



Program Level Student-Learning Outcomes Assessment
Special Education Programs
Program Report 2018-2019

Prepared by: Susan Andrews, M.Ed.
SPA: Council for Exceptional Education

Program Overview

The special education programs through the University of Alaska Southeast (UAS) Alaska College of Education (AKCOE) were nationally recognized by the Council for Exceptional Children in 2015. The special education programs consist of four pathways: Master of Education (M.Ed.), Graduate Certificate (G.C.), Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT), and the Bachelor of Arts (BA). The M.Ed. and the G.C. programs lead to the K-12 special education endorsement to those already holding an Alaska teaching certificate. The MAT degree was initiated in 2012 to provide an alternative route to certification with the K-12 endorsement in special education to candidates who do not have a valid teaching certificate but who do have a baccalaureate degree. The BA in Special Education was also initiated in 2012 and allows candidates to complete their baccalaureate degree which includes coursework leading to certification with the K-12 endorsement in special education.

The special education programs are 100% distance delivered by two full-time faculty members, one part-time faculty, and one adjunct instructor. Courses are “stacked” which means that all programs are typically represented in the course roster for each course offering in a given semester. This presents unique challenges because the BA and MAT are initial certification programs and the M.Ed. and G.C. programs consist of experienced certified teachers typically working in the field. None of the programs in special education use a cohort model.

The special education faculty support candidates who often work in challenging situations in public schools. The program is committed to inclusive practice and social justice. All of our required core courses emphasize the development and implementation of culturally responsive special education services in all Alaska communities and in particular the rural and remote Alaska Native villages. Faculty are student-centered in course delivery and in a similar manner, encourage candidates to develop learner centered, individualized and trauma informed classroom practices. The importance of collaboration with families, reflection on practice, and knowledge of theoretical foundation of practice and instruction are central components to the special education program at UAS.

The State of Alaska has a growing need for special education teachers and the UAS programs were designed to meet those needs by supporting teachers in the field as they transition to special education, and by providing pathways for candidates who do not have a teaching certificate. The candidates enrolled in the G.C. program constitute the largest group. Many of these candidates are part of the General Education to Special Education incentive program sponsored by the Anchorage School District. The number of candidates who live and work in Alaska Native villages varies; however, there has been an increasing number of candidates from these remote and rural locations. Many of the candidates in both the MAT and BA programs are employed as paraprofessionals in their districts. Many of our candidates are “place bound” and the current e-learning format provides the flexibility that many candidates require.

FY 2018 includes summer 2017 - spring 2018; FY 2019 includes summer 2018 - spring 2019 terms.

Table 1

Current Enrollment by Primary Major			
Major	Degree	FY 2018	FY 2019
Special Education	B.A.	25	25
	M.A.T.	28	23
	G.C.	19	16
	M.Ed.	41	30
Distinct Individuals		113	94

Table 2

Degrees Earned			
Major	Degree	FY 2018	FY 2019
Special Education	B.A.	4	3
	M.A.T.	27	12
	G.C.	10	7
	M.Ed.	11	11
Distinct Individuals		52	33

Table 3

Number of Students Admitted							
Major	Degree	Summer 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Summer 2018	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
Special Education	B.A.	1	7	2	1	3	2
	M.A.T.	3	3	3	2	4	4
	G.C. (only)	5		3	4	3	5
	M.Ed. (only)			1	1	2	
	Both M.Ed. & G.C.	6	5	2	5	2	2
Distinct Individuals		15	15	11	13	14	13

Enrollment is based on close freeze data. The sum of the majors is greater than the count of distinct individuals because some students are enrolled in the graduate certificate program and in the M.Ed. degree

Table 4

Enrollment Including Double Programs (G.C. & M.Ed.)			
Major	Degree	FY 2018	FY 2019
Special Education	B.A.	26	27
	M.A.T.	28	25
	G.C.	68	50
	M.Ed.	45	39
Total		167	141
Distinct Individuals		141	131

Program Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Process

All special education programs are built on a foundation provided by the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards. When developing the program, thought was given to the content of the coursework and the specific skill competencies that provide a framework for each key assessment.

By examining the data provided by each key assessment, faculty identified important competencies that demonstrate the candidate's ability to integrate content knowledge and skills (Table 5). These competencies are: problem identification, gathering of information from multiple sources of data including an effective learning environment, interpretation of data, application of assessment data in the development of plans and instructional strategies, monitoring progress and determining the effectiveness of interventions, and the impact on student learning supported by data and not assumptions.

