



CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

Annual Learning Outcomes Assessment Report 2017-2018

Degree Program Information	
Academic Degree Program (<i>Major</i>)	Special Education
Degree (<i>BS, BA, BFA, MFA, MBA, etc.</i>)	MA
Department/ School	Attallah College of Educational Studies
Number of students currently enrolled (as majors) in the program:	44
Multi-year assessment granted? (yes or no)	No
If on multi-year assessment state clearly the programs assessment rotation for 16/17 and 17/18.	
Contact Person	
Name <i>(Person coordinating program's assessment effort)</i>	Meghan Cosier, Ph.D. Director of Teacher Education, Interim Program Coordinator for Special Education Trisha Sugita, Ph.D. (On Leave from April-October 2018)
Title	Meghan Cosier: Associate Professor, Director of Teacher Education Trisha Sugita: Assistant Professor, Program Coordinator
E-mail address	Meghan Cosier: cosier@chapman.edu Trisha Sugita: nishimur@chapman.edu
<p>The Attallah College of Educational Studies offers Special Education (Education Specialist) preliminary teaching credentials in two disability-related areas: mild/moderate and moderate/severe. In addition, we offer a Master of Arts in Special Education. Beginning this 2017-2018 academic year, we also offer a joint credential (Multiple Subject ("general elementary education") and mild/moderate (special education) with a Master of Arts in Special Education. Candidates complete Special Education programs as either full-time or part-time students, and generally complete their program in four to seven semesters. The Education Specialist Credential (Special Education) and Joint Credential programs are embedded within the Master of Arts in Special Education program, although the MA can be completed without obtaining a teaching credential.</p> <p>The mild/moderate and moderate/severe programs were revised from 53 credits to 41 credits in 2017-2018. The new Joint Credential Program is 52 credits.</p> <p>The "old" course sequences can be viewed here: 2016-2017 Course Sequence</p> <p>The revised course sequences can be found here: SPECIAL EDUCATION AND JOINT CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SEQUENCE 2017-2018.</p>	

Although the program was revised, the Key Assignments remain the same. Therefore, we are able to compare performance from one year to the next. However, please note that some course numbers have changed, and thus, some course numbers may not align from one year to the next. “Old” and “new” course numbers are noted if applicable.

The program identified program learning outcomes aligned with the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) and Program Standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist credentials (Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe) outlined by the California Teaching Commission (CTC). Based on the program learning outcomes, the program developed Key Assignments that address TPEs as outlined by CTC. *In an effort to maintain consistent evaluation of student outcomes, key assignments were maintained despite the revision of programs and some courses as the programs continue to seek to prepare teachers to meet the TPEs outlines by the CTC.*

PLEASE NOTE:

The CTC has been developing a [new proposed credential structure](#) for Education Specialists. We suspect that we will need to revise the current Key Assignments to reflect this structure. This is referenced in our improvement steps for the upcoming year. For more information please view here: [CTC Proposed Credential Structure 2018](#)

Use of Feedback from Prior Reports:

This report specifically applied feedback from reviews of the 2016-2017 report (see link to evaluation below). Specifically, we focused on comparison of scores across time. We were able to focus on this more this year because some of the Key Assignments (Behavior Case Study and Assessment Report) were implemented for the first time in 2016-2017 and therefore, prior scores were not available. Furthermore, we described how we have “met” our goals of a 3.0 score or better when the candidates score below a 3.0 on an assignment. There are only a few instances where this occurs. When it does occur, the candidate is provided specific, in-depth feedback and then is asked to revise the assignment until the assignment displays mastery of the TPE at a 3.0 or better, OR the Program Coordinator works with the candidate to develop a remediation plan in which the candidate is provided a specific timeframe to complete additional tasks to demonstrate mastery of the TPEs associated with the assignment.

[2016-2017 ALOAR Feedback](#)

FOR ALL UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS
WASC CORE COMPETENCIES

WASC Core Competencies are assessed AT or NEAR graduation. Only data relating to student's final assessments in the Core Competencies needs to be reported in the WASC report. Reporting of the WASC Core Competencies is cumulative and required every year regardless of a programs status on the multi-year assessment plan. Next year Information Literacy and Quantitative Reasoning will be added.

Please note every undergraduate program is required to submit actual data assessing **Critical Thinking** in the 16/17 Annual Learning Outcomes Assessment Report that you submit this June by completing Section I. Process and Section II. Performance.

Options that you can consider for assessing **Critical Thinking**:

1. Use standardized CLA exam and administer it to your seniors at some point next year.
2. Use AAC&U Value Rubric for Critical Thinking and have faculty apply it to a senior level paper or assignment.
3. Design your own critical thinking rubric and apply it as described above.
4. Or if critical thinking is already incorporated into an existing program learning outcome, you can assess it that way.

Every undergraduate program is required to submit preliminary plans for assessing **Written Communication and Oral Communication** in the 16/17 Annual Learning Outcomes Assessment Report that you submit this June. The preliminary plans should be detailed by filling out Section I. Process for Written Communication and Oral Communication.

Options that you can consider for assessing **Written Communication and Oral Communication**:

1. Use standardized CLA exam and administer it to your seniors at some point next year.
2. Use AAC&U Value Rubric for Written and Oral Communication and have faculty apply it to a senior level paper or assignment.
3. Design your own Written and Oral Communication rubric and apply it as described above.
4. Or if Written and/or Oral Communication is already incorporated into an existing program learning outcome, you can assess it that way.

Please note that in one year from now, you will submit the data, results and analysis of your Oral and Written Communications assessments as part of your 17/18 Annual Learning Outcomes Assessment Report.

Learning Outcome: WASC Core Competencies (at or near graduation only) I. Process: Critical Thinking / Oral Communication / Written Communication	
<p>Student Learning Outcome <i>(Please create an outcome statement regarding critical thinking, oral communication and written communication that is relevant to the degree program.)</i></p>	<p>Critical Thinking SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program</p> <p>Oral Communication SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program</p> <p>Written Communication SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program</p>
<p>Evidence of Learning <i>(Please state the specific assignment, project, or exam used to assess critical thinking, oral communication and written communication.)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • capstone project • presentation • performance • course-embedded exam • assignment • standardized test • portfolio 	<p>Critical Thinking SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program</p> <p>Oral Communication SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program</p> <p>Written Communication SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program</p>
<p>Collecting and Analyzing the Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you select the sample? • What was your sample size (number of students)? • Provide the percentage of the sample size as compared to the relevant population. • How did you assess the student work/data collected? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible Tools: rubric, exam questions, portfolio samples • Attach all assessment tools 	<p>Critical Thinking SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program</p> <p>Oral Communication SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program</p> <p>Written Communication SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program</p>
<p>Expected Level of Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was your target(s) for student performance for this outcome? <i>(This should tie to the methods in which you assessed the students and collected and analyzed data in the section above. Keep in mind as this is at or near graduation the expected level of achievement should coincide with an advanced or mastery level.)</i> 	<p>Critical Thinking SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program</p> <p>Oral Communication SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program</p> <p>Written Communication SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program</p>

II. Performance: WASC Core Competencies (at or near graduation only) Required: Critical Thinking	
Have expected levels of achievement been met for this outcome? Explain. <i>(Did your graduating students reach the expected level of achievement set by the program?)</i>	Critical Thinking SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program
Please provide a summary of the assessment data in a table, along with a brief analysis of the results. <i>(Insert your data table for Critical Thinking in the template.)</i>	Critical Thinking SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program
How will results be shared and evidence used to make decisions? Was it shared with faculty (full time and adjunct) and students?	Critical Thinking SLO: Special Education is a Graduate Program

