

The assessment of student learning outcomes, program revisions based upon those outcomes, and plans for future assessment activities.

### **Learning outcomes assessed**

Across the 2013-2016 academic years, the faculty of the Special Education Credential Program evaluated specific parts of the program. During those years the entire curriculum of our program was revised to address new state standards and to develop a more streamlined and cohesive program that includes the Clear credential and Master's degree coursework in an effort to attract and keep more graduate students through their advanced degrees. The Master of Arts in Special Education had undergone significant review as reflected in the approved SOAP.

The following are the revised performance goals:

#### **Pedagogy and Universal Access (including Teaching English Learners and Special Populations)**

##### ***Goal 1. Provide teacher candidates with knowledge to plan and implement curriculum and instruction.***

Graduates of the Special Education Master's Program will be able to:

- 1.1: plan instruction based upon appropriate use and interpretations of assessment results, to develop IEP goals and objectives, individual transition plans, and behavior intervention plans, taking into account subject matter, students' prior knowledge of curriculum, linguistic abilities, cultural characteristics, and learning styles.
- 1.2: analyze assessment and performance data from multi-tiered systems of support, universal design for learning, and classroom-based assessments to determine whether to maintain, modify or change specific instructional strategies, curricular content or adaptations, supports and/or daily schedules to facilitate skill acquisition and successful participation for diverse learners
- 1.3: plan and utilize universal design for learning instructional strategies, activities, and content that address diverse student interests, utilize individual strengths, and accommodate various styles of communication and learning, and align with and core curriculum.
- 1.4: implement educational programs that reflect current evidence-based and/or best practices

#### **Collaboration**

##### ***Goal 2. Provide teacher candidates with knowledge to communicate and participate in collaborative educational practices.***

Graduates of the Special Education Master's Program will be able to:

- 2.1: demonstrate effective communication skills in the areas of respectful collaboration, managing conflicts, networking and negotiating, and supervising and training support of paraeducators.
- 2.2: collaborate and communicate effectively with administrators, school colleagues, support staff, paraeducators, family members, other service providers, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.
- 2.3: collaborate to design, implement, and evaluate educational plans that reflect transition across the life span for all learners.

#### **Professionalism**

##### ***Goal 3. Provide students with knowledge to develop as a professional.***

Graduates of the Special Education Master's Program will be able to:

- 3.1: apply and reflect on ethical standards to his or her professional conduct
- 3.2: reflect on his or her own progress, accept professional advice, consider constructive criticism, and engage in critical reflections, open discussion of ideas, and a continuous program of professional development.

#### **Research**

##### ***Goal 4. Provide teacher candidates with knowledge to utilize research to improve instructional practices, classroom management, inclusive strategies, and providing support to students, their teachers and families.***

Graduates of the Special Education Master's Program will be able to:

- 4.1: design, implement, analyze effect of and reflect on research conducted in a school setting. Student will utilize either an action research or a single subject design

- 4.2: develop a research proposal in writing and defend it in an oral presentation
- 4.3: write a literature review in APA style that meets passing rubric score for style/format, content, mechanics, and references.

#### **Instruments used to assess the learning outcomes**

- [Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate Form](#)
- [Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrators/Employer](#)
- [Writing Assessment Rubric](#)
- [Research Proposal Scoring Guide](#)
- [Intervention Project\\*/Social Integration Project\\*\\*](#)
- [Project Rubric or Thesis Rubric](#)
- [Portfolio Evaluation Rubric](#)
- [Candidate Disposition](#)

**Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey – Candidate Form:** This survey is designed to assess whether program graduates believe that goals and objectives of the program are met. The instrument contains (1) a statement of purpose, (2) demographic information, (3) questionnaire examining the level of competency achieved by the Special Education Program graduates and (4) additional comments made by the graduates. This survey is given to each candidate twice; when the candidate exits the Special Education Program at Clear. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 0-3: 3 = well prepared; 2 = moderately well prepared; 1 = poorly prepared; 0 = no knowledge/unable to evaluate. Data are used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes are made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

**Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey - Employer/Administrator Form:** This survey intended to examine the quality of the Special Education Program perceived by the administrators or employers who hire our graduates or provide sites for the candidates of our program to complete their final student teaching. This measure consists of 4 sections: (1) a cover letter explaining purposes of survey (2) demographic information (3) questionnaire and (4) additional comments. Practicum Administrator are surveyed twice: When the students have completed their final student teaching at their practicum sites at the end of the Clear credential programs. University supervisors are responsible for distributing this survey to district employers. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 0-3: 3 = well prepared; 2 = moderately well prepared; 1 = poorly prepared; 0 = no knowledge/unable to evaluate. Data are used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Data collected are used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes are made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

**Writing Assessment** - A writing rubric was used to evaluate our candidates' writing, understanding of literature review, and data reporting in SPED 233. Data collected was used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes were made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

**Research Proposal** –The final project for SPED 243 is a Research Proposal. Students are expected to engage in an iterative process of writing. Students must keep and submit all drafts and group feedback. Data collected was used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement.

**Intervention Project\*** [Special Education Teaching Sample Project] – In SPED 246, students in the Mild-Moderate credential option complete a comprehensive intervention project. Students are scored on their description of the class context; development of measurable and obtainable goals and objectives and lesson planning; ability to analyze and interpret curriculum-based measurement/progress monitoring assessments to plan effective and differentiated instruction and interventions; instructional decision-making; and reflection relating instruction and student learning outcomes and identification of professional development goals.

**Social Integration Plan\*\*** –In SPED 247, students in the Moderate-Severe credential option complete a project on which they reflect and identify the ways in which they are supporting the development of social

relationships and the active integration of a focus child into classroom and school environments by increasing communication skills. To that end, students complete projects and reflect in three areas: Communication Plan, Communication Matrix, and Picture Exchange Project.

**Portfolio** – Preparing a portfolio is a formative evaluation method requiring on-going data collection and reflection. During the process of preparing their portfolio, students are required reflect upon the evidence they provide. The portfolio consists of three sections: Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) and related forms, materials or artifacts demonstrating student competency and ability to perform as a special education teacher, and the program completion forms. Data collected will be used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes will be made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

**Candidate Dispositions** – The Kremen School of Education and Human Development fosters the development of the following professional dispositions among our candidates: reflection, critical thinking, professional ethics, valuing diversity, collaboration, and life-long learning. Candidates are expected to reflect on these dispositions in their work with students, families, and communities. Multiple evaluative sources are used when assessing our candidate's dispositions. This examination involves professors, field-based supervisors/ mentors, and employers. The assessment of dispositions begins when candidates enter the program and continues throughout the graduate program at various levels. Assessment results provide feedback to university supervisors, to program instructors, and to the candidate.

## **RESULTS**

### **Evaluation and Needs Assessment – Candidate Level 2/Clear**

#### *Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey*

In each of the areas of professional responsibility listed below, I feel →	
1	I have subject-area expertise
2	I have an understanding of student learning needs
3	I am able to plan engaging instruction
4	I am able to effectively teach all students
5	I am able to use assessments to support student learning
6	I select/develop appropriate instructional goals
7	I make instructional decisions that reflect both student needs and curricular expectations
8	I adapt instruction effectively to meet the needs of diverse learners across a variety of settings
9	I collaboratively develop IEPs with parents and other service providers to include yearly goals and benchmark objectives that target the student's needs (including transition for students age 14 and up)
10	I implement appropriate instructional strategies and techniques to support individual student needs
11	I create and/or maintain a constructive and positive learning environment
12	I am able to develop rapport with students
13	I have the ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on observation and assessment data.
14	I collaborate effectively
15	I communicate effectively
16	I work well with students' families
17	I effectively utilize technology for a variety of purposes (e.g., instruction, communication, and/or assessment)
18	I reflect on my teaching practices
19	I demonstrate ethical behavior
20	I demonstrate cultural competence

#### Data

This data from the California State University system-wide Survey of candidates after one year of teaching for academic year 14-15 could not be used as changes made to the survey caused it to be invalid. The survey was revised for the 15-16 school year with a new rubric. Data will not be available until later in Fall 2016.

#### Results

The program faculty reviewed the survey data derived from the Survey. The system side survey data is sent to the Dean's office that then sends out disaggregated data by program. Changes were made accordingly to address areas of need. Assessment is stressed across the program; especially related to CBM. Positive behavioral supports are directly assessed in SPED 125 but it also is assessed in SPED 175/176. Although not mentioned in the survey the program has also needed to add MTSS and UDL across the program.

## Evaluation and Needs Assessment – Administrator/Employer Level 2/Clear

### Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey

Candidate performance rated by the administrator/employer on a scale of 0-3.

