.6. Use of technology and media for teaching	3.55	0.510
A.7. Actively engage students in the learning process	3.65	0.489
A.8. Modify teaching as a result of student understanding.	3.55	0.605
A.9. Provide ample opportunity for higher-order thinking	3.50	0.688
B. Classroom Management		
B.1. Create a safe and orderly learning environment.	3.45	0.605
B.2. Maintain a safe and orderly learning environment.	3.35	0.587
B.3. Respond effectively to disruptive behavior.	3.05	0.605
B.4. Manage class time effectively.	3.50	0.513
C. Incorporate Diversity		
C.1. Design, adapt, and deliver effective instruction to English Language Learners.	3.35	0.587
C.2. Design, adapt, and deliver effective instruction to Special Education students.	3.35	0.745
C.3. Design, adapt, and deliver effective instruction to advanced students.	3.35	0.587
D. Utilize Assessment		
D.1. Design effective formative assessment tools.	3.45	0.605

D.2. Design effective summative assessment tools.	3.45	0.605
D.3. Effectively respond to assessment results.	3.45	0.605
D.4. Incorporate effective feedback.	3.55	0.510
D.5. Engage students with assessments.	3.50	0.607
E. Embody Professionalism		
E.1. Demonstrate dispositions and behaviors appropriate to the profession	3.80	0.410
E.2. Demonstrate ethics appropriate to the profession	3.65	0.489
E.3. Work effectively with the school community	3.65	0.489
E.4. Communicate effectively with parents.	3.263	0.733
E.5. Engage in meaningful reflections	3.70	0.470

ADVANCED PROGRAM: Based on the courses and experiences in your advanced program how well can you do the following (Note – clients refer to whoever is the recipient of our service):	Mean	SD
A. Plan		
A.1. Align accepted principles and standards of good practice to area of specialization.	3.60	0.598
A.2. Understand and make connections across multiple aspects in area of specialization	3.70	0.571
A.3. Effectively utilize principles and standards of good practice in area of specialization	3.60	0.598
A.4. Design effective procedures and engage methods appropriate to area of specialization.	3.70	0.657
A.5. Use technology in your area of specialization	3.70	0.733
A.6. Modify method or approach in response to understanding clients in your area of specialization.	3.60	0.598
A.7. Provide opportunity for higher-order thinking	3.65	0.587
B. Management		
B.1. Create/maintain a safe and orderly work environment.	3.75	0.444
B.2. Respond effectively to my client's behavior.	3.60	0.681
B.3. Manage work time/tasks effectively.	3.70	0.571
C. Incorporate Diversity		
C.1. Effectively provide for and respond to the needs of English Language Learners/clients.	3.80	0.523
C.2. Effectively provide for and respond to the needs of Special Education clients.	3.70	0.865
C.3. Effectively provide for and respond to the needs of clients of diverse cultures and ethnic backgrounds.	3.65	0.489
D. Utilize Assessment		

D.1. Effectively design and/or properly select a variety of appropriate assessment tools.	3.50	0.513
D.2. Effectively use and respond to the results of a variety of appropriate assessment tools.	3.50	0.607
D.3. Incorporate effective feedback.	3.50	0.607
E. Embody Professionalism		
E.1. Demonstrate dispositions and behaviors appropriate to the profession	3.65	0.489
E.2. Demonstrate ethics appropriate to the profession	3.70	0.470
E.3. Work effectively with the school community	3.70	0.470
E.4. Communicate effectively with professional partners.	3.80	0.616
E.5. Engage in meaningful reflections	3.65	0.587

7. Narrative explanation of **evidence available from employers of program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

One survey was sent to Guam Department of Education (GDOE) school principals to assess new teacher graduates for SY 2018-19 and SY 2019-20. For these school years, there were 69 new teacher graduates from the University of Guam School of Education (SOE) who were placed in 31 out of the 41 Guam Department of Education schools. The link to the SOE Employer Survey was emailed to the school principals to complete online using Qualtrics. The response rates were as follows:

- Elementary: 12 out of 21 principals responded (57% response rate)
- Secondary: 6 out of 10 principals responded (60% response rate)
- **OVERALL: 18 out of the 31 principals responded (58% response rate)**

The principals were asked to complete one survey per first-year teacher in their respective schools. The breakdown by school level of the number of teachers who were assessed is as follows:

- Elementary: 27 out of 46 first-year teachers were rated (59%)
- Secondary: 15 out of 23 first-year teachers were rated (65%)
- **OVERALL: 42 out of the 69 first-year teachers were rated (61%)**

Survey: Part I

The first part of the survey included 39 items in which the principals were asked to rate their satisfaction with the professional preparation using a five-point Likert Scale: 5 = *very satisfied*, 4 = *quite satisfied*, 3 = *satisfied*, 2 = *somewhat satisfied*, 1 = *not satisfied*, and *not observed*. The different aspects of teacher effectiveness rated on the survey are categorized in Table 1. Note: The last item was not placed into a category because the item rated the principal's overall satisfaction with the preparation of the first-year teacher. The internal consistency reliability of the survey was achieved through the use of the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient. The results in Table 1 show the items for each category, and the Alpha value that measures only the attribute for those categories. The nine categories received a reliability coefficient ranging from .94 to .99. Table 1 also shows the mean values of the survey items by category.

Table 1: *Teacher Effectiveness Categories and Reliability Coefficients and Mean*

CODE	CATEGORY	SURVEY ITEM	ALPHA	MEAN
pink	Content knowledge	A1, A2	.98	4.24
purple	Lesson planning and preparation	B1 – B5	.97	4.11
green	Instructional delivery	C1 – C6	.98	4.00
yellow	Accommodations for student diversity	D1 – D3	.99	3.85
blue	Assessment	E1 – E4	.96	3.86
gray	Classroom management and environment	F1 – F4	.98	4.03
orange	Interpersonal communication	G1 – G7	.98	4.20
red	Technology	H1 – H3	.94	4.16
white	Professionalism and Professional Growth	I1 – I4	.98	4.26
	OVERALL		.99	4.05

According to our annual survey of employers of our initial program graduates, the results show that while still lower than other areas, the scores have improved in the area of Accommodations for Student Diversity and in Interpersonal Communication which were rated as 3.3 and 3.7 in the prior year's survey. Interestingly, the school administrators and the completers see that Accommodations for Student Diversity, an area where special education is addressed, is a common area that needs more attention within the course work.

With all mean scores 3.69 or higher, we are satisfied that our graduates are performing at or above the expected level (satisfied or above). The scores below indicate that our employers of our initial graduates are quite to very satisfied with the teachers we are producing.

	Mean	SD
A. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE:		
A1. Broad knowledge of subject matter	4.24	0.88
A2. Knowledge of subject content for grade level taught	4.24	0.88
B. LESSON PLANNING & PREPARATION:		
B1. Aligns to national state standards	4.24	0.96
B2. Aligns lessons with college and career readiness standards	4.19	1.04
B3. Pursues organized plan to cover required content.	4.21	0.93
B4. Connects global perspectives in lesson content.	4.00	0.83
B5. Accommodates different learning styles, needs, and abilities.	3.90	0.93
C. INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY:		
C1. Presentation of content material	4.12	1.06
C2. Uses classroom time effectively	4.14	1.05
C3. Actively engages students in the learning process	4.02	0.9
C4. Integrates curriculum involving local and global issues.	3.95	0.99
C5. Varies instructional strategies	3.93	0.97
C6. Utilizes culturally responsive educational practices.	3.83	0.91
D. ACCOMODATIONS FOR STUDENT DIVERSITY:		
D1. Identifies special needs students and refers them to appropriate channel	3.86	1.00
D2. Accommodates needs of diverse students	3.83	0.96
D3. Accommodates needs of students with disabilities	3.85	0.98
E. ASSESSMENT:		
E1. Makes “action plans” based on student outcomes	3.69	0.95
E2. Provides students with immediate feedback	3.86	0.81
E3. Assesses student performance	4.02	0.92
E4. Uses assessment results to improve instruction	3.88	0.99

F. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT:		
F1. Organizes classroom	3.98	1.07
F2. Develops a safe and positive learning environment	4.05	1.06
F3. Manages classroom and student discipline	3.95	1.10
F4. Creates a productive learning environment.	4.12	1.02
G. INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION:		
G1. Communicates and works with parents	4.24	0.91
G2. Communicates and works with the community	4.12	0.92
G3. Communicates and works with colleagues	4.31	0.87
G4. Communicates and works with administration	4.33	0.86
G5. Communicates and works with school staff	4.31	0.84
G6. Asks for assistance when needed	4.02	0.87
G7. Responds to needs of students and co-workers	4.10	0.96
H. TECHNOLOGY		
H1. Uses technology in the classroom for instruction	4.17	0.99
H2. Uses technology for data collection and analysis	4.14	0.98
H3. Encourages student use of technology in the learning process	4.17	1.01
I. PROFESSIONALISM AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH		
I1. Professional in demeanor and attitude	4.29	0.89
I2. Responsive to constructive criticism	4.26	0.91
I3. Joins in self-evaluation and professional development	4.29	0.89
I4. Reflects on teaching practices and sets goals to improve	4.21	0.93
Overall satisfaction with preparation of the first year teacher	4.05	0.99

8. Narrative explanation of how the program investigates **employment rates for program completers**, with a characterization of findings. This section may also indicate rates of completers' ongoing education, e.g., graduate study.

The Guam Department of Education (GDOE) communicates this information with us on a semesterly basis for the initial educators and although communication has changed somewhat due to the pandemic, we were still able to ascertain the numbers of completers employed by the GDOE and by communication with completers. . The current data is Fall '20 and Spring '21. From the 51 completers, 24 in the Fall of '20 and 27 in the Spring of '21, we are confident that 45 are employed. The GDOE staffing patterns

indicate that 95% of those employed are in their schools. Additionally, we are aware of other completers employed in the island of Saipan and in the state of Nevada.

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program’s expectations for successful performance and indicators of the degree to which those expectations are met.

Table 3. Expectations and Performance on Standard 1: Candidate and Completer Performance

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
GPA,	Required GPA for Undergraduate is 2.7 Required GPA for Graduate is 3.0	At exit, GPA averages for the academic year across the three initial educator preparation programs indicates our completers continue to be high academic achievers with GPA means ranging from 3.49 to 3.76.
Praxis	Candidates applying for admission into the educator preparation program are required to pass Praxis Core. The passing scores are established by the same law that created the Guam Commission for Educator Certification. Reading requires a passing score of 156 Writing requires a passing score of 162 Math requires a passing score of 150 It is expected that all students will pass the Praxis Core.	It is recognized that in order to be admitted to the School of Education you have to pass the Praxis Core. So, technically we have a 100% pass rate. However, when reviewing the ETS Data Manager, students who have identified the UOG as a score recipient are included in the pass rate report. Not all students apply to the School of Education. Some test takers are seeking a temporary certification from the state.

		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Test CORE</th> <th>N</th> <th>n</th> <th>Pass Rate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Math</td> <td>127</td> <td>97</td> <td>76.38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RDG</td> <td>130</td> <td>96</td> <td>73.58</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WRTG</td> <td>147</td> <td>104</td> <td>70.75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Test CORE	N	n	Pass Rate	Math	127	97	76.38	RDG	130	96	73.58	WRTG	147	104	70.75
Test CORE	N	n	Pass Rate															
Math	127	97	76.38															
RDG	130	96	73.58															
WRTG	147	104	70.75															
Praxis Subject Assessment	<p>The following Praxis Subject Assessments are requirement prior to Student Teaching or Internship. The expectation is that all students will pass the test above the cut score established by the Guam Commission for Educator Certification.</p> <p>Elementary Education: Content Knowledge: 163</p> <p>Middle School Mathematics: 165</p> <p>Middle School Science: 150</p> <p>Art: Content Knowledge: 158</p> <p>English Language Arts: Content Knowledge: 167</p> <p>General Science: Content Knowledge: 150</p> <p>Music: Content Knowledge:</p>	<p>While 100% of our students must pass the subject assessment prior to student teaching or prior to admission into the MAT program, it is particularly important that we monitor the content tests for our undergraduate and advanced programs. This past year, many students who did not pass the Mathematics subject assessment chose to take the middle school math assessment. The Secondary program coordinator needs to provide the content area faculty across the UOG campus with a breakdown of the test areas that need more attention. For example, we need to evaluate the History for Education program and see if it has enough Geography. On the Mathematics test, Number & Functions, Algebra, Functions, and Calc subtest scores need to be seen by the program and for the general science, more attention on Life Science and/or Earth and Space Science would benefit our future teachers.</p>																