Learning Outcome #1	
I. Process:	
Student Learning Outcome	Students will demonstrate the ability to deliver a comprehensive program of systematic instruction in reading, writing, listening, and speaking aligned to the state adopted English Language Arts Content Standards and the Reading/Language Arts Framework (PS 9).
<p>Supports University Theme <i>(Some or all of the program's learning outcomes must support at least two of the university's strategic themes)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Themes: Internationalization, Personalized Education, Faculty/Student Research, Interdisciplinarity, or Student Writing • Describe how the theme is supported by the learning outcome 	<p>Personalized Education: In order to deliver a comprehensive program of systematic instruction in reading, writing, listening, and speaking aligned to the state adopted English Language Arts Content Standards and the Reading/Language Arts Framework, students need to work closely with their instructors or other constituents, such as University Supervisor and Master Teacher involved in their key assignments.</p> <p>In addition, all special education courses are small and faculty members provide individual mentoring to ensure that students are able to deliver systematic instruction.</p> <p>Student Writing: In order to articulate a comprehensive program of systematic instruction that aligns to state standards, students are required to write critically and design instruction that meets the needs of students with disabilities.</p>
<p>Supports WASC Core Competency, For Undergraduate Programs Only <i>(Please indicate whether this outcome supports any of WASC's core competencies)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oral Communication • Written communication • Information Literacy • Quantitative Reasoning • Critical Thinking 	<p>Oral Communication Written Communication Critical Thinking Special Education is a graduate program</p>
<p>Where is the outcome published for students?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Syllabi <i>(If syllabi, list course numbers)</i> • Website • Handbook 	<p>Syllabi: EDUC 563, EDUC 560, EDUC 590/592, EDUC 591/593</p> <p>Syllabi can found here: Syllabi for Special Education and Joint Credential</p> <p>The outcome is published for students in the syllabi and in the handbook.</p>
<p>Evidence of Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • capstone project • presentation • performance • course-embedded exam • assignment • standardized test • portfolio 	<p>Evidence of learning for this PLO include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Assignment: Teaching/Tutoring Project • TPE Portfolio <p>These assessments represent the student's demonstration of mastery of this PLO.</p>
<p>Collecting and Analyzing the Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you select the sample? • What was your sample size <i>(number of students)</i>? 	<p>All students (not a sample) enrolled in the core courses listed above are required to complete and pass the Key Assignment: Teaching Project. The reported sample is for the 2017-18 academic year. Prior to 2017-2018 the program operated under rolling admissions. Thus, the sample number varies each academic year. The TPE Portfolio represents a core competency that</p>

- Provide the percentage of the sample size as compared to the relevant population.
- How did you assess the student work/data collected?
 - Possible Tools: rubric, exam questions, portfolio samples
 - Attach all assessment tools

every student by the end of their program must master in order to be eligible for the Preliminary Education Specialist credential (completers of student teaching). It was developed to target the key skills all Education Specialists must embody to be eligible for the Preliminary Education Specialist credential.

Relevant Professional Standards:

This key assignment addresses the Preliminary Educational Specialist Standards:

Primary: PS 9

TPEs: 1, 8, 9

Description of the key assignment is listed below:

Teaching/Tutoring Project

Each student in the Preliminary Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Credential Programs completes a Teaching/Tutoring Project. This Project is designed to facilitate the students understanding of the academic, social, and behavioral complexities related to working with students with disabilities. Through this assignment the students must develop systematic instruction in reading, writing, listening, and speaking aligned to the state adopted English Language Arts Content Standards and the Reading/Language Arts Framework. Students work directly with a K-12 student in the field as part of the project and have the opportunity to assess, plan, organize, implement, and evaluate instruction based on their knowledge of a learner, the intended outcomes for the learner, and selected relevant curriculum. This assignment is completed in ED 563 for students in the Mild/Moderate Preliminary Program and in ED 560 for students in the Moderate/Severe Preliminary Program. The course instructor is responsible for assessing student performance on this assignment. This key assignment is rated on a scale from 1 (Novice Level) to 4 (Apprentice Level). State requirements delineate that candidates must receive a “3” to meet the program standard. The assignment directions can be found here: [Key Assignment: Teaching/Tutoring Project](#). The scoring rubric can be found here: [Teaching/Tutoring Assignment Scoring Rubric](#).

TPE Portfolio Mild/Moderate:

The purpose of the Teacher Performance Expectation Portfolio is to document the candidate’s mastery of each of the 13 TPEs that are per the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) standards that are embedded within the Program Standards for the Mild/Moderate credential program. Specifically for this PLO TPE 1 and 9 are targeted. The Candidates are rated on a four point rubric, based upon their demonstration of evidence (at the University level and in fieldwork/student teaching). (See rubric here: [TPE Portfolio MM](#)). Per state requirements, candidates must receive a “3” to meet the standard. Please note that all candidates who score below a 3 are provided feedback and asked to revise the assignment to reflect a score of a minimum of a 3 on the assignment. Scores included in this report reflect the candidates first attempt.

	<p>TPE Portfolio Moderate/Severe:</p> <p>The purpose of the Teacher Performance Expectation Portfolio is to document the candidate’s mastery of each of the 13 TPEs per the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) standards for the Moderate/Severe credential program. Specifically for this PLO TPE 1 and 9 are targeted. The Candidate is rated on a four point rubric, based upon their demonstration of evidence (at the University level and in fieldwork/student teaching). (See rubric here: TPE Portfolio MS). Per state requirements, candidates must receive a “3” to meet the standard. Please note that all candidates who score below a 3 are provided feedback and asked to revise the assignment to reflect a score of a minimum of a 3 on the assignment. Scores included in this report reflect the candidates first attempt.</p>
<p>Expected Level of Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What was your target(s) for student performance for this outcome? (This should tie to the methods in which you assessed the students and collected and analyzed data in the section above.)</i> 	<p>CTC requires mastery of all program standards and TPEs for all teacher candidates. Students participate in ongoing evaluation through formative assessments to ensure that they satisfy the expected level of achievement (≥ 3.0) by the end of the semester and by the culmination of their program. If the student does not meet the expected level of mastery on their Key Assignment, they are placed on a support plan to outline steps for remediation.</p> <p>For the Teaching/Tutoring Project, each component of the rubric address TPE 1, 8, and 9 and Program Standard 9. TPEs are required performance expectations of the teacher candidates. The Teaching Project serves as one of two indicators that the student has met the competency.</p> <p>The second indicator is the TPE Portfolio. Specifically, TPE 1, 8, and 9 and Program Standard 9 are indicators for this PLO. Teacher candidates must include evidence within their student teaching experience that target systematic instruction in reading, writing, listening, and speaking aligned to the state adopted English Language Arts Content Standards and the Reading/Language Arts Framework. For the TPE portfolio, if students do not meet the level of expected achievement (≥ 3.0), they will not be eligible to complete their student teaching and will be required to repeat coursework until they have mastered Program Standard 9.</p>
<p>II. Performance</p>	
<p>Have expected levels of achievement been met for this outcome? Explain.</p>	<p>The PLOs guide our instruction in Special Education. They are requirements mandated by the state for all special education candidates to master. The key assessments and rubrics were designed to measure the candidate’s mastery of the TPE and the PLO.</p> <p>For the Teaching Project, the overall mean for teacher candidates in 2016-2017 for the Mild/Moderate candidates was 3.44 (n=20), whereas in 2017-2018, the mean for MM candidates was 3.74 (n=18) representing a slight increase in mean scores from the prior year. For the Moderate/Severe candidates in 2016-2017 the overall mean was 3.80 (n=13), whereas the mean score for candidates in 2017-2018 was 3.72 (n=4). This represents a slight decrease in scores from the prior year. However, this may be due to the smaller number of candidates who completed the assignment in 2017-</p>

	<p>2018. This was a revised key assignment for the program in 2016-2017. The CTC standards for this PLO are rigorous; a key reason this assignment was chosen is that it demonstrates a candidate's ability to apply theory into practice and work with a student out in the field. PLO and students were held to a higher level of rigor of mastery. Overall, the scores fell within the expected range of (3.0 to 4.0) related to this outcome. This PLO will continue in the forthcoming years as it is also a state standard and evidence from the field indicates that our candidates require support in this competency prior to their completion of their pre-service program.</p> <p>For the TPE Portfolio, the overall mean for the teacher candidates in the 2016-2017 year in the Mild/Moderate program was 3.80 (n=16); for the Moderate/Severe candidates the overall mean was 3.72 (n=13). For the 2017-2018 academic year, the overall mean score for the Mild/Moderate candidates was 3.30 (n=9), and 3.74 (n=3). The CTC standards for this PLO are rigorous; a key reason this assignment was chosen is that it demonstrates a candidate's ability to apply theory into their clinical practice. Clinical practice is the demonstration of the candidate's ability to apply their understanding of coursework in the field for 15 weeks.</p> <p>Because the special education program is based on mastery of learning and teaching, formative feedback is provided on an ongoing basis to the student as documented on class assignments throughout the program. Students cannot be recommended for degrees or credentials until all assessments are completed satisfactorily (as demonstrated by their summative program assessments: TPE Portfolio).</p>
<p>Please provide a summary of the assessment data in a table, along with a brief analysis of the results.</p>	<p>See link below for the Key Assignment Teaching Project and TPE portfolio individual scores and average scores for EDUC 560, 563, and 590-593.</p> <p>Key Assignment Individual Scores</p> <p>The link below provides a detailed account of each of the 13 TPEs as targeted by each course. For this PLO, Table 2 provides data for TPEs: 1, 8, 9.</p> <p>TPE Alignment by Course</p> <p>Teaching/Tutoring Project</p> <p>In 2016-2017, for Teaching/Tutoring Project, we assessed 20 students for the mild/moderate credential. The overall average score was a 3.44 on this key assignment. Of the 20 students, the median score was 3.50 with a standard deviation of .49. Minimum=-2.22 Maximum=4.0 and Range of 1.78.</p> <p>On 2017-2018, for the Teaching/Tutoring Project we assessed 18 candidates for the mild/moderate credential. The overall mean score was 3.74, indicating a slight increase from the prior year. The median score was 3.88, with a range of 2.57-4.0, representing a slightly higher median and similar range from the prior year. <i>Please note that the one candidate who scored a 2.57 received support from the instructor and was asked to revise the</i></p>