In each of the areas of professional responsibility listed below, the Clear Credential candidate's preparation is best described as →	
The teacher candidate...	
1	Demonstrates subject-area expertise
2	Demonstrates an understanding of student learning needs
3	Is able to plan engaging instruction
4	Is able to effectively teach all students
5	Is able to use assessments to support student learning
6	Selects/develops appropriate instructional goals
7	Makes instructional decisions that reflect both student needs and curricular expectations
8	Adapts instruction effectively to meet the needs of diverse learners across a variety of settings
9	Collaboratively develops IEPs with parents and other service providers to include yearly goals and benchmark objectives that target the student's needs (including transition for students age 14 and up)
10	Implements appropriate instructional strategies and techniques to support individual student needs
11	Creates and/or maintains a constructive and positive learning environment
12	Develops rapport with students
13	Demonstrates the ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on observation and assessment data.
14	Collaborates effectively
15	Communicates effectively
16	Works well with students' families
17	Effectively utilizes technology for a variety of purposes (e.g., instruction, communication, and/or assessment)
18	Reflects on his/her practices
19	Demonstrates ethical behavior
20	Demonstrates cultural competence

### Data

University supervisors are responsible for distributing this survey to district administrators/employers during the candidate's last semester of final practicum. The response rate from the administrator/employer varies from year to year. Previous data from 2013 and 2014 are not available. For 2015-2016, the data are shown below.

Scale 1-3 [0 = no knowledge/unable to evaluate; 1 = poorly prepared; 2 = moderately well prepared; 3 = well prepared.] Scores of 2 and 3 meet the requirement.

	# surveys returned	Mean
Fall 2015	5	2.80
Spring 2016	8	2.85

Overall rating by Administrator/Employer [Dissatisfied; Satisfied; Very Satisfied; Unable to Evaluate] yielded an overall mean rating of Very Satisfied.

### Results

The data show that the program is effective overall and that district administrators/employers are satisfied to very satisfied with the university candidates they hire. This indicates that the program is producing positive results. An area to address is the relatively low numbers of surveys returned. The number of surveys returned are affected by three variables: (1) whether the student has been offered and accepted

a teaching position during final practicum, (2) whether the district administrator/employer returns the survey to the university, and (3) whether the survey is returned to the Coordinator or placed in the student's cumulative record. The program will develop an electronic survey of the descriptors and overall rating for the district administrator/employer to complete. If possible, the survey will be designed to collate the responses from the district administrators/employers after responses are entered.

## Writing Assessment

### Writing Assessment Rubric

Style and Format	<b>EXEMPLARY (4):</b> Follow all requirements for (3) and flows smoothly from one idea to another. Writer has made effort to assist the reader in following logic of ideas.	<b>ACCOMPLISHED (3):</b> APA, double space, models language and conventions of scholarly literature, style contributes to comprehensibility, models discipline's style.	<b>DEVELOPING (2):</b> Some APA, lacks consistent style, unclear which citation is for which statement. Overuses quotes, significant revisions needed.	<b>BEGINNING (1):</b> APA not followed; not thorough or competent; lack of clarity and coherence; writer's focus interferes with clear communication.
Mechanics	<b>EXEMPLARY (4):</b> Follow all requirements for (3) and error free, writing flows, transitions support and follow writer's logic.	<b>ACCOMPLISHED (3):</b> Sentences and words are chosen to clearly communicate ideas. Minor errors, conventions followed, comprehensible, transitions and subheading are clear.	<b>DEVELOPING (2):</b> Frequent errors in spelling or grammar/verb agreement, comprehensibility difficult, writing not smooth.	<b>BEGINNING (1):</b> Numerous spelling and grammar errors, logic of paper difficult to follow. Sentence structure interferes with clarity.
Content and Organization	<b>EXEMPLARY (4):</b> Follow all requirements for (3) and excels in organization, raises important issues, good basis for further research. Includes interview with scholar on the field.	<b>ACCOMPLISHED (3):</b> All requirements followed, major points found and logically arranged, interesting paper, credible summarization of related literature. Includes correspondence with scholar on the topic	<b>DEVELOPING (2):</b> Lacking in substantial ways, poorly focused, scholarly argument weak, major ideas inadequate, content and organization needs significant revisions. No correspondence or interview.	<b>BEGINNING (1):</b> Scholarly review of literature inadequate, content poorly focused, lacks organization, reader left with little understanding of the topic.
Literature Review	<b>EXEMPLARY (4):</b> Current and emerging research is cited. Citations largely peer reviewed journals reporting original research. APA style refs without errors	<b>ACCOMPLISHED (3):</b> All substantial statements referenced. Few secondary references. Very few quotes used. Variety of sources. APA style refs w/minimal errors.	<b>DEVELOPING (2):</b> Frequent secondary references. Large use of quotations. Low variety of sources, little use of original research reports. Dozen APA reference errors or more.	<b>BEGINNING (1):</b> Secondary or no references. Largely report of opinions. Little use of original research reports.