Table 5

Foci for the CEC Initial Preparation Standards							
CEC Standards	Competencies	IEP Project	Case Study	Transi- tion Plan	Lang. & Lit. Interven- tion Project	Clinical Place- ment Observa- tion	Port- folio
CEC: Learner & Learning							
1. Learner Development & Individual Learning Differences	Use of data from multiple sources	X	X		X	X	X
	develop plans & Instr. strategies	X	X	X	X	X	X
	monitor progress	X	X	X	X	X	X
2. Learning Environments	Evaluation of the learning environment		X		X		
CEC: Content Knowledge & Professional Foundations							
3. Curricular Content Knowledge	Application of content knowledge and skills	X	X	X	X	X	X
CEC: Instructional Pedagogy							
4. Assessment 5. Instructional Planning & Strategies	Application (interpretation) of data	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Identify key instructional issues (problem identification)	X	X	X	X	X	X

	Determine effectiveness of intervention	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Evaluate candidate impact on student learning	X	X		X	X	X
CEC: Professionalism & Collaboration							
6. Professional Learning & Practices	Application and knowledge of policies and Sp. Ed. Regulations	X	X	X		X	X
7. Collaboration							

How the data is collected on the Program SLOs (rubrics, portfolios, etc.)

Small class sizes and close advising allow faculty to facilitate candidate success in the key competencies through using a model of assessment often referred to as “mastery learning.” Typically, candidates who struggle are provided individualized support in identifying the areas that need attention and reconsideration. In this way, the candidates’ learning is supported throughout many of the courses in the program, providing faculty with more information relating to the candidates’ abilities to perform well as special educators, and to support students with exceptional learning needs. Every rubric for each key assessment is aligned with the competencies for the program, which makes it possible to quickly identify areas where candidates need additional support.

The data collected on the Program SLOs during the previous academic year

IEP Project Data Tables

CEC Update Analysis of Data for IEP Project Low and High Incidence Disabilities: (There are two courses that share the IEP Project as a Key assessment. One is concerned with curriculum strategies for students with Low Incidence disabilities and the other is for curriculum strategies for students with High Incidence disabilities. The data for both is recorded below in two separate charts).

IEP Project for Students with Low Incidence Disabilities, Analysis of the Data, and Findings for all three programs is entered in split cells BA, MAT, GC (Graduate Certificate).

AY 2018 (Summer 2018, Fall 2018) N= 0 BA/4 MAT/ 10 Graduate Certificate
 No BA students during the summer 2018 or fall 2018

Table 6 Curriculum Strategies: Low Incidence Disabilities

CEC Standard by Rubric Criteria	Not Met		Met		Exceeds	
	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA
Description of Student	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of Learning Issues and domains of development (CEC 1) Identification of educational issues (CEC 4.2,4.3, 5.1,5.6) 	0	MAT	31	MAT	1	MAT

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of variables in the learning environment (CEC 2.1,4.2.,4.3) • Identification of cultural and family dynamics (CEC 1) 	0	GC	1	GC	9	GC
Instructional Strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and use of evidence based practices (CEC 2.1, 5.1,5.6) • Identification of strategies that facilitate integration into various settings (CEC 2.1, 5.1, 5.6) 	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA
	1	MAT	2	MAT	1	MAT
	0	GC	2	GC	8	GC
Individual Education Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLAAFP (4.2,4.3) • Goals and Objectives (CEC 5.1,5.6) • Integration of instructional practices into goals and objectives (5.1.,5.6) 	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA
	2	MAT	2	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	4	GC	6	GC

AY 2018 (Summer 2018, Fall 2018, Spring 2019) N= 2 BA/ 5 MAT/ 7 Graduate Certificate

Note: One BA student was not able to complete the course/semester.