	<p><i>assignment until the assignment reflected a 3 or better in relation to mastery of requirements.</i> Thus, we consider our objective of scoring a 3 or better met.</p> <p>In 2016-2017, for the 13 Moderate/Severe candidates, the overall average score was 3.72. Of the 13 students, the median score was 4.00 with a standard deviation of .355. Minimum=3.00 Maximum=4.0 and Range 1.00.</p> <p>In 2017-2018, for the four moderate/severe candidates, the overall mean score was 3.72, which is exactly the same as the prior year. Of the 4 students, 50% (n=2) scored a 4, 25% (n=1) scored a 3.88, and 25% (n=1) scored a 3. The scores ranged from 3.0-4.0, with a median of 3.94.</p> <p>TPE Portfolio</p> <p>In 2016-2017, for the TPE Portfolio, we assessed 16 for the mild/moderate credential. The average score on the TPE portfolio was 3.80. 62.5% of students received a score of 4.0, 33.5% received a score in the range of 3.85-3.00 based on a 1 – 4 rubric scale). This falls within the expected range as candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of competencies.</p> <p>In 2017-2018, for the TPE portfolio we assessed 9 Mild/Moderate candidates. The average score was 3.30. Scores ranged from 3.30-3.77 based on a 1-4 point scale. This falls within the expected range of scores and shares a similar range with scores from the previous year, showing that all candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations in this area. The previous year, significantly more candidates scored a 4. We attribute this to increased rigor in scoring.</p> <p>In 2016-2017, for the TPE Portfolio we assessed 13 students for the moderate/severe credential. Of the 13 students, 53.8 % received a score of 4.0, 46.2% received a score within the range of 3.85-3.23 (based on a 1 – 4 rubric scale). This falls within the expected range as candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of competencies.</p> <p>In 2017-2018, for the TPE portfolio we assessed 3 moderate/severe credential candidates. Scores ranges from 3.38-4.00 with a mean of 3.74. This represents a similar range and mean from the previous year, and falls within the expected range required to show that candidates meet or exceed expectations.</p>
<p>How will results be shared and evidence used to make decisions? Was it shared with faculty (full time and adjunct) and students?</p>	<p>The findings are presented to the Special Education faculty each semester and the faculty meet to review student progress and assessment results. The data is then used to identify classes to conduct additional forms of formative assessments and to refine instructional practices of the program to address the areas of need as identified by the data.</p> <p>In addition, twice a year an Adjunct Faculty meeting is held and the data from the PLOs are shared with the faculty. Students are informed of their scores on key assignments through Taskstream. Because the special</p>

	<p>education program is based on mastery of learning and teaching, formative feedback is provided on an ongoing basis to the student as documented on class assignments throughout the program. Students cannot be recommended for degrees or credentials until all assessments are completed satisfactorily (as demonstrated by their summative program assessments: TPE Portfolio). If they do not meet the minimum score of “3.0” on their key assessments, the Program Coordinator meets with candidate to draft a remediation plan.</p>
<p>III. Progress</p>	
<p>How have previous years’ findings been used to improve learning, courses and program in relation to this outcome? Specify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Refer to previous years’ assessment reports/responses for this section.</i> • <i>How did this year’s achievement level compare to past years?</i> • <i>Show year-to-year progress, preferably in a data table.</i> 	<p>From 2015-16 to 2016-17, performance on the Teaching/Tutoring Project and the TPE portfolio has remained stable. In 2017-2018, the program began a new cohort style model with one admissions semester per year. Thus, there is a slight dip in 2017-2018 in regard to moderate/severe candidates. Therefore, the N size varies from 2016-2017, 2017-2018, suggesting caution be taken when comparing mean scores.</p> <p>The stability of scores on these assessments across time is due to two factors. First, the credential program is based on a level of mastery. Therefore, teacher candidates are unable to successfully move forward or complete their program without demonstrating mastery of at least 3.0 on the rubrics. Second, formative assessments are conducted throughout the program to provide feedback to each candidate to support their mastery of learning. Students receive ongoing feedback from University Supervisors in addition to district level personnel during the semester of student teaching (TPE portfolio).</p> <p>For the Teaching/Tutoring Project, there was an increase in mean score from 3.44 to 3.74 for mild/moderate candidates, while the mean score for moderate severe candidates remained stable. 17 out of 18 candidates met expectations on the first submission of the assignment scoring a between a 3.0 and 4.0. One candidate scored a 2.57. This candidate was provided with detailed feedback and asked to revise the assignment to demonstrate mastery of the assignment at a minimum of 3.0.</p> <p>For the TPE Portfolio, there was a slight decrease in score for mild/moderate candidates from 3.8 to 3.30. This appears to be due to less “4” scores for candidates overall. The TPE Portfolio Rubric was calibrated among full-time and part-time faculty, and this may have resulted in more rigorous scoring and less 4.0 scores among candidates. Scores for moderate/severe candidates remained stable.</p> <p>Please view link below for scores over the last four years:</p> <p>Yearly Key Assignment Scores</p> <p>To meet revised Education Specialist Teacher Performance Expectations of the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing (CTC), we created a program grid to assess the current program, and identified areas for improvement. The Program Coordinator met with faculty members regarding requirements/revised CTC standards, met with faculty teaching in the program to determine necessary additions/changes in courses, and</p>

	<p>created a proposal to redesign the program for the 2017-18 academic year. Focus groups were conducted with both students and adjunct faculty to ensure that our redesigned program for 2017-18 were aligned with program standards and relevant to the current field of special education.</p> <p>In addition, this past academic year 2017-2018, the program has taken the feedback from previous WASC reports and revised the Key Assignment Rubrics to align to the PLOs and address the CTC standards. Taskstream has helped to streamline assessment data.</p> <p>For a comparison of 17-18, 16-17 and 15-16 scores see tables here: Yearly Key Assignment Scores</p> <p>For this upcoming academic year, we plan to improve the following with regards to our PLOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Refining the established rubrics to ensure that each PLO are consistently measured across the programContinue trainings on Taskstream and the expectations of PLO rubrics to ensure calibration of both part-time and full time faculty.Continue refinement of rubrics and formative assessments throughout the program.Revise any Key Assignments to align with revised TPEs released by the California Commission on Teacher Credential (discussed in the introduction to the report).
--	--

Learning Outcome #2	
I. Process:	
Student Learning Outcome	Demonstrate the ability to design the components of behavioral plans that include lifestyle enhancements, environmental and antecedent modifications, instructional and curricular modifications, teaching replacement behavior, teaching communication skills, social interactions, self-management, self-advocacy skills, reinforcement strategies, coping skills, and where necessary, emergency intervention strategies (PS 12).
<p>Supports University Theme <i>(Some or all of the program's learning outcomes must support at least two of the university's strategic themes)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Themes: Internationalization, Personalized Education, Faculty/Student Research, Interdisciplinarity, or Student Writing Describe how the theme is supported by the learning outcome 	<p>Personalized Education:</p> <p>In order to demonstrate the ability to design the components of behavioral plans that include lifestyle enhancements, environmental and antecedent modifications, instructional and curricular modifications, teaching replacement behavior, teaching communication skills, social interactions, self-management, self-advocacy skills, reinforcement strategies, coping skills, and where necessary, emergency intervention strategies. Students need to work closely with their instructors or other constituents, such as University Supervisor and Master Teacher involved in their key assignments.</p> <p>In addition, all special education courses are small and faculty members provide individual mentoring to ensure that students are able to deliver systematic instruction.</p> <p>Student Writing:</p> <p>In order to articulate a behavior program of intervention that aligns to state standards, students are required to write critically and identify appropriate interventions that meet the needs of students with disabilities.</p>
<p>Supports WASC Core Competency, For Undergraduate Programs Only <i>(Please indicate whether this outcome supports any of WASC's core competencies)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oral Communication Written communication Information Literacy Quantitative Reasoning Critical Thinking 	<p>Oral Communication Written Communication Critical Thinking Special Education is a graduate program</p>
<p>Where is the outcome published for students?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Syllabi <i>(If syllabi, list course numbers)</i> Website Handbook 	<p>Syllabi: EDUC 566, EDUC 590/EDUC 592 and EDUC 591/593</p> <p>Syllabi can found here: Syllabi for Special Education and Joint Credential</p>
<p>Evidence of Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> capstone project presentation performance course-embedded exam assignment standardized test portfolio 	<p>Evidence for this PLO:</p> <p>Key Assignment(s) include: Behavior Case Study TPE Portfolio</p> <p>These assessments represent the student's demonstration of mastery of this PLO.</p>