Relevant Topic	<b>EXEMPLARY (4):</b> Topic relevant to profession and the student's professional work.	<b>ACCOMPLISHED (3):</b> Topic is relevant to profession in general but not the student's professional practice.	<b>DEVELOPING (2):</b> Topic interesting and related to education in some vague way.	<b>BEGINNING (1):</b> Topics include reality television, celebrities, politics, or astrology.
----------------	--	---	---	--

Data

SPED 233	# Ss	Score Mean	Score Max	Score Range
Fall 2013	22	182.7	200	152-200
Spring 2014 (section 1)	19	93.11	100	80-99
Spring 2014 (section 2)	19	93.53	100	88-98

**NOTE:** In 2015, two faculty on sabbatical and one faculty out on parental leave. Only one of the four tenure track faculty were working.

In 2015-2016, program faculty agreed to change the assessment scoring to a rubric to provide better more descriptive information for program improvement. The changes are noted in the scoring below.

Scale 1-4 [1 = Beginning, 2 = Developing, 3 = Accomplished, 4 = Exemplary]

Scores of 3 and 4 meet the requirement.

SPED 233	# Ss	Style & Format/APA	Mechanics	Content & Organization
Fall 2015	12	3.0	3.2	3.1
Spring 2016	21	2.8	3.1	3.0

Results

The writing assessment results has shown that the writing assignment needs to provide more support in APA style and format. Although multiple classes, handouts, and activities cover APA it often happens only in this class. During a program retreat, SPED faculty agreed to use APA references and style in course assignments across the program. As a result, faculty will provide this additional APA support and will strongly encourage candidates to make use of the Fresno State Graduate Writing Center.

## Research Proposal

### Project Proposal Evaluation Rubric

#### QUALITY INDICATORS

##### **CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY**

- Introduction to the study has a clear statement of the problem, demonstrating how topic is significant to area of study and professional organization.
- Introduction situates specific problem within a broader context.
- The research questions/ hypothesis are stated clearly.
- Assumptions, limitations, and bounds of the study are clearly stated.
- Important terms are defined conceptually and operationally.

##### **CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

- Coverage of the literature is adequate and within scope of problem.
- Literature review is well organized around major ideas or themes.
- The content of the review is drawn from the most relevant published knowledge and current research on the topic under investigation.
- Scholarly sources, such as books, peer-reviewed journals, or other materials appropriate to the issue or problem are chosen for study.
- There is a literature-based description of the research variables or potential themes and perceptions to be investigated.
- The literature review makes explicit connections between prior knowledge and research and the issue or problem under investigation

##### **CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY**

- The research design is appropriate and described fully.
- The role of the researcher is clearly explained.
- The research setting is described and justified.
- Population, sample, criteria for selecting sample/participants, and access to subjects/participants are appropriate and described in adequate detail.
- The process to generate, gather and record data is explained in detail.
- Data gathering methods and procedures are appropriate and clearly described.
- The systems used for keeping track of data and emerging understandings (logs, reflective journals, cataloging) clearly described.
- Description of instrumentation or data collection tools is present.
- Measures for ethical protections and rights of participants are adequate.
- Data analysis methods and procedures are clearly described.

##### **OVERALL PRESENTATION: STYLE AND FORMAT:**

###### APA Style:

- The proposal must conform to the guidelines for style as set forth in the most recent edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA Manual). This includes but is not limited to:
  - correct grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling.
  - proper in-text citations for references, direct quotations, and
  - paraphrasing.
  - the reference list.
  - all tables and figures.
  - headings and sub-headings.