Table 7 Curriculum Strategies: High Incidence Disabilities

CEC Standard by Rubric Criteria	Not Met		Met		Exceeds	
	0	BA	1	BA	0	BA
Description of Student <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of Learning Issues and domains of development (CEC 1) • Identification of educational issues (CEC 4.2,4.3, 5.1,5.6) • Identification of variables in the learning environment (CEC 2.1,4.2.,4.3) • Identification of cultural and family dynamics (CEC 1) 	0	BA	1	BA	0	BA
	1	MAT	0	MAT	4	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	6	GC
Instructional Strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and use of evidence based practices (CEC 2.1, 5.1,5.6) • Identification of strategies that facilitate integration into various settings (CEC 2.1, 5.1, 5.6) 	0	BA	1	BA	0	BA
	1	MAT	1	MAT	3	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	6	GC
Individual Education Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLAAFP (4.2,4.3) • Goals and Objectives (CEC 5.1,5.6) • Integration of instructional practices into goals and objectives (5.1.,5.6) 	0	BA	1	BA	0	BA
	1	MAT	2	MAT	2	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	6	GC

Case Study Data Table

Data for Practicum is only collected in the fall and spring semesters. Student teaching includes only BA and MAT candidates. Data for all three programs is entered in the following manner BA, MAT, and Graduate Certificate.

AY 2018 (Fall 2018, Spring 2019) N= 5 BA, 1 MAT, 5 and Graduate Certificate

1 BA incomplete

Table 8 Case Study

Criteria / Domain of Practice	Not Met		Met		Exceeds	
	0	BA	4	BA	0	BA
Instructional Planning (CEC 5)	0	BA	4	BA	0	BA

	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	5	GC
Instructional Strategies (CEC 5)	0	BA	4	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	5	GC
Assessments (CEC 4)	0	BA	4	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	4	GC
Learning Environments (CEC 2)	0	BA	4	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	5	GC
Language and Communication (CEC 1,5)	0	BA	4	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	5	GC
Collaboration (CEC 7)	0	BA	4	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	5	GC
Post observation conference foundations (CEC 6)	0	BA	4	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	2	GC	3	GC
Post observation conference professional and ethical practice (CEC 6)	0	BA	4	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	5	GC

Transition Plan Data Table

Data for all three programs is entered in the following manner BA, MAT, and Graduate Certificate.
 AY 2018 (Summer 2018, Spring 2019) N= 2 BA, 4 MAT, 6 Graduate Certificate

Table 9 Transition Plan

Criteria / Domain of Practice	Not Met		Met		Exceeds	
Description of student	0	BA	1	BA	1	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	3	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	5	GC
Person centered planning summary / self-determination / self-advocacy (CEC 2, 6, 7)	0	BA	1	BA	1	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	3	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	5	GC
Identifying Resources (CEC 2, 6, 7)	0	BA	1	BA	1	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	3	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	5	GC
Transition Plan (CEC 2, 6, 7)	0	BA	1	BA	1	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	3	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	5	GC

Language and Literacy: Assessment & Intervention Plan Data Table

Data for all three programs is entered in the following manner BA, MAT, and Graduate Certificate.
 AY 2018 (Fall 2018, Spring 2019) N= 5 BA, 4 MAT, and 8 Graduate Certificate

One GC student was not able to complete part 3 of the project due to the K-12 student being unavailable.

Table 10 Language and Literacy: Assessment & Intervention Plan

Criteria / CEC Standards	Not Met		Met		Exceeds	
Part 1: Overview and Description of Presenting Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of presenting issues (CEC 4) • PLAAFP (CEC 1.4) • Summary of observational data / natural settings (CEC 4) • Summary of individual sessions (CEC 4) • Description of learning environment (CEC 2) • Learning and communication profile summary and analysis (ECE 4,5) 	0	BA	5	BA	0	BA
	2	MAT	1	MAT	1	MAT
	2	GC	1	GC	5	GC
Part 2: Intervention Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention plan (CEC 5) • Assistive / alternative and augmentative strategies (CEC 4,5) • Evaluation of Intervention Plan (CEC 4) 	1	BA	4	BA	0	BA
	3	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	3	GC	3	GC	2	GC
Part 3: Summary and Meta Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary & analysis of intervention & assessment data (CEC 5) • Modifications and accommodations (CEC 5) • Evaluation of assistive / alternative a& augmentative strategies (CEC 5) • Plan for sharing with stakeholders (CEC 4) 	1	BA	4	BA	0	BA
	1	MAT	3	MAT	0	MAT
	1	GC	2	GC	4	GC

Data Table and Analysis of Student learning

The following data table is focused on the analysis of student learning aligned through the Teacher Work Sample across the EPP and represents a small segment of the overall CEC assessment described in the narrative. Data for all three programs is entered in the following manner BA, MAT, and Graduate Certificate (G.C.).