<p>Collecting and Analyzing the Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How did you select the sample?</i> • <i>What was your sample size (number of students)?</i> • <i>Provide the percentage of the sample size as compared to the relevant population.</i> • <i>How did you assess the student work/data collected?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Possible Tools: rubric, exam questions, portfolio samples</i> • <i>Attach all assessment tools</i> 	<p>All students (not a sample) enrolled in the core courses listed above are required to complete and pass the Key Assignment: Behavior Case Study. The reported sample is for the 2017-2018 academic year. Prior to 2017-2018, the program operated under rolling admissions, making the sample numbers vary each academic year. The 2017-2018 academic year is the first year of a cohort model, with one admissions point each year (fall 2017). Thus, in future years, numbers will be more consistent from year to year. The TPE Portfolio represents a core competency that every student by the end of their program must master in order to be eligible for the Preliminary Education Specialist credential (completers of student teaching). It was develop to target the key skills all Education Specialists must embody to be eligible for the Preliminary Education Specialist credential.</p> <p>The key assignments were as follows:</p> <p>Behavior Case Study Each student in the Preliminary Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Credential Programs completes a Behavior Intervention Plan. The plan is designed to facilitate the student’s understanding of legal and ethical requirements and the ethics of intervention. Through the design of intervention, candidates will have the opportunity to address the following area(s): lifestyle enhancements, environmental and antecedent modifications, instructional and curricular modifications, teaching replacement behavior, teaching communication skills, social interactions, self-management, self-advocacy skills, reinforcement strategies, coping skills, and where necessary, emergency intervention strategies.</p> <p>Behavior Plan Project Description</p> <p>Behavior Plan Rubric</p> <p>Relevant Professional Standards: This key assignment addresses the Preliminary Educational Specialist Standards: Primary: PS 12 TPEs: 3, 6, 11</p> <p>TPE Portfolio Mild/Moderate: The purpose of the Teacher Performance Expectation Portfolio is to document the candidate’s mastery of each of the 13 TPEs per the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards for the Mild/Moderate credential program. Specifically, for this PLO TPE 3, 6, and 11 are targeted. The Candidate is rated on a four point rubric, based upon their demonstration of evidence (at the University level and in fieldwork/student teaching). A link to the portfolio scoring rubric can be found here: TPE Portfolio MM</p> <p>TPE Portfolio Moderate/Severe: The purpose of the Teacher Performance Expectation Portfolio is to document the candidate’s mastery of each of the 13 TPEs per the California</p>
--	--

	<p>Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards for the Moderate/Severe credential program. Specifically for this PLO TPE 3, 6, and 11 are targeted. The Candidate is rated on a four point rubric, based upon their demonstration of evidence (at the University level and in fieldwork/student teaching). A link to the portfolio scoring rubric can be found here: TPE Portfolio MS</p>
<p>Expected Level of Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What was your target(s) for student performance for this outcome? (This should tie to the methods in which you assessed the students and collected and analyzed data in the section above.)</i> 	<p>CTC requires mastery of all program standards and TPEs for all teacher candidates. Students participate in ongoing evaluation through formative assessments to ensure that they satisfy the expected level of achievement (≥ 3.0) by the end of the semester and by the culmination of their program. If the student does not meet the expected level of mastery on their Key Assignment, the is placed on a student support plan to outline steps for remediation.</p> <p>For the Behavior Plan Project (see links for assignment and scoring guide directions below) each component of the rubric address TPE 3, 6, and, 11 and Program Standard 12. TPEs are required Behavior Plan Project serves as one of two indicators that the student has met the competency.</p> <p>Behavior Plan Project Description</p> <p>Behavior Plan Rubric</p> <p>The second indicator is the TPE Portfolio. Specifically, TPE 3, 6, and 11 and Program Standard 12 are indicators for this PLO. Teacher candidates must include evidence within their student teaching experience that develops a behavior plan for a K-12 student that includes lifestyle enhancements, environmental and antecedent modifications, instructional and curricular modifications, teaching replacement behavior, teaching communication skills, social interactions, self-management, self-advocacy skills, reinforcement strategies, coping skills, and where necessary, emergency intervention strategies</p> <p>For the TPE portfolio, if students do not meet the level of expected achievement (≥ 3.0), the program coordinator may develop a remediation with the candidate that requires the candidate to complete tasks that demonstrate mastery of TPEs, OR they will not be eligible to complete their student teaching and will be required to repeat coursework until they have mastered Program Standard 12.</p>
<p>II. Performance</p>	
<p>Have expected levels of achievement been met for this outcome? Explain.</p>	<p>The PLOs guide our instruction in Special Education. They are requirements mandated by the state for all special education candidates to master. The key assessments and rubrics were designed to measure the candidates' mastery of the TPE and the PLO.</p> <p>For the Behavior Case Study, all Education Specialist students (mild/moderate and moderate/severe) are required to take the course EDUC 566 (previously the assignment was in EDUC 602). The overall mean for teacher candidates in 2016-2017 was 3.09 (n=12). In 2017-2018, the mean score for candidates was 3.67 (n= 18), suggesting an increase in scores from one year to the next. One candidate scores 2.50. The candidate was provided</p>

feedback and asked to revise the assignment to demonstrate a level of competency of at least a 3.0. Thus, levels of achievement were met. The CTC standards for this PLO are rigorous; a key reason this assignment was chosen is that it demonstrates a candidate's ability to apply theory into practice and work with a student out in the field. PLO and students were held to a high level of rigor of mastery. Overall, the scores fell within the expected range with 17 candidates scoring between 3.0 and 4.0, and one candidate falling slightly below the expected range. This candidate was asked to revise the assignment to show mastery of the requirements at the minimum score of 3.0. This PLO will continue in the forthcoming years as it is also a state standard and evidence from the field indicates that our candidates require support in this competency prior to their completion of their pre-service program.

In 2016-2017, for the TPE Portfolio, we assessed 16 for the mild/moderate credential. The average score on the TPE portfolio was 3.80. 62.5% of students received a score of 4.0, 33.5% received a score in the range of 3.85-3.00 based on a 1 – 4 rubric scale). This falls within the expected range as candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of competencies.

In 2017-2018, for the TPE portfolio we assessed 9 Mild/Moderate candidates. The average score was 3.30. Scores ranged from 3.30-3.77 based on a 1-4 point scale. This falls within the expected range of scores and shares a similar range with scores from the previous year, showing that all candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations in this area. The previous year, significantly more candidates scored a 4. We attribute this to increased rigor in scoring.

In 2016-2017, for the TPE Portfolio we assessed 13 students for the moderate/severe credential. Of the 13 students, 53.8 % received a score of 4.0, 46.2% received a score within the range of 3.85-3.23 (based on a 1 – 4 rubric scale). This falls within the expected range as candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of competencies.

In 2017-2018, for the TPE portfolio we assessed 3 moderate/severe credential candidates. Scores ranges from 3.38-4.00 with a mean of 3.74. This represents a similar range and mean from the previous year, and falls within the expected range required to show that candidates meet or exceed expectations.

The CTC standards for this PLO are rigorous; a key reason this assignment was chosen is that it demonstrates a candidate's ability to apply theory into their clinical practice. Clinical practice is the demonstration of the candidate's ability to apply their understanding of coursework in the field for 15 weeks.

