

Standard 5.

The unit must implement a formal process for using the assessment system and stakeholder feedback to inform unit and program improvement.

FDLTCC Elementary Education (K–6) Unit Review Narrative

The Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College (FDLTCC) Elementary Education (K–6) unit implements a formal, documented, and recurring process for continuous improvement that systematically uses assessment system data (Standard 3) and stakeholder feedback (Standard 4) to inform decisions at both the unit and program levels. This improvement process is embedded within the unit’s assessment system, supported by defined roles and timelines, and enacted through a consistent annual cycle that ensures accountability, transparency, and sustained program quality. The process aligns with Minnesota Rules 8705.1010, Subpart 1.E, and reflects the unit’s commitment to evidence-based decision-making, equity-centered practice, and responsiveness to community and workforce needs.

The unit’s continuous improvement cycle is intentionally designed to integrate quantitative and qualitative data from multiple sources, incorporate perspectives from candidates, program completers, faculty, school partners, and community stakeholders, and result in formal action plans that are monitored and communicated back to stakeholders. Across all stages of the cycle, the unit ensures alignment with Minnesota requirements, including Standards of Effective Practice, Minnesota Academic Standards, structured literacy mandates, multilingual learner expectations, and board-adopted performance assessment requirements. The data can be seen in meeting notes from various different stakeholder groups. Watermark is the data management program for collection of student learning and licensure ([Watermark Management program data.pdf](#), [Meetings](#))

Data collection occurs continuously throughout the fall and spring semesters. The unit collects survey data, including exit surveys and one-year post-completion surveys of completers and supervisors, as required under Unit Standard 3. Clinical performance data are gathered through edTPA evaluations and supervisor observation notes. Multiple assessment data are collected from course-embedded tasks, including structured literacy assessments, multilingual and Native language integration tasks aligned with state literacy and linguistic requirements, and technology integration assignments. Performance assessment data include state-required edTPA Task 1 (Planning) and Task 3 (Assessment). In addition, stakeholder feedback is gathered through advisory meetings, course evaluations, email communication, and individual meetings with school and community partners. All assessment and feedback data are securely stored and managed within the Watermark system to ensure accuracy, consistency, and longitudinal analysis ([common metrics survey](#), [Data for EdTPA Metrics survey GPA.pdf](#)),

The following stage involves stakeholder review and interpretation of the aggregated data and occurs primarily during the annual summer Data Summit, with continued analysis during fall and spring advisory meetings. This stage directly aligns with Unit Standard 4 and ensures that all stakeholder

groups—including candidates, program completers, faculty, school partners, and community representatives—actively examine survey results, clinical performance patterns, multiple assessment outcomes, and performance assessment data. Stakeholders collaboratively identify strengths, gaps, and emerging short- and long-term needs, ensuring that improvement priorities reflect both evidence and lived experience across educational contexts ([FDLTCC Program Review Form EL Ed. student eval of course: MATH 1050 Mathematics for Elementary Teachers.](#)).

The next stage centers on formal action planning at both the unit and program levels and typically takes place in late summer or early fall during faculty beginning of the year education team meetings. This documentation ensures compliance with PELSB expectations for recorded, monitored, and communicated improvement planning and provides a clear roadmap for implementation. This stage is followed by the implementation of identified improvements during the academic year following plan adoption. Improvement efforts may include curriculum revisions, such as strengthening structured literacy assignments to align with Minnesota’s READ Act requirements; clinical practice adjustments, and assessment updates ([Meetings](#))

The final stage of the cycle involves systematic monitoring, follow-up, and communication back to stakeholders. Progress toward action plan goals is reviewed through weekly education meetings, biyearly advisory meetings, and evaluated more comprehensively during the next annual Data Summit. Follow-up data are analyzed to determine the impact of implemented changes, and results are shared with stakeholders through advisory meetings, updated syllabi and program materials, and other unit communications. Stakeholders are invited to confirm whether improvements have addressed the identified concerns and to recommend further refinements as needed, ensuring the cycle remains responsive and iterative. ([Meetings](#))

The unit documents each stage of the continuous improvement process through a range of artifacts, including committee and advisory meeting minutes, Watermark-generated data summaries, revised policies and curriculum materials, and stakeholder communications. Collectively, these artifacts provide clear evidence of a consistent, recurring, and formal process for using assessment data and stakeholder feedback to guide improvement. This includes updated syllabus discussions and approvals.

Assessment data and stakeholder feedback together drive concrete improvement decisions. Feedback related to multilingual learner preparation has informed enhancements to coursework in ANSH 2010 and EDU 3100. Student feedback has led to future courses having in person options in the 2026-2027 school year. ([FDLTCC ANSH 2010 Anishinaabe for the Classroom.pdf](#), [FDLTCC EDU 3100 Language Arts I.pdf](#)).

Stakeholder feedback is systematically triangulated with quantitative assessment data to inform improvement priorities. When perspectives differ across stakeholder groups, the elementary education committee analyzes contextual factors, identifies root causes, and prioritizes actions with the greatest impact on candidate readiness and licensure alignment. Final priorities reflect alignment with Standards of Effective Practice, state licensure mandates, Indigenous community guidance, and

workforce needs identified by partner districts. Through this formal, documented, and cyclical continuous improvement process, FDLTCC ensures that assessment results and stakeholder voices meaningfully inform both unit-level and program-level decisions. The integration of data, collaborative interpretation, structured action planning, and ongoing monitoring demonstrates the unit's capacity to sustain improvement over time. This process fully fulfills the expectations of Unit Standard 5 and supports high-quality, culturally responsive preparation of future elementary educators.