AY 2018 (Spring 2019) N= 0 BA, 2 MAT, 4 G.C.

1 MAT incomplete and 1 not included in the following table.

Table 11 Analysis of Student Learning

	Not Met		Met		Exceeds	
Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA
	1	MAT	0	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	4	GC
Alignment with Learning Goals	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA
	1	MAT	0	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	4	GC
Interpretation of Data	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA
	1	MAT	0	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	4	GC
Evidence of Impact on Student Learning	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA
	1	MAT	0	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	4	GC

Clinical Practice Observation Data Table

Data for Practicum is only collected in the fall and spring semesters. Student teaching includes only BA and MAT candidates. Data for all three programs is entered in the following manner BA, MAT, and Graduate Certificate.

AY 2018 (Fall 2018, Spring 2019) N= 5 BA, 1 MAT, and 5 Graduate Certificate

Note: The outcome for one MAT candidate is to repeat the practicum experience fall 2019.

Table 12 Clinical Practice Observation

CEC Standard/ Domain of Practice	Not Met		Met		Exceeds	
	0					
Instructional Planning (CEC 5)	0	BA	5	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	5	GC
Instructional Strategies (CEC 5)	0	BA	4	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	5	GC
Assessment: Evaluation of Student Learning (CEC 4)	0	BA	5	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	4	GC
Learning Environments & Social Interactions (CEC 2)	0	BA	5	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	5	GC
Language and Communication (CEC 1, 5)	0	BA	5	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	5	GC
Collaboration (CEC 7)	0	BA	5	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	5	GC
Post Observation Conference Foundations (CEC 6)	0	BA	5	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	5	GC
Post Observation Conference Development and Characteristics of Learners	0	BA	5	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	5	GC
Post Observation Conference Professional and Ethical Practice (CEC 6)	0	BA	5	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	0	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	5	GC

Portfolio Data Tables and analysis

CEC Update Analysis of Data for the portfolio is only collected in the fall and spring semesters. Data for all three programs is entered in the following manner BA, MAT, and Graduate Certificate.

AY 2018 (Summer 2018, Fall 2018, Spring 2019) N= 5 BA, 5 MAT, and 6 GC

1 MAT candidate took an incomplete

Table 13 Portfolio

1. Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences	Not Met		Met		Exceed	
	0					
	0	BA	1	BA	4	BA

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding of Content Application Reflection 	0	MAT	1	MAT	5	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	5	GC
2. Learning Environments						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding of Content Application Reflection 	0	BA	1	BA	4	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	5	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	6	GC
3. Curriculum Content Knowledge						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding of Content Application Reflection 	0	BA	1	BA	4	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	5	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	5	GC
4. Assessment						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding of Content Application Reflection Content 	0	BA	3	BA	2	BA
	0	MAT	2	MAT	3	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	5	GC
5. Instructional Planning and Strategies						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding of Content Application Reflection 	0	BA	2	BA	3	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	4	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	6	GC
6. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding of Content Application Reflection 	0	BA	1	BA	4	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	4	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	6	GC
7. Collaboration						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding of Content Application Reflection 	0	BA	2	BA	3	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	4	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	5	GC
Personal Philosophy Statement						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding of Content Application Reflection 	0	BA	2	BA	3	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	4	MAT
	0	GC	1	GC	5	GC

Professional Characteristics Assessment (PCA)

The first data cycle (after the pilot) for the Professional Characteristics Assessment (PCA), was conducted AY 2018 (Spring 2019). A total of 4 candidates were assessed N= 4 BA & 0 MAT

Table 14 PCA

	Not Met		Met		Exceeds	
1. Motivated to become an effective practitioner and committed to his/her decision to teach.	0	BA	1	BA	1	BA
	0	MAT	0	MAT	3	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	0	GC
2. Respectful of and committed to meeting the needs of individuals from diverse backgrounds...	0	BA	2	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	0	MAT	3	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	0	GC
3. Works collaboratively with all members of the school community.	0	BA	2	BA	0	BA
	0	MAT	0	MAT	3	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	0	GC
4. Demonstrates intellectual curiosity.	0	BA	0	BA	2	BA
	0	MAT	0	MAT	3	MAT