Because the special education program is based on mastery of learning and teaching, formative feedback is provided on an ongoing basis to the student as documented on class assignments throughout the program. Students cannot be recommended for degrees or credentials until all assessments are

	<p>completed satisfactorily (as demonstrated by their summative program assessments: TPE Portfolio).</p>
<p>Please provide a summary of the assessment data in a table, along with a brief analysis of the results.</p>	<p>The link for Key Assignment: Teaching Project and TPE portfolio individual scores and average scores in EDUC 602, 590-593 can be found here: Key Assignment Individual and Mean Scores.</p> <p>The link below provides a detailed account of each of the 13 TPEs as targeted by each course. For this PLO, Table 2 provides data for TPEs: 3, 6, 11</p> <p>Specific Course and TPE Alignment</p> <p>Behavior Case Study</p> <p>For 2016-2017, The average score on the TPE portfolio was 3.09 (n= 12). 8% o of students received a score of 4.0, 67% received a score in the range of 3.57-3.00, and 25% received a score between the range of 2.86-2.71. based on a 1 – 4 rubric scale). This generally falls within the expected range as candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of competencies, with one candidate scoring slightly below the 3.0 expectation.</p> <p>In 2017-2018, 18 candidates completed the Behavior Case Study. The mean score was 3.67, with a range of 2.50-4.00, and a median of 4.0. 61% (n= 11) of candidates scored a 4; 33% of candidates (n=6); 6% of candidates (n=1) scored below a 3, with a score of 2.5. This candidate was provided feedback and asked to revise the assignment in order to demonstrate that he/she met requirements at a minimum 3.0.</p> <p>TPE Portfolio</p> <p>In 2016-2017, for the TPE Portfolio, we assessed 16 for the mild/moderate credential. The average score on the TPE portfolio was 3.80. 62.5% of students received a score of 4.0, 33.5% received a score in the range of 3.85-3.00 based on a 1 – 4 rubric scale). This falls within the expected range as candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of competencies.</p> <p>In 2017-2018, for the TPE portfolio we assessed 9 Mild/Moderate candidates. The average score was 3.30. Scores ranged from 3.30-3.77 based on a 1-4 point scale. This falls within the expected range of scores and shares a similar range with scores from the previous year, showing that all candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations in this area. The previous year, significantly more candidates scored a 4. We attribute this to increased rigor in scoring.</p> <p>In 2016-2017, for the TPE Portfolio we assessed 13 students for the moderate/severe credential. Of the 13 students, 53.8 % received a score of 4.0, 46.2% received a score within the range of 3.85-3.23 (based on a 1 – 4 rubric scale). This falls within the expected range as candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of competencies.</p>

	<p>In 2017-2018, for the TPE portfolio we assessed 3 moderate/severe credential candidates. Scores ranges from 3.38-4.00 with a mean of 3.74. This represents a similar range and mean from the previous year, and falls within the expected range required to show that candidates meet or exceed expectations.</p>
<p>How will results be shared and evidence used to make decisions? Was it shared with faculty (full time and adjunct) and students?</p>	<p>The findings are presented to the Special Education faculty each semester and the faculty meet to review student progress and assessment results. The data is then used to identify classes to conduct additional forms of formative assessments and to refine instructional practices of the program to address the areas of need as identified by the data.</p> <p>In addition, twice a year an Adjunct Faculty meeting is held and the data from the PLOs are shared with the faculty. Students are informed of their scores on key assignments through Taskstream. Because the special education program is based on mastery of learning and teaching, formative feedback is provided on an ongoing basis to the student as documented on class assignments throughout the program. Students cannot be recommended for degrees or credentials until all assessments are completed satisfactorily (as demonstrated by their summative program assessments: TPE Portfolio). If they do not meet the minimum score of “3.0” on their key assessments, the candidate is asked to use feedback to revise the assignment until the candidate can demonstrate that mastery at a minimum, or the Program Coordinator meets with candidate to draft a remediation plan in which the candidate must demonstrate mastery of the content. Thus, we find that we are meeting the goals of a “3 or better” as all candidates who do not meet these requirements on the first attempt are supported in revising the assignment, or completing a remediation plan that demonstrates mastery.</p>
<p>III. Progress</p>	
<p>How have previous years’ findings been used to improve learning, courses and program in relation to this outcome? Specify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Refer to previous years’ assessment reports/responses for this section.</i> • <i>How did this year’s achievement level compare to past years?</i> • <i>Show year-to-year progress, preferably in a data table.</i> 	<p>The Behavior Case Study is a continuing key assignment for the program. As a result from feedback of previous ALOARs, the Special Education Program revised the key assignments to accurately reflect our PLOs and consistently measure student progress.</p> <p>Mean scores for the behavior case study increased from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018, from a mean score of 3.09 to a mean score of 3.62. Progress over time can be seen in the table below.</p> <p>Yearly Key Assignment Scores</p> <p>For the TPE Portfolio there was a slight decrease in score for mild/moderate candidates from 3.8 to 3.30. The mean remained stable. The decrease appears to be attributed to less “4” scores among candidates. The rubric was calibrated among full and part-time faculty, with a focus on rigorous scoring. This may have resulted in less “4” scores. Scores for moderate/severe candidates remained stable.</p> <p>Please view link below for scores over the last four years:</p>

[Yearly Key Assignment Scores](#)

To meet revised Education Specialist Teacher Performance Expectations of the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing (CTC), we created a program grid to assess the current program, and identified areas for improvement. The Program Coordinator met with faculty members regarding requirements/revised CTC standards, met with faculty teaching in the program to determine necessary additions/changes in courses, and created a proposal to redesign the program for the 2017-18 academic year. Focus groups were conducted with both students and adjunct faculty to ensure that our redesigned program for 2017-18 were aligned with program standards and relevant to the current field of special education.

In addition, this past academic year 2017-2018, the program has taken the feedback from previous WASC reports and revised the Key Assignment Rubrics to align to the PLOs and address the CTC standards. Taskstream has helped to streamline assessment data.

For a comparison of 17-18, 16-17 and 15-16 scores see tables here: [Yearly Key Assignment Scores](#)

For this upcoming academic year, we plan to improve the following with regards to our PLOs:

Refining the established rubrics to ensure that each PLO are consistently measured across the program

Continue trainings on Taskstream and the expectations of PLO rubrics to ensure calibration of both part-time and full time faculty.

Continue refinement of rubrics and formative assessments throughout the program.

Revise any Key Assignments to align with revised TPEs released by the California Commission on Teacher Credential (discussed in the introduction to the report).

Learning Outcome #3	
I. Process:	
Student Learning Outcome	Students will demonstrate the ability to develop, implement, adapt, modify, and evaluate a variety of pedagogical approaches to instruction, including instructional sequences, unit and lesson plans, that provide students with disabilities with equitable access to the content and experiences found in the state approved core curriculum (PS 13).
Supports University Theme <i>(Some or all of the program's learning outcomes must support at least two of the university's strategic themes)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Themes: Internationalization, Personalized Education, Faculty/Student Research, Interdisciplinarity, or Student Writing Describe how the theme is supported by the learning outcome 	<p>Personalized Education: In order to demonstrate the ability to develop, implement, adapt, modify, and evaluate a variety of pedagogical approaches to instruction, students must share ideas and proposals with their course instructors, University Supervisors, and Master Teachers, and receive formative feedback.</p> <p>In addition, all special education courses are small and faculty members provide individual mentoring to ensure that students develop, implement, adapt, modify, and evaluate a variety of pedagogical approaches to instruction.</p> <p>Student Writing: In order to provide written evidence of effective development, implementation, adaptation, modification, and evaluation of pedagogical approaches, students must demonstrate thoughtful and logical integration of course content and state standards that appropriately meet the needs of students with disabilities.</p>
Supports WASC Core Competency, For Undergraduate Programs Only <i>(Please indicate whether this outcome supports any of WASC's core competencies)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oral Communication Written communication Information Literacy Quantitative Reasoning Critical Thinking 	<p>Oral Communication</p> <p>Written Communication</p> <p>Critical Thinking</p> <p>Special Education is a graduate program</p>
Where is the outcome published for students? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Syllabi (If syllabi, list course numbers) Website Handbook 	<p>EDUC 563, EDUC 560, EDUC 590/592, EDUC 591/593</p> <p>Syllabi can found here: Syllabi for Special Education and Joint Credential</p>
Evidence of Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> capstone project presentation performance course-embedded exam assignment standardized test portfolio 	<p>Evidence of learning for this PLO include: TPE Portfolio. This assessment represents the student's demonstration of mastery.</p> <p>EDUC 500, 564, and 571, also introduce and develop this program outcome. However, at this time, assignments in these courses are not considered "key assignments" for our program.</p>
Collecting and Analyzing the Data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you select the sample? What was your sample siz (number of students)? 	All students (not a sample) enrolled in the core courses listed above are required to complete and pass the Key Assignment: TPE Portfolio. The reported sample is for the 2017-2018 academic year. In prior years, the program operated under rolling admissions, thus, the sample number varied

