

## Standard 4.

*The unit's assessment system must include a process to engage its stakeholders, including candidates, program completers, school partners, teacher educators, and representatives from the community to:*

*(1) systematically review data collected under Standard 3;*

*(2) provide feedback and recommendations on unit-wide strengths and areas of improvement, which can include program-specific feedback and recommendations; and*

*3) provide feedback and recommendations on long-term plans specific to the unit's program offerings.*

### **FDLTCC Elementary Education (K–6) Unit Review Narrative**

The Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College (FDLTCC) Elementary Education (K–6) unit maintains a structured, recurring, and inclusive stakeholder engagement system embedded within its unit-wide assessment framework. This system ensures that candidates, program completers, school partners, teacher educators, and community representatives are systematically engaged in the review of assessment evidence collected under Standard 3; in providing feedback on unit-wide and program-specific strengths and areas for improvement; and in informing long-term planning related to program offerings. The stakeholder engagement process aligns with Minnesota Rules 8705.1010, Subpart 1.D (Unit Standard 4), and reflects the unit's commitment to transparency, shared responsibility, and continuous improvement.

Stakeholder engagement at FDLTCC is intentionally built into the design of the assessment system. Engagement occurs through committees, scheduled annual and semester-based data reviews, course-embedded feedback opportunities, and multiple formal and informal feedback channels. Standing bodies that support this process include the advisory committee, the education faculty regular weekly meetings, AASC, and the Dadibaakonigewin Indigenous Advisory Council. These committees operate alongside recurring assessment data are examined collectively. In addition, candidates provide input through course-embedded feedback opportunities, particularly in courses addressing oral academic language and multilingual learners, such as EDU 2010 and EDU 3100. Feedback is further gathered through surveys, email communications, one-on-one meetings, clinical partner input, and advisory consultations. (Evidence: See [syllabi](#) for oral academic language and multilingual learner (look at EDU 3100 and ANSH 2010), meetings: [AASC mtg 03 30 23](#), [FDLTCC EI Ed Avisory Agenda Nov 13 2025 -](#), [August 21 Mtg Minutes](#), [Seasonal Dadibaakonigewin Meeting 2.9.22](#))

Multiple stakeholder groups participate in the assessment system in clearly defined ways. Candidates contribute through course evaluations, formal program checkpoints, and targeted feedback activities embedded within coursework. Their feedback focuses on program supports, course sequencing, field placements, and perceptions of readiness for clinical practice and licensure. Program completers provide data through Common Metrics instruments and participate in alumni check-ins and focus groups coordinated by program leadership and assessment personnel. School partners—including cooperating teachers, mentor teachers, building administrators, and district liaisons—offer feedback through clinical evaluation tools, debrief meetings, and advisory discussions. Teacher educators engage through standing committees, data summits, and faculty deliberations, where they review evidence and

contribute to programmatic decisions. Community representatives, particularly members of the Dadibaakonigewin Indigenous Advisory Council, provide culturally grounded feedback and long-term strategic guidance to ensure alignment with community values, Indigenous education priorities, and regional workforce needs.

Stakeholder participation follows a defined and recurring schedule that ensures consistency and equity of voice. During each fall and spring semester, advisory meetings held during the academic year allow school partners and community representatives to review program developments and discuss emerging K–6 needs across regional and tribal school contexts. Annually, the unit convenes a comprehensive data summit during the summer, at which aggregated Standard 3 data—including survey results, clinical evaluation outcomes, multiple assessments, and performance assessment data—are reviewed across stakeholder groups. This annual review also supports long-term strategic planning, including discussions related to Indigenous education priorities, Minnesota licensure requirements, and workforce trends. In addition, formal program checkpoints at the entry, mid-program, and student-teaching readiness stages provide structured opportunities for feedback from candidates, faculty, advisors, and clinical supervisors, with documentation maintained through Watermark. (Evidence: [July 16-18 Data retreat](#), [EDU Fact Sheet 2025-2026](#) ).

Stakeholders systematically review multiple categories of data aligned to Standard 3. These include performance data from course-embedded multiple assessments some examples that can be seen in ANSH 2010 and EDU 3100. Data is stored in Watermark for assessments. Survey data reviewed by stakeholders include exit surveys, one-year post-completion surveys, and supervisor surveys, which are administered and summarized by the assessment office and analyzed both semesterly and annually. Clinical experience data, including edtpa and observation results, are monitored by the education facilitator. In addition, stakeholders review state-required performance assessment data, including edTPA Task 1 (Planning) and Task 3 (Assessment). (Evidence: [ANSH 2010 3 Anshinaabe for the Classroom](#), [Fall 2023 Language Arts I Section 1 Activity Data for EdTPA Metrics survey GPA.pdf](#), [supervisor Common Metrics Survey](#)).

To prepare stakeholders for effective participation in data review and decision-making, the program coordinator sends out an agenda ahead of time and creates a powerpoint for the meeting to look at data. Advisory members receive orientation related to Minnesota standards, structured literacy requirements, multilingual learner expectations, and standards of effective practice. Feedback and recommendations from stakeholders are gathered through both formal and informal mechanisms. Formal channels include advisory meeting minutes, elementary ed committee meetings, program revision proposals, and survey instruments such as Common Metrics and course evaluations. Informal feedback is collected through emails, individual conversations, clinical partner notes, and candidate comments. All stakeholder input is documented and stored in shared digital repositories, including Watermark and departmental SharePoint sites, and is reviewed as part of the unit’s annual assessment cycle. (Evidence: [EI Ed Mtg.](#) )

Stakeholders also identify concerns and areas for improvement during advisory meetings, elementary ed faculty discussions, and survey analyses. These concerns are prioritized based on their impact on candidate readiness, the breadth of candidates affected, and alignment with state requirements, P–12 partner needs, and licensure trends. Unit-wide concerns are addressed through the advisory Committee, while program-specific issues are managed by program faculty. This prioritization process ensures that improvement efforts are strategic, data-driven, and responsive. Stakeholder engagement plays a central role in long-term planning for the Elementary Education unit. Program faculty, advisory council members, partner districts, licensure liaisons, program completers, and candidate representatives participate in discussions about future directions. (Evidence: [FDLTCC EI Ed Advisory Agenda Nov 13 2025](#)).

Through this comprehensive stakeholder engagement system, FDLTCC demonstrates a robust, transparent, and collaborative approach to assessment and program improvement. The systematic review of Standard 3 data, coupled with meaningful stakeholder input and shared ownership of decision-making, ensures alignment with community values, workforce demands, and licensure requirements. This process fully satisfies the expectations of Unit Standard 4 and reflects a healthy, community-responsive assessment system that supports continuous improvement in the preparation of elementary educators.