###### The writing:

- is scholarly (i.e., the language is accurate, balanced, specific rather than overly general,
- tentative regarding conclusions, grounded in previous scholarship and evidence).
- is direct and precise.
- is clear and comprehensible, without excessive jargon.
- paragraphs focus on a main point and all sentences within the paragraph relate to the main point.
- transition sentences are used to bridge main ideas.

###### The paper:

<b>QUALITY INDICATORS</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is organized logically and comprehensively.</li> <li>• has headings and subheadings to identify the logic and movement of the project and make it easy for the reader to follow.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Overall Project Proposal Assessment Score</b></p> <p>27- 30 points – Approved with Commendation, Exceptional Level of Scholarship</p> <p>24- 26 points - Approved as Written</p> <p>21- 23 points – Approved with Minor Revisions</p> <p>20 points or less - Fail/Requires Revision &amp; Resubmission of Specified Categories/Chapter (s)</p>

Data

<b>ED 243</b>	<b># Ss</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Max</b>
Fall 2013	4	70	70
Spring 2014	Data not available.		

**NOTE:** In 2015, two faculty on sabbatical and one faculty out on parental leave. Only one of the four tenure track faculty were working.

In 2015-2016, program faculty agreed to change the assessment scoring to provide more information for program improvement. The changes are noted in the scoring below.

Scale 1-4 [1 = Beginning, 2 = Developing, 3 = Accomplished, 4 = Exemplary]  
 Scores of 3 and 4 meet the requirement.

<b>ED 243</b>	<b># Ss</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>Review of Literature</b>	<b>Methodology and Discussion</b>	<b>Style and Format/APA</b>
Spring 2015	13	3.2	3.4	2.6	3.2
Spring 2016	6	3.2	3.2	2.67	3.2

Results

Faculty reviewed the mean scores and noted the lowest scores fell in the methodology section. The vast majority of special education candidates' research, write, and create projects, which do not require such things as sampling, a research design, and gathering data. The scores reflect this. Faculty agreed to provide support in the gathering and use of data through other assignments such as the Research Design Assignment in SPED 233 and will also strongly encourage candidates to make use of the Graduate Writing Studio and the Graduate Net Initiative.

## Intervention Project [Mild/Moderate Credential Candidates]

### Intervention Project Rubric

Part	Description
Part 1: Students receiving Special Education Services	In this section you will choose one or a small group of students with identified disabilities in language arts and/or mathematics. Identify one or more of the categories under which the student(s) qualify for special education services as defined by IDEA. You will choose to address the students' instructional needs/IEP Objectives in mathematics or language arts. Identify any processing disorder(s) and discuss how you will tailor instruction to meet the needs of the learner. Based upon the information collected, develop a plan for behavior management/motivation including expectations, accountability, and positive reinforcement. [25 points possible]
Part 2: Design for Instruction	In this section you will develop measureable, attainable, short-term goals and a series of lesson objectives, including the CA Essential Standards addressed, based upon the chosen deficits/IEP Objective(s). You will deliver 8-10 days of intervention matched to student skill deficit or 8-10 days of differentiated instruction using State Board of Education (SBE) core curriculum. You will include a detailed description of the instructional design (i.e., lesson plans), including teacher demonstration, explicit instruction, and structured, guided, and independent practice. [25 points possible]
Part 3: Curriculum-based Measurement	In this section you will administer curriculum-based measurements for the purposes of evaluating the efficacy of your instruction. You will administer 3 CBMs to establish a baseline, then 3 more throughout the intervention, to track student progress. Copies of dated, scored probes are to be included in the project. You will demonstrate your ability to analyze and interpret the curriculum-based measurement to plan effective and differentiated instruction and interventions. [25 points possible]
Part 4: Instructional Decision-Making	In this section you will describe examples of instructional decisions made during the project based on curriculum-based measurement, student responses, pacing, teaching to mastery, and student motivation. [25 points possible]
Part 5: Reflection & Self-Evaluation	In this section you will reflect upon the relationship between your instruction and student learning outcomes. Describe specific strategies and/or curriculum used and the relationship to student success. Develop professional development goals based upon the experience of the project. [25 points]

### Data

#### Fall 2013

SPED 246	# Ss	Mean	Max	Range
Part 1	18	24.62	26	1-26
Part 2	18	23.06	25	19-25
Part 3	18	34.67	38	20-38
Part 4 & 5	18	50.44	51	41-51

#### Spring 2014

SPED 246	# Ss	Mean	Max	Range
Part 1	21	23.87	26	20-26
Part 2	21	23.52	25	17.5-25
Part 3	21	36.43	38	20.5-38
Part 4	21	24.76	25	20-25
Part 5	21	24.51	26	5-26

**NOTE:** In Fall 2014 and Spring 2015, the Coordinator was on leave, and two faculty were on sabbatical. No data collected for 14-15.