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Provide the percentage of the sample size as compared to the relevant population.</i> • <i>How did you assess the student work/data collected?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Possible Tools: rubric, exam questions, portfolio samples</i> • <i>Attach all assessment tools</i> 	<p>each year. This year, 2017-2018, is the first year of a cohort model approach in which candidates are admitted only one time per year (fall). This should make the sample numbers more stable in the future. The TPE Portfolio represents a core competency that every student by the end of their program must master in order to be eligible for the Preliminary Education Specialist credential (completers of student teaching). It was develop to target the key skills all Education Specialists must embody to be eligible for the Preliminary Education Specialist credential.</p> <p>Relevant Professional Standards: This key assignment addresses the Preliminary Educational Specialist Standards: Primary: PS 13 TPEs: 2,4, 5, 6, 9, 10</p> <p>Because this PLO targets six TPEs (46% of the required TPEs), the measurement of this PLO takes place in the candidate’s summative clinical practice experience. Therefore, the TPE Portfolio is key assessment for this PLO.</p> <p>TPE Portfolio Mild/Moderate</p> <p>TPE Portfolio Moderate/Severe</p> <p>Description of the key assignments:</p> <p>TPE Portfolio Mild/Moderate: The purpose of the Teacher Performance Expectation Portfolio is to document the candidate’s mastery of each of the 13 TPEs that are per the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) standards that are embedded within the Program Standards for the Mild/Moderate credential program. Specifically, for this PLO TPE 1 and 9 are targeted. The Candidates are rated on a four point rubric, based upon their demonstration of evidence (at the University level and in fieldwork/student teaching). (See rubric via link above). Per state requirements, candidates must receive a “3” to meet the standard. Please note that all candidates who score below a 3 are provided feedback and asked to revise the assignment to reflect a score of a minimum of a 3 on the assignment. Scores included in this report reflect the candidates first attempt.</p> <p>TPE Portfolio Moderate/Severe The purpose of the Teacher Performance Expectation Portfolio is to document the candidate’s mastery of each of the 13 TPEs per the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) standards for the Moderate/Severe credential program. Specifically, for this PLO TPE 1 and 9 are targeted. The Candidate is rated on a four point rubric, based upon their demonstration of evidence (at the University level and in fieldwork/student teaching). (See rubric via link above.) Per state requirements, candidates must receive a “3” to meet the standard. Please note that all candidates who score below a 3 are provided feedback and asked to revise the assignment to</p>
--	---

	<p>reflect a score of a minimum of a 3 on the assignment. Scores included in this report reflect the candidates first attempt.</p>
<p>Expected Level of Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What was your target(s) for student performance for this outcome? (This should tie to the methods in which you assessed the students and collected and analyzed data in the section above.)</i> 	<p>CTC requires mastery of all program standards and TPEs for all teacher candidates. Students participate in ongoing evaluation through formative assessments to ensure that they satisfy the expected level of achievement (≥ 3.0) by the end of the semester and by the culmination of their program. If the student does not meet the expected level of mastery on their Key Assignment, the is placed on a student support plan to outline steps for remediation.</p> <p>TPE Portfolio. Specifically, TPE 2,4,5, 6, 9, 10 and Program Standard 13 are indicators for this PLO. Teacher candidates must include evidence of their ability to develop, implement, adapt, modify, and evaluate a variety of pedagogical approaches to instruction, including instructional sequences, unit and lesson plans, that provide students with disabilities with equitable access to the content and experiences found in the state approved core curriculum , if students do not meet the level of expected achievement (≥ 3.0), they will not be eligible to complete their student teaching and will be required to repeat coursework until they have mastered Program Standard 13.</p>
<p>II. Performance</p>	
<p>Have expected levels of achievement been met for this outcome? Explain.</p>	<p>The PLOs guide our instruction in Special Education. They are requirements mandated by the state for all special education candidates to master. The key assessments and rubrics were designed to measure the candidates mastery of the TPE and the PLO.</p> <p>See Link Here for the Key Assignment TPE portfolio individual scores and average scores for EDUC 590-593.</p> <p>The link below provides a detailed account of each of the 13 TPEs as targeted by each course. For this PLO, Table 2 provides data for TPEs: 1, 8, 9.</p> <p>TPEs Targeted by Course</p> <p>In 2016-2017, for the TPE Portfolio, we assessed 16 for the mild/moderate credential. The average score on the TPE portfolio was 3.80. 62.5% of students received a score of 4.0, 33.5% received a score in the range of 3.85-3.00 based on a 1 – 4 rubric scale). This falls within the expected range as candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of competencies.</p> <p>In 2017-2018, for the TPE portfolio we assessed 9 Mild/Moderate candidates. The average score was 3.30. Scores ranged from 3.30-3.77 based on a 1-4 point scale. This falls within the expected range of scores and shares a similar range with scores from the previous year, showing that all candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations in this area. The previous year, significantly more candidates scored a 4. We attribute this to increased rigor in scoring.</p>

	<p>In 2016-2017, for the TPE Portfolio we assessed 13 students for the moderate/severe credential. Of the 13 students, 53.8 % received a score of 4.0, 46.2% received a score within the range of 3.85-3.23 (based on a 1 – 4 rubric scale). This falls within the expected range as candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of competencies.</p> <p>In 2017-2018, for the TPE portfolio we assessed 3 moderate/severe credential candidates. Scores ranges from 3.38-4.00 with a mean of 3.74. This represents a similar range and mean from the previous year, and falls within the expected range required to show that candidates meet or exceed expectations.</p> <p>Because the special education program is based on mastery of learning and teaching, formative feedback is provided on an ongoing basis to the student as documented on class assignments throughout the program. Students cannot be recommended for degrees or credentials until all assessments are completed satisfactorily (as demonstrated by their summative program assessments: TPE Portfolio).</p>
<p>Please provide a summary of the assessment data in a table, along with a brief analysis of the results.</p>	<p>See link here for Key Assignment: TPE portfolio individual scores and average scores in EDUC 590-593.</p> <p>The link below provides a detailed account of each of the 13 TPEs as targeted by each course. For this PLO, Table 2 provides data for TPEs: 2,4, 5, 6, 9, 10</p> <p>TPEs Targeted by Course</p> <p>Scores across time can be viewed here: Yearly Key Assignment Scores</p> <p>In 2016-2017, for the TPE Portfolio, we assessed 16 for the mild/moderate credential. The average score on the TPE portfolio was 3.80. 62.5% of students received a score of 4.0, 33.5% received a score in the range of 3.85-3.00 based on a 1 – 4 rubric scale). This falls within the expected range as candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of competencies.</p> <p>In 2017-2018, for the TPE portfolio we assessed 9 Mild/Moderate candidates. The average score was 3.30. Scores ranged from 3.30-3.77 based on a 1-4 point scale. This falls within the expected range of scores and shares a similar range with scores from the previous year, showing that all candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations in this area. The previous year, significantly more candidates scored a 4. We attribute this to increased rigor in scoring.</p> <p>In 2016-2017, for the TPE Portfolio we assessed 13 students for the moderate/severe credential. Of the 13 students, 53.8 % received a score of 4.0, 46.2% received a score within the range of 3.85-3.23 (based on a 1 – 4 rubric scale). This falls within the expected range as candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of competencies.</p> <p>In 2017-2018, for the TPE portfolio we assessed 3 moderate/severe credential candidates. Scores ranges from 3.38-4.00 with a mean of 3.74.</p>

