

**Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16**

**Due to your dean by June 1**

**Due from dean to assessment office by June 15**

**Degree Program Name:** Special Education (Undergraduate) **Contact Name and Email:** Robin.Burden@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

**Part One**

<p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the <a href="#">Graduate Student Learning Outcome*</a> each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</b></p>
<p>1.1 Candidate will identify historical and current legal, regulatory, and ethical issues in special education.</p>	<p>Comprehensive Exam</p> <p>State Required Exam</p>	<p>80% of Students Score 80% or above</p> <p>State established cut score</p>	<p>100% of students scored at 80% or above</p> <p>100% of students met the cut score</p>	<p>Robin Burden, shared at a Program Area meeting on 4/22/16</p> <p>Judy Sheese, shared via email</p>
<p>1.2 Candidate will identify the disabilities covered in IDEA, the characteristics of those disabilities and the characteristics of learners having those disabilities.</p>	<p>Comprehensive Exam</p> <p>IEP—Rubric</p> <p>Teacher Work Sample—Rubric</p>	<p>80% of Students Score 80% or above</p> <p>80% of Students Score 80% or above</p> <p>80% of Students Score 80% or above</p>	<p>100% of students scored at 80% or above</p> <p>F 2015: 10/11 successfully completed the assignment; 1 student remediated</p> <p>S 2016 14/15 successfully completed the assignment; 1 to be remediated</p> <p>F 2015 &amp; S 2016: 100 % of students scored at 80% or above</p>	<p>Robin Burden, shared at a Program Area meeting on 4/22/16</p>
<p>1.3 Candidate will identify the motivation behind behavioral issues and develop interventions to address inappropriate behaviors</p>	<p>Behavior Intervention Plan—Rubric/Checklist</p>	<p>80% of Students Score 80% or above</p>	<p>F 2015: 84% scored 80% or above</p> <p>S 2016: 81% scored 80% or above with 1 student repeating the course</p>	<p>Scheduled for reporting during a September 2016 Program Area Meeting</p>

2.1. Candidates will appropriately plan and teach content to students with exceptional needs.	Teacher Work Sample	80% of Students Score 80% or above	F 2015 & S 2016: 100 % of students scored at 80% or above	Robin Burden, shared at a Program Area meeting on 4/22/16
2.2. Candidates will analyze current practices in assistive technology and apply the knowledge for a specific student.	Develop a Universal Design for Learning Plan—Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	F 2015 & S 2016: 100% of students scored at 80% or above	Scheduled for reporting during a September 2016 Program Area Meeting
2.3. Candidate will investigate the impact of instruction and other factors on students' learning	Teacher Work Sample—Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	F 2015 & S 2016: 100 % of students scored at 80% or above	Robin Burden, shared at a Program Area meeting on 4/22/16
2.4. Candidate will develop an inclusive program for a student with exceptional learning needs	Develop a/n IEP/TIEP—Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	F 2015: 10/11 scored at 80% or above; 1 student remediated S 2016 14/15 scored at 80% or above; 1 student to be remediated	Robin Burden, shared at a Program Area meeting on 4/22/16
2.5. Candidate will appropriately develop, individualize, apply, and interpret assessments with regards to students with exceptional learning needs	Response to Intervention Project—Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	This activity was changed from SPED 203 to SPED 311. The first semester that SPED 311 was offered was S 2016. Therefore, those are the only scores that are being reported: S 2016: 14/15 scored at 80% or above. 1 student failed the course.	Scheduled to be discussed in September 2016
3.1. Candidate will collaborate with all stakeholders to provide a positive learning environment for students with exceptional learning needs.	Develop a/n IEP/TIEP—Rubric  Teacher Work Sample—Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	F 2015: 10/11 scored at 80% or above; 1 student remediated S 2016 14/15 scored at 80% or above; 1 to be remediated  F 2015 & S 2016: 100 % of students successfully completed the assignment	Robin Burden, shared at a Program Area meeting on 4/22/16