Fall 2015

<b>SPED 246</b>	<b># Ss</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Range</b>
Part 1	9	24.44	26	21-26
Part 2	9	23.5	25	20-25
Part 3	9	32.83	38	22-38
Part 4	9	24.44	25	20-25
Part 5	9	24.83	26	18.50-26

Spring 2016

<b>SPED 246</b>	<b># Ss</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Range</b>
Part 1	14	23	26	20-26
Part 2	14	22.21	25	14-22.1
Part 3	14	36	38	30-38
Part 4	14	24.79	25	22-25
Part 5	14	25.79	26	23-26

### Results

The data show that from 2013 to 2016, the writing performance in the content areas decreased slightly. As a result, faculty will provide additional instruction in writing to content and will strongly encourage candidates to make use of the Fresno State Graduate Writing Center. During the program retreat, faculty agreed to use APA references and style in course assignments across the program.

## Social Integration Project [Moderate/Severe Credential Candidates]

### Data

*NOTE: This course is offered once per year.*

Spring 2014

<b>SPED 247</b>	<b># Ss</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Range</b>
Communication Plan	18	69.83	75	45-75
Communication Matrix Project	18	99.17	120	45-120
Picture Exchange Project	18	331.94	30	255-370

*NOTE: In 2015, two faculty on sabbatical and one faculty out on parental leave. Only one of the four tenure track faculty were working.*

Spring 2016

<b>SPED 247</b>	<b># Ss</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Range</b>
Communication Plan	8	280.25	300	235.5-300
Communication Matrix Project	8	92.50	100	80-100
Picture Exchange Project	8	260.44	273	225-273

### Results

The results are inclusive due to the differing data score maximums used. Faculty noted that there was student improvement, though that is difficult to quantify. Different part-time lecturers taught the course in each semester and appear to have used different point values to measure the same assignments. Program faculty need to ensure that signature assignments and measurements remain the same across reporting years to ensure accurate reporting and analysis of data. In addition, it is recommended that faculty convert evaluation results to a rubric scale to derive comparable scores in each area.

## Master's Project/Thesis

### *Project Rubric*

**1. Primary trait:** The Graduate student has clearly stated the problem addressed and purpose of his/her project.

**Scoring rubric:**

- 1) Problem/purpose not discernible from the text, or so confused so as to violate scientific principles.
- 2) Problem/purpose discernible, but not stated in testable form; contextual connections vague.
- 3) Problem/purpose recognized and well stated; contextual connections clear.
- 4) Problem/purpose clearly stated and well crafted in an elegantly testable form; Hypothesis/objectives made with very clear contextual connection.

**2. Primary trait:** The review of relevant literature provides a historical context and comprehensive perspective of the topic.

**Scoring rubric:**

- 1) The review does not adequately demonstrate the relationship between the project and current best practice in the field.
- 2) The review adequately demonstrates the relationship between the project and current best practice in the field but contains errors.
- 3) The review is well written and demonstrates the relationship between the project and current best practice in the field.
- 4) The review is very well written, demonstrates a relationship between the project and current best practice, and provides a comprehensive perspective of the topic.

**3. Primary trait:** The summary/recommendations/conclusions section clearly provides implications of the literature and a rationale for the project.

**Scoring rubric:**

- 1) Procedures are vague, disorganized, and/or are filled with irrelevant information.
- 2) Procedures are unclear but interpretable. Some irrelevant information interferes.
- 3) Procedures are easily interpreted. Relevant information dominates.
- 4) Procedures are so clear that they require no additional interpretation and could be used directly as protocol. Appropriate details are provided.

**4. Primary trait:** The project component clearly integrates current results with previous scientific knowledge.

**Scoring rubric:**

- 1) The project component merely replicates other materials and is unlikely to be used by the author or others.
- 2) The project component weakly integrates new information and lacks a dissemination component.
- 3) The project component critically integrates new information and is likely to be useful to others in the field.
- 4) The project component creatively integrates new information, is likely to be used by others and has a clear dissemination component.