	0	GC	0	GC	0	GC
5. Flexible in his/her thinking and creative in his/her ideas.	0	BA	1	BA	1	BA
	0	MAT	1	MAT	2	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	0	GC
6. Professional and ethical in his/her behavior.	0	BA	1	BA	1	BA
	0	MAT	0	MAT	3	MAT
	0	GC	0	GC	0	GC

Student Teacher Observation Tool (STOT)

The first data cycle (after the pilot) for the Student Teacher Observation Tool (STOT), was conducted AY 2018 (Spring 2019). A total of 4 candidates were assessed N= 2 BA & 3 MAT

Table 15 STOT

	Item #	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0
4. The Learner and Learning								
5. Development	1-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
6. Differences	3-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
7. Environment	5-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
8. Content Knowledge								
• Knowledge	10-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
• Application	13-16	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
9. Instructional Practice								
• Assessment	17-20	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
• Planning for Instruction	21-24	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
• Instructional Strategies	25-28	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
10. Professional Responsibility								
• Learning and Ethical Practice	29-32	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
• Leadership and Collaboration	33-34	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Note: The Alaska Department of Education Is now requiring all candidates to pass the Praxis II Special Education Core Knowledge and Application as part of the certification requirements as of September 1, 2018. All special education candidates, in all programs, are now required to pass the Praxis II Special Education Exam (5354) prior to program completion and graduation.

An evaluation of the data collected on the Program SLOs during the previous academic year

The charts present summary data for candidates who are enrolled in each of the programs in a given annual year. Evaluation scores are based on criteria listed in the descriptive rubrics for each key assessment. Faculty review candidate progress on each key assessment following the completion of each course in order to make informed program changes where necessary. The special education faculty met regularly to discuss candidate progress, efficacy of key assessments, and additional assessments that might be implemented.

All candidates receive specific instruction prior to, and after the key assessment is administered in specific courses. Typically, candidates who have not met the criteria listed in each assessment

rubric, are given the opportunity to resubmit assessments after receiving extensive feedback. For this reason, the data charts submitted for each key assessment shows that the majority of candidates have reached either the “met” or “exceeded” level for criteria in each key assessment.

Future plans to improve student learning

Specific Gates documenting candidates’ progression and evaluation was determined for admissions, progression of courses, and completion providing clear descriptions of criteria for each component of the assessment for not-passing, passing with provision or passing.

Recent review of the program in preparation for CAEP lead to potential areas for improvement. Special education faculty felt it was redundant to have two IEP projects so made the decision to discontinue the IEP project for the high incident disability category to begin fall 2019. Faculty explored having candidates review and evaluate a paper case study during the assessment course in preparation for conducting a case study later in their program. This decision resulted in the case study key assessment being moved to the practicum course EDSE S494 and EDSE S694 from the assessment course EDSE S410 and EDSE S610. Students now conduct the case study during the practicum experience working with K-12 students.

Based on the data gathered from the key assessments and from feedback from program candidates, faculty began discussions to focus on spiral learning experiences related to the identified competencies across all courses. This will be accomplished by identifying and aligning competencies in courses in a specific course sequence. Starting in the fall 2019, candidates begin their program with the assessment course since understanding assessment is a critical need supporting candidate success in methods courses.

The Clinical Placement Observation form that is a qualitative “running record” of candidate progress in each of the seven CEC standards had been used in both practicum and student teaching. The narrative captures growth over time in practicum and student teaching and meets the needs of candidates who are often in very diverse settings. However, in collaboration with the other Alaska College of Education programs for initial licensure, the Special Education faculty members began piloting a more systematic process in the student teaching placements for MAT and BA candidates. The College of Education is currently using the STOT (Student Teaching Observation Tool) for observations in student teaching for initial licensure. Also being used is the PCA (Professional Characteristics Assessment) to document professional dispositions. The Clinical Placement Observation form is now used only in the practicum placement and data is collected on all special education program candidates.

The faculty are working in partnership with the Anchorage School District (ASD) developing a cohort model specifically designed to support the ASD general education to special education teacher (GETS) program. The intent is to jump-start the candidate’s graduate certificate program giving students on-site training with K-12 students and education during an intensive two-week summer institute working in the ASD extended school year. The institute will be open to all eligible UAS special education candidates and focus on the content of assessment and curriculum strategies.

Faculty are in the process of preparing a single master's program in which candidates have the option to pursue the M.A.T. (Master of Arts), G. C. (Graduate Certificate), or the M.Ed. (Master of Education).