3.2. Candidate will collaborate with other school personnel	Teacher Work Sample-- Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	F 2015 & S 2016: 100 % of students scored at 80% or above	Robin Burden, shared at a Program Area meeting on 4/22/16
3.4 Candidate will reflect on their professional practice	Teacher Work Sample-- Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	F 2015 & S 2016: 100 % of students scored at 80% or above	Robin Burden, shared at a Program Area meeting on 4/22/16

\* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

*If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.*

#### Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).
- e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

#### Part Two

**In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students’ learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator’s feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.**

*If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.*

## Part Two

**In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.**

- 1) Special Education has been asked to make changes to our program several times over the past few years. For the past several years, the program was a dual-licensure program working with Elementary Education. At that time, only "dual majors" could become licensed in special education and the special education licensure was first K-5 and later P-5. This meant that secondary education majors could not earn a special education license at the undergraduate level. Beginning with Fall 2015, we created a Stand-Alone Special Education major as well as two minor programs that allowed both Elementary Education majors and secondary content majors to become licensed in special education at their developmental levels. Although we have monitored the progress of our students carefully, we do not feel that one year's data should dictate changes to the current assessment plan.
- 2) We will continue to monitor student success rates during the 2016-2017 school year and consider making changes at that time.
- 3) In the coming year, we will continue with the current plan, but will update rubrics with the new Special Education standards that became official during this school year. We would like to look at the Outcomes and determine if we need decrease the number of Outcomes or increase the number of assessments as it seems that many of the assessments are covering multiple Outcomes. We will also look at making changes to the Behavior Intervention Plan bringing it more in line with the current CEC Standards as a Behavior Intervention Plan or as a Single-Subject Research activity.

**Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University**

Degree Program: BS in Special Education Date: 7.21.16

	<b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<b>Level 1 – Developing</b>	<b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>
<b>1. Student Learning Outcomes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> An Outcomes Library was provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are student-centered.  <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, and student-centered.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.  <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed.  <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, student-centered, and span multiple learning domains.  <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization).  <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.

				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
<b>2. Measures &amp; Performance Goals</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are not specific.	<input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sufficient information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct.  <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some <a href="#">high impact practices</a> (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)  <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.  <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided to demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what

				<p>students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.</p>
<p><b>3. Results</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
<p><b>4. Engagement &amp; Improvement</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they do not clearly connect to the results or are too vague to implement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the</p>

		about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<p>history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 1 - Developing</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>		

## COMMENTS

### Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

#### 1. Learning Outcomes

Program outcomes are specific, measurable, and student-centered, and the curriculum map indicates that each is appropriately addressed in the curriculum.

FYI, the Science Ed program's outcomes somehow were embedded in the Special Education program's outcomes library in Taskstream. I am assuming the 2015 outcome set for your program is accurate?

#### 2. Measures & Performance Goals

The program used multiple measures to assess the ten outcomes, and it generally is clear that they are appropriate—though you might provide more detail about less obvious items such as a Teacher Work Sample, and do identify the courses/experiences each measure is delivered in. Including links to the rubrics/scoring keys also would help clarify the connection between the outcomes and the measures. Are the questions on the comprehensive exam keyed to the outcomes so that you/students know exactly which issues they are well prepared/less well prepared on? Thank you for including the state licensure exam among your measures: I was pleased to see that your majors' pass rates consistently exceed the state average. I have no problem with your using one measure to serve multiple outcomes, by the way, so long as there is a clear connection between the outcome and the measure. Last, performance goals seem appropriate, given the actual results.

#### 3. Results

Some N's are missing, but it is clear that students exceeded established expectations.

#### 4. Engagement & Improvement

The report suggests that most of the work of assessment falls to a single individual, though the results are widely shared. (Again, links to minutes would document this.) Are there opportunities for more of the faculty to be involved? In Part Two you note that the current program is too new for you to feel that you have sufficient data on which to base changes on, which makes perfect sense, particularly in the context of the "old" program's success as documented by the exam pass rates. Yet you still are focused on continuous improvement as is evident from your contemplation of changes to rubrics and the Behavior Intervention Plan. Thank you!