

Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-2017

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

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>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?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
<p>1.1.1. Candidates will analyze historical and current legal, regulatory, and ethical issues in special education.</p>	<p>Develop an IEP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rubric • SPED 698D 		<p>Summer 2017--6/7 (86%) scored at 80% or higher.</p> <p>Student under 80% was an international student not seeking licensure.</p>	<p>Rebecca Hinshaw will share at an upcoming Program Area Meeting</p>
<p>1.2. Candidates will analyze current practices in assistive technology and apply the knowledge for a specific student.</p>	<p>Develop an Assistive Technology Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rubric • SPED 624 	<p>80% of Students Score 80% or above</p>	<p>Summer 2017—14/14 (100%) scored above 80%</p>	<p>Robin Burden will share at an upcoming Program Area Meeting</p>
<p>1.3. Candidates will identify foundations of Special Education</p>	<p>State Required Exam</p>	<p>State established cut score</p>	<p>2016-2017—4/4 (100%) passed the state required exam. Results are only reported once a year.</p>	<p>Judy Sheese, shared via email</p> <p>Robin Burden will share at an upcoming Program Area Meeting.</p>
<p>2.1. Candidates will appropriately plan and teach content to students with exceptional needs</p>	<p>Field Evaluation and Submission of Lesson Plans (Unit)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rubric • SPED 622 	<p>80% of Students Score 80% or above</p>	<p>F-2016—5/5 (100%) scored above 80%</p>	<p>Larry Timmerman emailed to Robin Burden. This information was shared at a Program Area Meeting</p>
<p>2.2. Candidates will analyze current practices in assistive technology and apply the knowledge for a specific student.</p>	<p>Develop an Assistive Technology Plan—Rubric</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPED 624 	<p>80% of Students Score 80% or above</p>	<p>Summer 2017—14/14 (100%) scored above 80%</p>	<p>Robin Burden will share at an upcoming Program Area Meeting</p>

2.3. Candidate will investigate the impact of instruction and other factors on students' learning	Teacher Work Sample— Rubric • SPED 623	80% of Students Score 80% or above	SP 2017 —8/8 (100%) scored above 80%	Larry Timmerman emailed to Robin Burden. This information will be shared at a Program Area Meeting
2.4. Candidate will develop an inclusive program for a student with exceptional learning needs.	Develop an IEP • Rubric • SPED 698D	80% of Students Score 80% or above	Summer 2017 --6/7 (86%) scored at 80% or higher. Student under 80% was an international student not seeking licensure.	Rebecca Hinshaw will share at an upcoming Program Area Meeting
3.1. Candidates will collaborate with all stakeholders to provide a positive learning environment for students with exceptional learning needs.	Develop an IEP • Rubric • SPED 698D	80% of Students Score 80% or above	Summer 2017 --6/7 (86%) scored at 80% or higher. Student under 80% was an international student not seeking licensure.	Rebecca Hinshaw will share at an upcoming Program Area Meeting
3.2. Candidates will collaborate with other school personnel.	Development of a Collaboration Plan – Rubric • SPED 626	80% of Students Score 80% or above	F 16—17/17 (100%) scored above 80%	Thoma (adjunct) presented via email. Burden presented at a Program Area Meeting

Coll* 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

- Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- 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.
- 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.”
- 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).
- 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.

- 1) Although the Summer 2017 data included in this report is scheduled to be presented formally during a Program Area Meeting in September, 2017, faculty members have looked at individual pieces throughout the 2016-2017 school and have had informal discussions about the results. We are holding the formal presentations/discussions until the 2017-2018 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. One course that we are looking to eliminate is SPED 625, High Incidence Disabilities. The content is rather redundant.
- 2) At issue in the last SLO report is the way that data for the statewide licensing exam is reported to us. In working with Dr. Judy Sheese, we believe that we are able to accurately report data for the undergraduate and graduate students taking the exam. There is some redundancy in the questions asked of graduate students as to their levels, but in examining the number of undergraduate students, we were able to determine that only 4 graduate students took the exam.
- 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.

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

Degree Program: Special Education (Graduate) Date: 11.8.17

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <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 are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that 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

				<p>addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <i>Not really.</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation</p>

				<p>is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>
<p>3. Results</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 and 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</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. <i>Not enough.</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness 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</p>

		standards expected of them.	standards expected of them.	achieve/achieve less well. <input 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.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ? <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. ? <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. <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.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS

Thank you for completing your 2016-17 Student Learning Reports. The rubric attached to the reports identifies the criteria I used to assess them. Strengths include the programs’ outcomes, which are clear, specific, measurable, and span multiple learning domains; and their results, which show that students met performance standards for most or all of the assessment measures, perhaps most importantly the state exam, the culminating measure which substantiates that they are well prepared.

Part Two of both reports, however, lacks sufficient detail. I appreciate it that the undergraduate program was restructured in 2015 and to date, you have not seen a need to make changes to it. But I would like to see more evidence of and reflection on what assessment has revealed to you about what students know and can do well and less well, and about what actions might help future cohorts improve or simply ensure that they are well prepared to face future changes and challenges in the discipline.

As you know, we are gearing up for the Higher Learning Commission (which will visit ISU in 2020 or 2021 as part of the accreditation reaffirmation process). It thus is particularly important for us to be able to provide evidence that we are systematically assessing our curricular and co-curricular programs; using the information we derive from that process to develop actionable plans for improvement in student learning; and documenting the improvements that result. Please be prepared to report on such efforts in your 2018 Student Learning Summary Report.