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 **(Graduate)**   **Contact Name and Email:** Robin Burden; 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

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What method(s)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?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
1.1.1. Candidates will analyze historical and current legal, regulatory, and ethical issues in special education.	IEP--Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	N=14; 65% scored at 80% or above. However, 7 students were Int'l and were seeing this for the first time. Of the 7 domestic students, 71% (5) scored at 80% or above. One of these students has been academically dismissed and the other had newborn twins in the family.	Burden All graduate results are slated for sharing/discussion at a Program Area Meeting in September 2016
1.2. Candidates will analyze current practices in assistive technology and apply the knowledge for a specific student.	Develop an Assistive Technology Plan—Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	N=21; 100% scored at 80% or above	Burden All graduate results are slated for sharing/discussion at a Program Area Meeting in September 2016
1.3. Candidates will identify foundations of Special Education	State Required Exam	State established cut score	100% of students taking the exam met or exceeded the state cut score	Robin Burden, shared at a Program Area meeting on 4/22/16 Judy Sheese, shared via email dated 4/22
2.1. Candidates will appropriately plan and teach content to students with exceptional needs	Field Evaluation and Submission of Lesson Plans (Unit)--Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	N=12 (2 students never attended/stopped submitting but did not withdraw); even so, 80% of students scored at 80% or above	Thoma (adjunct) All graduate results are slated for sharing/discussion at a Program Area Meeting in September 2016

2.2. Candidates will analyze current practices in assistive technology and apply the knowledge for a specific student.	Develop an Assistive Technology Plan—Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	N=21; 100% scored at 80% or above	Burden All graduate results are slated for sharing/discussion at a Program Area Meeting in September 2016
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	N=11; 55% scored at 80% or higher. However, 3 students either never attended or stopped submitting assignments but did not withdraw. Had they withdrawn, they done so, 75% would have scored at 80% or above.	Thoma (adjunct) All graduate results are slated for sharing/discussion at a Program Area Meeting in September 2016
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	N=14; 65% scored at 80% or above. However, 7 students were Int'l and were seeing this formatfor the first time. Of the 7 domestic students, 71% (5) scored at 80% or above. One of these students has been academically dismissed and the other had newborn twins.	Burden All graduate results are slated for sharing/discussion at a Program Area Meeting in September 2016
2.5. Candidates will appropriately develop, individualize, apply, and interpret assessments with regards to students with exceptional learning needs.	CBM Assignment—Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	N=14; 11 students submitted the assignment. Of the 11 who submitted, 100% scored at 80% or above. Overall, 78% scored at 80% or above	Burden All graduate results are slated for sharing/discussion at a Program Area Meeting in September 2016
3.1. Candidates will collaborate with all stakeholders to provide a positive learning environment for students with exceptional learning needs.	Develop a/n IEP/TIEP—Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	N=14; 65% scored at 80% or above. However, 7 students were Int'l and were seeing this format for the first time. Of the 7 domestic students, 71% (5) scored at 80% or above. One of these students has been academically	Burden All graduate results are slated for sharing/discussion at a Program Area Meeting in September 2016

			dismissed and the other had newborn twins in the family.	
3.2. Candidates will collaborate with other school personnel.	Development of a Collaboration Plan – Rubric	80% of Students Score 80% or above	Summer 2016—N=14; 11 students submitted the assignment. Of the 11 who submitted, 100% scored at 80% or above. Overall, 78% scored at 80% or above Fall-2016—10; 100% scored at 80% or above	Burden/Thoma (adjunct) All graduate results are slated for sharing/discussion at a Program Area Meeting in September 2016

* 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) Although the information included in this report is scheduled to be presented formally during a Program Area Meeting in September, 2016, faculty members have looked at individual pieces throughout the 2015-2016 school and have had informal discussions about the results. We are holding the formal presentations/discussions until the 2017-2017 school year because we are looking at making significant changes—such as combining and/or eliminating courses. We currently require 13 courses or 39 credit hours. In comparison with other programs, this appears to be quite high. We want to examine this more closely. We also need to discuss whether or not Learning Outcomes can be combined (we have a lot of them) and if we need to expand the number of indicators student mastery of these Outcomes (we seem to use the same indicators repeatedly). Thus, we will be reviewing both the program and the Assessment Plan.

2) As discussed above, we will be reviewing both the MS Program and the Assessment Plan with an eye to streamlining both. We do have some concerns regarding the Teacher Work Sample, in that it was really developed with a general education teacher in mine. It has been adapted for special education at the undergrad level and we need to start using the new one at the graduate level also. Another issue is the way that data for the statewide licensing exam is reported to us. Currently, both undergraduate and graduate students are intermingled. At the program level, it is impossible to determine how many teacher candidates are at the different levels. We have discussed this problem with the Associate Dean and the Director of Licensing and they are looking at a solution to this problem.

3) We will be looking at the Assessment Plan (both the Learning Outcomes and the indicators to determine student success) in an effort to ensure that we are meeting the needs of our students, department, university, state, our SPA (Council for Exceptional Children) and CAEP.

Degree Program: MS in Special Education   Date: 7.14.16

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS
Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. **Learning Outcomes**
   The graduate learning outcomes are clear and measurable, and the curriculum map demonstrates that they are amply addressed. Your outcomes library includes more than forty outcomes, so I certainly see why you may be looking for opportunities to reduce them!

2. **Measures & Performance Goals**
   Outcome 2.1 and its measure clearly are connected: You're using a lesson plan to assess whether learners can appropriately plan and teach content. But for the other outcomes, I really need more detail about the measures used so I can verify the connection. Having access to the rubrics would be useful as well. You also need to identify the courses/experiences the measures are used in. The performance standards are clear (though again, they would be more meaningful if I had more detail about the measures). Since students did not meet a number of them, do they still seem appropriate to you?

3. **Results**
   Students achieved the benchmark set for just half of the outcomes. The accompanying analysis attributes this to students' personal difficulties, which I can appreciate. Were this year's results an anomaly, are they part of a pattern that should be addressed?

4. **Engagement & Improvement**
   A second member of the department shares some responsibility for collecting and analyzing data, and the report suggests there are continuous conversations with the faculty as a whole. You identify areas for improvement in the curriculum, the assessment plan, and the Teacher Work Sample. Do these plans relate directly to what you've learned as the result of assessing student learning? Do you have plans to improve student performance in the outcomes students did not meet? Last, it is odd that the state does not separate undergraduate and graduate test takers. Or are these particular graduates post-baccalaureate students completing the undergraduate curriculum? In any case, your test results are good.

   Thanks for sharing this information about your student learning assessment program!