	<p>Social Studies: Content Knowledge: 154</p> <p>Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge: 160</p> <p>Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications: 151</p> <p>Reading Specialist: 164</p> <p>School Leaders Licensure Assessment: 151</p> <p>English to Speakers of Other Languages: 155</p> <p>Professional School Counselor: 156</p>											
<p>Praxis: Principles of Learning and Teaching</p>	<p>At midpoint, initial candidates' pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills are primarily measured through the Praxis PLT exam. The required passing cutoff score is 160 for Elementary K–6 and 157 for Secondary 7–12, as set forth by the Guam Commission for Educator Certification. The performance expectation is that all students pass and all subsection scores fall within the average range. .</p>	<p>Detailed datasets included in SOE's Annual Data Reports (ADRs) show a breakdown of candidates' passing scores by test categories: (a) Instructional Process and (b) Assessment—for pedagogical knowledge, and (c) Students as Learners and (d) Professional Development Leadership and Community—for professional knowledge, and (e) Analysis of Instructional Scenarios. It is very rare that students do not pass on a first attempt.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1352 1352 1898 1416"> <thead> <tr> <th>PLT Section</th> <th>N</th> <th>Avg</th> <th>Avg poss.</th> <th>Avg. range</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PLT Section	N	Avg	Avg poss.	Avg. range					
PLT Section	N	Avg	Avg poss.	Avg. range								

		<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>A) Inst. Process</td> <td>51</td> <td>15</td> <td>21</td> <td>12-18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B) Assessment</td> <td>51</td> <td>15</td> <td>21</td> <td>12-18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C) Students as Learners</td> <td>51</td> <td>11</td> <td>14</td> <td>8-12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D) Prof. Dev. Leadership & Community</td> <td>51</td> <td>9</td> <td>13</td> <td>7-13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E) Analysis of Inst. Scenarios</td> <td>51</td> <td>10</td> <td>16</td> <td>7-15</td> </tr> </table>						A) Inst. Process	51	15	21	12-18	B) Assessment	51	15	21	12-18	C) Students as Learners	51	11	14	8-12	D) Prof. Dev. Leadership & Community	51	9	13	7-13	E) Analysis of Inst. Scenarios	51	10	16	7-15
A) Inst. Process	51	15	21	12-18																												
B) Assessment	51	15	21	12-18																												
C) Students as Learners	51	11	14	8-12																												
D) Prof. Dev. Leadership & Community	51	9	13	7-13																												
E) Analysis of Inst. Scenarios	51	10	16	7-15																												
Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA)	<p>We began using the Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA) in Fall 2018 to assess our candidates' disposition at entry, midpoint, and exit in the initial educator preparation and advanced programs. The assessment is completed by the candidate's course instructor. Candidates are aware that this assessment applies to the university setting, courses, early practicum experiences, and their final internship. Furthermore, elements in the EDA were aligned to SOE's Conceptual Framework—preparing candidates as Knowledgeable Scholars (KS), Effective Communicators (EC), and Reflective Decision-makers (RD).</p>	<p>The results for these two programs show that our candidates largely receive Meets Expectations for each EDA element (1-9).</p> <p>Percentage of overall ratings show a range of 91.67%-100% or an average of 97.22% of the candidates received Meets Expectations and 2.78% of the candidates are Developing.</p>																														

	<p>The candidates are rated on a three-point scale of Needs Improvement, Developing, and Meets Expectations.</p> <p>Faculty of SOE, both full-time and parttime, participated in a refresher/calibration on how to assess students using the EDA in April of 2021.</p> <p>The expectation is that all candidates <i>meet expectations</i>, however there are practices in place that should a candidate be rated at needs improvement or developing, meetings with the advisor or faculty committee may be necessary.</p>	
--	---	--

Table 4. Expectations and Performance on Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
Classroom Supervisor Survey	Classroom supervisors complete a survey at the end of student teaching for the initial undergraduate programs. The expectation is the classroom supervisor will observe their student teacher engaged in the activities described most of the time (3) or higher (always = (4)).	In AY 20-21, of the 51 undergraduate completers, only 30 classroom supervisors completed the exit assessment. However, the scores for elementary and secondary for the 25 items ranged from 3.32 to 3.91. The lowest average hidden within the secondary ed scores was a 2.94 on "Interacted with parents/guardians in