	<p>This represents a similar range and mean from the previous year, and falls within the expected range required to show that candidates meet or exceed expectations.</p>
<p>How will results be shared and evidence used to make decisions? Was it shared with faculty (full time and adjunct) and students?</p>	<p>The findings are presented to the Special Education faculty each semester and the faculty meet to review student progress and assessment results. The data is then used to identify classes to conduct additional forms of formative assessments and to refine instructional practices of the program to address the areas of need as identified by the data.</p> <p>In addition, twice a year an Adjunct Faculty meeting is held and the data from the PLOs are shared with the faculty. Students are informed of their scores on key assignments through Taskstream. Because the special education program is based on mastery of learning and teaching, formative feedback is provided on an ongoing basis to the student as documented on class assignments throughout the program. Students cannot be recommended for degrees or credentials until all assessments are completed satisfactorily (as demonstrated by their summative program assessments: TPE Portfolio). If they do not meet the minimum score of “3.0” on their key assessments, the Program Coordinator meets with candidate to draft a remediation plan.</p>
<p>III. Progress</p>	
<p>How have previous years’ findings been used to improve learning, courses and program in relation to this outcome? Specify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Refer to previous years’ assessment reports/responses for this section.</i> • <i>How did this year’s achievement level compare to past years?</i> • <i>Show year-to-year progress, preferably in a data table.</i> 	<p>From 2015-16 to 2016-17, performance on the TPE portfolio have an increase in sample size (which is indicative of the program growing) (see Table 1). In 2017-2018, the program began a new cohort style model with one admissions semester per year. Thus, there is a slight dip in 2017-2018 in regard to moderate/severe candidates.</p> <p>Overall scores continue to remain stable from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018. Scores can be viewed here: Yearly Key Assignment Scores</p> <p>For the TPE Portfolio, there was a slight decrease in score for mild/moderate candidates from 3.8 to 3.30. The rubric was calibrated among full and part-time faculty, with a focus on rigorous scoring. This may have resulted in less “4” scores. Scores for moderate/severe candidates remained stable.</p> <p>Please view link below for scores over the last four years:</p> <p>Yearly Key Assignment Scores</p> <p>The stability of scores on these assessments across time is due to two factors. First, the credential program is based on a level of mastery. Therefore, teacher candidates are unable to successfully move forward or complete their program without demonstrating mastery of at least 3.0 on the rubrics. Second, formative assessments are conducted throughout the program to provide feedback to each candidate to support their mastery of learning. Students receive ongoing feedback from University Supervisors in addition to district level personnel during the semester of student teaching (TPE portfolio).</p>

	<p>For the Teaching Portfolio, there was a slight decrease in score for mild/moderate candidates from 3.8 to 3.30. Scores for moderate/severe candidates remained stable.</p> <p>To meet revised Education Specialist Teacher Performance Expectations of the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing (CTC), we created a program grid to assess the current program, and identified areas for improvement. The Program Coordinator met with faculty members regarding requirements/revised CTC standards, met with faculty teaching in the program to determine necessary additions/changes in courses, and created a proposal to redesign the program for the 2017-18 academic year. Focus groups were conducted with both students and adjunct faculty to ensure that our redesigned program for 2017-18 were aligned with program standards and relevant to the current field of special education.</p> <p>In addition, this past academic year 2017-2018, the program has taken the feedback from previous WASC reports and revised the Key Assignment Rubrics to align to the PLOs and address the CTC standards. Taskstream has helped to streamline assessment data.</p> <p>For a comparison of 17-18, 16-17 and 15-16 scores see tables here: Yearly Key Assignment Scores</p> <p>For this upcoming academic year, we plan to improve the following with regards to our PLOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Refining the established rubrics to ensure that each PLO are consistently measured across the programContinue trainings on Taskstream and the expectations of PLO rubrics to ensure calibration of both part-time and full time faculty.Continue refinement of rubrics and formative assessments throughout the program.Revise any Key Assignments to align with revised TPEs released by the California Commission on Teacher Credential (discussed in the introduction to the report).
--	--

Learning Outcome #4	
I. Process:	
Student Learning Outcome	Students will utilize both formal and informal assessments to evaluate students' needs and strengths for the purpose of making accommodations, modifications, instructional decisions and ongoing program improvements (PS 5)
<p>Supports University Theme <i>(Some or all of the program's learning outcomes must support at least two of the university's strategic themes)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Themes: <i>Internationalization, Personalized Education, Faculty/Student Research, Interdisciplinarity, or Student Writing</i> <i>Describe how the theme is supported by the learning outcome</i> 	<p>Personalized Education: In order to demonstrate the ability to utilize both formal and informal assessments to evaluate student needs and strengths and make accommodations, modifications, and instructional decisions, students will need to work closely with their instructor to ensure that they follow the federal regulations that guide the assessment process.</p> <p>In addition, all special education courses are small and faculty members provide individual mentoring to ensure that students are able to use assessment procedures.</p> <p>Student Writing: In order to articulate comprehensive assessment report that aligns to state standards, students are required to write critically and make appropriate recommendations and supports that meet the needs of students with disabilities.</p>
<p>Supports WASC Core Competency, For Undergraduate Programs Only <i>(Please indicate whether this outcome supports any of WASC's core competencies)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Oral Communication</i> <i>Written communication</i> <i>Information Literacy</i> <i>Quantitative Reasoning</i> <i>Critical Thinking</i> 	<p>Oral Communication Written Communication Critical Thinking Special Education is a graduate program</p>
<p>Where is the outcome published for students?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Syllabi (If syllabi, list course numbers)</i> <i>Website</i> <i>Handbook</i> 	<p>EDUC 566, EDUC 590/592, EDUC 591/593</p> <p>Syllabi can found here: Syllabi for Special Education and Joint Credential</p>
<p>Evidence of Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>capstone project</i> <i>presentation</i> <i>performance</i> <i>course-embedded exam</i> <i>assignment</i> <i>standardized test</i> <i>portfolio</i> 	<p>Evidence of learning for this PLO include: Assessment Report and TPE Portfolio. This key assignment assessments represent the student's demonstration of mastery.</p> <p>EDUC, 544, 571, and 566 also introduce and develop this program outcome. However, at this time, assignments in these courses are not considered "key assignments" for our program.</p>
<p>Collecting and Analyzing the Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>How did you select the sample?</i> 	<p>All students (not a sample) enrolled in the core courses listed above are required to complete and pass the Key Assignment: Assessment Report. The reported sample is for the 2017-2018 academic year. Because the program</p>

- *What was your sample size (number of students)?*
- *Provide the percentage of the sample size as compared to the relevant population.*
- *How did you assess the student work/data collected?*
 - *Possible Tools: rubric, exam questions, portfolio samples*
 - *Attach all assessment tools*

operates under rolling admissions, the sample number varies each academic year. The TPE Portfolio represents a core competency that every student by the end of their program must master in order to be eligible for the Preliminary Education Specialist credential (completers of student teaching). It was develop to target the key skills all Education Specialists must embody to be eligible for the Preliminary Education Specialist credential.

The key assignments were as follows:

Assessment Report

Each student in the Preliminary Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Credential Programs complete an Assessment Report. The report is designed to facilitate the student’s understanding of legal and ethical requirements assessing K-12 students for special education services under federal law. Through the standardized assessment process candidates utilize both formal and informal assessments to evaluate students' needs and strengths for the purpose of making accommodations, modifications, instructional decisions and ongoing program improvements. Under the Individuals with Disabilities Improvement Act (2004), every student who meets eligibility for special education services are required to have in place an Individualized Education Plan. This plan is developed by the case carrier, which is the Special Education Teacher. This is an important PLO as the report is legally binding. Therefore, it is critical that our candidates master this PLO before completing the program.

[Assessment Report Instructions](#)

[Assessment Report Rubric](#)

Relevant Professional Standards:

This key assignment addresses the Preliminary Educational Specialist Standards:

Primary: PS 5

TPEs: 3, 4, 8, 9, and 12

TPE Portfolio Mild/Moderate:

The purpose of the Teacher Performance Expectation Portfolio is to document the candidate’s mastery of each of the 13 TPEs per the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards for the Mild/Moderate credential program. Specifically, for this PLO TPE 3, 6, and 11 are targeted.

The Candidate is rated on a four point rubric, based upon their demonstration of evidence (at the University level and in fieldwork/student teaching). A link to the portfolio scoring rubric can be found here: [TPE Portfolio MM](#)

TPE Portfolio Moderate/Severe

The purpose of the Teacher Performance Expectation Portfolio is to document the candidate’s mastery of each of the 13 TPEs per the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards for the Moderate/Severe credential program. Specifically, for this PLO TPE 3, 6, and 11 are targeted.

The Candidate is rated on a four point rubric, based upon their

	<p>demonstration of evidence (at the University level and in fieldwork/student teaching). A link to the portfolio scoring rubric can be found here: TPE Portfolio MS</p>
<p>Expected Level of Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What was your target(s) for student performance for this outcome? (This should tie to the methods in which you assessed the students and collected and analyzed data in the section above.)</i> 	<p>CTC requires mastery of all program standards and TPEs for all teacher candidates. Students participate in ongoing evaluation through formative assessments to ensure that they satisfy the expected level of achievement (≥ 3.0) by the end of the semester and by the culmination of their program. If the student does not meet the expected level of mastery on their Key Assignment, the is placed on a student support plan to outline steps for remediation.</p> <p>For the Assessment Report (see links above) each component of the rubric address TPE 3, 4, 8, 9, and 12 and Program Standard 5. TPEs are required Assessment Report serves as one of two indicators that the student has met the competency.</p> <p>The second indicator is the TPE Portfolio. Specifically, TPE 3, 4, 8, 9, and 12 Program Standard 5 are indicators for this PLO. Teacher candidates must include evidence within their student teaching experience that develops a assessment report for K-12 students that utilize both formal and informal assessments to evaluate students' needs and strengths for the purpose of making accommodations, modifications, instructional decisions and ongoing program improvements</p> <p>For the TPE portfolio, if students do not meet the level of expected achievement (≥ 3.0), they will not be eligible to complete their student teaching and will be required to repeat coursework until they have mastered Program Standard 12.</p>
<p>II. Performance</p>	
<p>Have expected levels of achievement been met for this outcome? Explain.</p>	<p>The PLOs guide our instruction in Special Education. They are requirements mandated by the state for all special education candidates to master. The key assessments and rubrics were designed to measure the candidates mastery of the TPE and the PLO.</p> <p>For the Assessment Report, candidates are required to take EDUC 566: Creating Positive Systems of Support through Assessment (previously the assignment was in EDUC 601). This is a combined course that requires all candidates regardless of their area of emphasis mastery.</p> <p>In 2016-2017, the overall mean for the teacher candidates both in the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe is 3.61 (n=12).</p> <p>In 2017-2018, 18 candidates completed the Assessment Report Assignment. The mean score was 3.62, with a range of 2.89-4.00, and a median of 3.95. 50% (n= 9) of candidates scored a 4; 44% of candidates (n=8); 6% of candidates (n=1) scored slightly below 3 at 2.89. This candidate was provided feedback and asked to revise the assignment in order to demonstrate that he/she met requirements at a minimum 3.0.</p>

	<p>For the TPE Portfolio, the overall mean for the teacher candidates in the Mild/Moderate program was 3.80 (n=16). For the Moderate/Severe candidates the overall mean was 3.72 (n=13). The CTC standards for this PLO are rigorous; a key reason this assignment was chosen is that it demonstrates a candidate's ability to apply theory into their clinical practice. Clinical practice is the demonstration of the candidate's ability to apply their understanding of coursework in the field for 15 weeks.</p> <p>Because the special education program is based on mastery of learning and teaching, formative feedback is provided on an ongoing basis to the student as documented on class assignments throughout the program. Students cannot be recommended for degrees or credentials until all assessments are completed satisfactorily (as demonstrated by their summative program assessments: TPE Portfolio</p>
<p>Please provide a summary of the assessment data in a table, along with a brief analysis of the results.</p>	<p>See the link here for Key Assignment: Assessment Report and TPE portfolio individual scores and average scores in EDUC 566 (Formerly 601), 590-593.</p> <p>The link below provides a detailed account of each of the 13 TPEs as targeted by each course. For this PLO, Table 2 provides data for TPEs: 3, 4, 8, 9, and 12</p> <p>TPEs Targeted in each course</p> <p>For the Assessment Report, we assessed 12 candidates who took EDUC 601 during the 2016-17 academic year. Due to enrolling admissions, the number of students required to take the course vary on an annual basis depending on the program sequence of each student. The average score on the Assessment Report was 3.61. The median score was 3.73 with a standard deviation of .317. The minimum score was 3.11 with a maximum score of 4.00. The range was .89.</p> <p>In 2017-2018, 18 candidates completed the Assessment Report Assignment in EDUC 566. The mean score was 3.62, with a range of 2.89-4.00, and a median of 3.95. 50% (n= 9) of candidates scored a 4; 44% of candidates (n=8); 6% of candidates (n=1) scored slightly below 3 at 2.89. This candidate was provided feedback and asked to revise the assignment in order to demonstrate that he/she met requirements at a minimum 3.0.</p> <p>In 2016-2017, for the TPE Portfolio, we assessed 16 for the mild/moderate credential. The average score on the TPE portfolio was 3.80. 62.5% of students received a score of 4.0, 33.5% received a score in the range of 3.85-3.00 based on a 1 – 4 rubric scale). This falls within the expected range as candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of competencies.</p> <p>In 2017-2018, for the TPE portfolio we assessed 9 Mild/Moderate candidates. The average score was 3.30. Scores ranged from 3.30-3.77 based on a 1-4 point scale. This falls within the expected range of scores and shares a similar range with scores from the previous year, showing that all candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations in this area. The previous year, significantly more candidates scored a 4. We attribute this to increased rigor in scoring.</p>

	<p>In 2016-2017, for the TPE Portfolio we assessed 13 students for the moderate/severe credential. Of the 13 students, 53.8 % received a score of 4.0, 46.2% received a score within the range of 3.85-3.23 (based on a 1 – 4 rubric scale). This falls within the expected range as candidates are required to demonstrate mastery of competencies.</p> <p>In 2017-2018, for the TPE portfolio we assessed 3 moderate/severe credential candidates. Scores ranges from 3.38-4.00 with a mean of 3.74. This represents a similar range and mean from the previous year, and falls within the expected range required to show that candidates meet or exceed expectations.</p>
<p>How will results be shared and evidence used to make decisions? Was it shared with faculty (full time and adjunct) and students?</p>	<p>The faculty meet to review student progress and assessment results. The data is then used to identify classes to conduct additional forms of formative assessments and to refine instructional practices of the program to address the areas of need as identified by the data.</p> <p>In addition, twice a year an Adjunct Faculty meeting is held and the data from the PLOs are shared with the faculty. Students are informed of their scores on key assignments through Taskstream. Because the special education program is based on mastery of learning and teaching, formative feedback is provided on an ongoing basis to the student as documented on class assignments throughout the program. Students cannot be recommended for degrees or credentials until all assessments are completed satisfactorily (as demonstrated by their summative program assessments: TPE Portfolio). If they do not meet the minimum score of “3.0” on their key assessments, the Program Coordinator meets with candidate to draft a remediation plan.</p>
<p>III. Progress</p>	
<p>How have previous years’ findings been used to improve learning, courses and program in relation to this outcome? Specify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Refer to previous years’ assessment reports/responses for this section.</i> • <i>How did this year’s achievement level compare to past years?</i> • <i>Show year-to-year progress, preferably in a data table.</i> 	<p>PLO # 4 was added last year. We added this program learning outcome in response to the feedback we received from the field indicating that this is one of two critical competencies that are essential from our graduates due to the legal nature of the report. Data from previous years were not reported.</p> <p>From 2016-17 to 2017-2018, performance on the Assessment Report and the TPE portfolio have remained stable. The stability is due to two factors. First, the credential program is based on a level of mastery. Therefore, teacher candidates are unable to successfully move forward or complete their program without demonstrating mastery of at least 3.0 on the rubrics. Second, formative assessments are conducted throughout the program to provide feedback to each candidate to support their mastery of learning. Students receive ongoing feedback from University Supervisors in addition to district level personnel during the semester of student teaching (TPE portfolio).</p> <p>For the Assessment Report, mean scores for 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 were 3.61 and 3.62 respectively, with similar ranges and standard deviations.</p>

	<p>For the TPE for MM candidates, mean scores decreased slightly from 3.44 to 3.30. Scores for 2017-2018 had a greater standard deviation and there were less scores of 4 for candidates in the 2017-2018 academic year.</p> <p>For the TPE for MA candidates, there was a slight increase in the mean from 3.44 to 3.74, with similar ranges and standard deviations. The N size for 2016-2017 is larger than the N size for 2017-2018 and should be taken into account.</p> <p>The link below includes tables that show scores over the last four academic years:</p> <p>Yearly Key Assignment Rubric Scores</p> <p>To meet revised Education Specialist Teacher Performance Expectations of the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing (CTC), we created a program grid to assess the current program, and identified areas for improvement. The Program Coordinator met with faculty members regarding requirements/revised CTC standards, met with faculty teaching in the program to determine necessary additions/changes in courses, and created a proposal to redesign the program for the 2017-18 academic year. Focus groups were conducted with both students and adjunct faculty to ensure that our redesigned program for 2017-18 were aligned with program standards and relevant to the current field of special education.</p> <p>In addition, this past academic year 2017-2018, the program has taken the feedback from previous WASC reports and revised the Key Assignment Rubrics to align to the PLOs and address the CTC standards. Taskstream has helped to streamline assessment data.</p> <p>For a comparison of 17-18, 16-17 and 15-16 scores see tables here: Yearly Key Assignment Scores</p> <p>For this upcoming academic year, we plan to improve the following with regards to our PLOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Refining the established rubrics to ensure that each PLO are consistently measured across the programContinue trainings on Taskstream and the expectations of PLO rubrics to ensure calibration of both part-time and full time faculty.Continue refinement of rubrics and formative assessments throughout the program.Revise any Key Assignments to align with revised TPEs released by the California Commission on Teacher Credential (discussed in the introduction to the report).
--	---