		regard to their child’s learning.” This may have been lower last academic year due to the multiple modes of learning our student teachers and interns were engage in leaving fewer opportunities to interact with parents. This is assessed each semester and will continue to be monitored.
Completer Survey	There is an expectation that our students agree that we have prepared them for planning, classroom management, incorporating diversity, utilizing assessment, and embodying professionalism. We expect that graduates will rate themselves at least a 3 (agree) or higher (strongly agree = 4) when responding to the prompt: “My classes and field experience at the University of Guam gave me ample opportunities to:	See section 6 above. Our graduates felt the UOG School of Education gave them ample opportunities in all areas, as all areas were rated with scores ranging from 3.05-3.8. This indicates to us that our students have the skills and abilities referenced in the aspects of Standard 2.
Employer Survey	We expect that employers will rate our graduates at least a 3 (satisfied) or higher (quite (4) and very (5) satisfied) when responding to the prompt: To what degree are you satisfied with the professional preparation of first-year teacher(s) from the University of Guam in each of the following areas?	See section 7 above. The average rating employers gave our graduates ranged from 3.69 to 4.33. This indicates that our employers are more than satisfied with the preparation of our graduates. Interestingly, both the employers of our graduates and the graduates themselves seem to agree that there is room for improvement in

		graduates' ability to accommodating students with special needs. This was also specifically noted in the comments by a few administrators.												
<p>Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA)</p>	<p>The expectation is that all candidates meet expectations, however there are practices in place that should a candidate be rated at needs improvement or developing, meetings with the advisor or faculty committee may be necessary.</p>	<p>For Standard 2, the elements of the EDA that were used in order to respond to the standard included 1) Appreciation and Value of Cultural and Academic Diversity, 2) Demonstrating Preparedness in Teaching and Learning, 3) Exhibiting the Social and Emotional Intelligence to Promote Personal and Educational Goals/Stability, and 4) Collaborating Effectively with Stakeholders.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>EDA Section for Standard 2</th> <th>Initial Programs AY 2020-2021</th> <th>Advanced Programs AY 2020-2021</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 Appreciation and Value of Cultural and Academic Diversity</td> <td>100% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations</td> <td>100% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 Demonstrating Preparedness in Teaching and Learning</td> <td>93.7% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations and 6.25% are Developing.</td> <td>100% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 Exhibiting the social and emotional intelligence to promote</td> <td>100% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations</td> <td>98.63% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	EDA Section for Standard 2	Initial Programs AY 2020-2021	Advanced Programs AY 2020-2021	1 Appreciation and Value of Cultural and Academic Diversity	100% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations	100% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations	2 Demonstrating Preparedness in Teaching and Learning	93.7% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations and 6.25% are Developing.	100% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations	3 Exhibiting the social and emotional intelligence to promote	100% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations	98.63% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations
EDA Section for Standard 2	Initial Programs AY 2020-2021	Advanced Programs AY 2020-2021												
1 Appreciation and Value of Cultural and Academic Diversity	100% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations	100% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations												
2 Demonstrating Preparedness in Teaching and Learning	93.7% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations and 6.25% are Developing.	100% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations												
3 Exhibiting the social and emotional intelligence to promote	100% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations	98.63% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations												

		personal and educational goals		and 1.37% are Developing.
		4 Collaborating Effectively with Stakeholders	97.92% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations and 2.08% are Developing.	100% of program completers at 100% Meets Expectations
		<p>Although we strive for 100% of our students to Meet Expectations, the fact that consistently 90% of our completers at initial and advanced meet expectations, we are satisfied with the progress we are making with dispositions.</p>		

5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

This section describes recent program accomplishments, efforts to address challenges, current priorities, and innovations that are in plan or process.

Faculty continue to try to find unique ways of engaging students in their own planning by hosting program seminars for newly admitted students to reaching out across campus to new freshman for guidance on four-year plans. The SOE is searching for new faculty in TESOL, Health & Physical Education, Special Education, and soon Administration and Supervision. This is happening while facing severe budget constraints. Two programs have decided not to admit new students until full-time, hopefully tenure-track faculty, are in place to advise and teach the students, while in the meantime current contract faculty in those programs can ensure those candidates remaining in the program are able to complete the degree successfully. The SOE is also currently going through strategic planning with one priority being the re-envisioning of the division structure. The SOE is meeting with all stakeholders in January to gather input on moving SOE forward into the future.