## Data

Scale 1-4 [1 = Beginning, 2 = Developing, 3 = Accomplished, 4 = Exemplary]  
Scores of 3 and 4 meet the requirement.

SPED 298	# Ss	Mean
Fall 2013	10	3.56
Spring 2014	10	3.5

**NOTE:** In 2015, two faculty on sabbatical and one faculty out on parental leave. Only one of the four tenure track faculty were working.

In 2015-2016, program faculty agreed to change the assessment scoring to provide more information for program improvement. The changes are noted in the scoring below.

Scale 1-4 [1 = Beginning, 2 = Developing, 3 = Accomplished, 4 = Exemplary].

Scores of 3 and 4 meet the requirement.

SPED 298/99	# Ss	Problem & Purpose	Relevant Literature & Comprehensive Perspective	Discussion & Recommendation	Integrates Current Results with Previous Knowledge
Fall 2015	7	3.71	3.41	3.57	3.57
Spring 2016	12	3.75	3.42	3.58	3.50

## Results

Based on the data, candidates successfully complete their Master's Projects competently. Faculty will continue to support candidates in the completion of their projects.

## Portfolio

### Portfolio Evaluation Rubric

SPED 236	EXEMPLARY [4]	ACCOMPLISHED [3]	DEVELOPING [2]	LIMITED [1-0]
Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) and related forms	Follow all requirements for (3) and excels in organization, raises important issues, excellent basis for further self-evaluation.	All requirements followed, major points found and logically arranged, raises important issues, good basis for further self-evaluation.	Incomplete poorly focused sections, major ideas inadequate, needs revisions, little basis for further self-evaluation.	Incomplete forms, major ideas missing in any section, needs major revisions, little or no basis for further self-evaluation.
Materials or Artifacts Demonstrating Student Competency	Follow all requirements for (3). Materials or artifacts relate directly to competencies and teaching and are not repeated over competencies.	All requirements followed. Materials or artifacts relate directly to competencies and teaching and are repeated across 2 competencies.	All requirements followed. Some materials or artifacts do not relate directly to competencies and teaching or are repeated across 3 competencies.	Many materials or artifacts do not relate directly to competencies and teaching or are repeated across 4 competencies.
Program Completion Forms	Follow all requirements for (3) and excels in organization, raises important issues, excellent basis for further self-evaluation.	All requirements followed, major points found and logically arranged, raises important issues, good basis for further self-evaluation.	Incomplete poorly focused sections, major ideas inadequate, needs revisions, little basis for further self-evaluation.	Incomplete forms, major ideas missing in any section, needs major revisions, little or no basis for further self-evaluation.

### Data

SPED 236	# Ss	Mean	Max	Range
Fall 2013	18	92.26	100	70-100
Spring 2014	14	88.19	100	18.5-100
Fall 2014	9	89.62	100	21-100
Spring 2015	10	93.47	100	88-100

**NOTE:** In 2015, two faculty on sabbatical and one faculty out on parental leave. Only one of the four tenure track faculty were working.

In 2015-2016, the rubric was revised to follow a 4-point scale. Program faculty agreed to change the assessment scoring to provide more information for program improvement. The changes are noted in the scoring below.

Scale 1-4 [1 = Beginning, 2 = Developing, 3 = Accomplished, 4 = Exemplary].  
Scores of 3 and 4 meet the requirement.

SPED 236	# Ss	Individualized Induction Plan	Materials or Artifacts Demonstrating Student Competency	Program Completion Forms
Fall 2015	17	3.0	3.46	3.37
Spring 2016	8	3.55	3.6	3.8

### Results

Faculty reviewed the data and noted that developing a professional and reflective Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) was a challenge area based on the minimally accomplished score. The IIP requires candidates to evaluate their own professional strengths and growth areas and to develop an action plan to address this. Faculty will provide more directed and targeted support and encouragement in the development of the IIP and will work with the receiving district support providers to assist in the improvement..

## Candidate Dispositions – Level 2/Clear

### *Candidate Dispositions Rubric [Candidate Self-Evaluates]*

<b>DISPOSITION: Reflection</b>
Applies, assesses, reflects upon, and adjusts instructional strategies to advance student learning.
Accepts and incorporates suggestions in subsequent practice.
Demonstrates self-analysis regarding one's own strengths and weaknesses.
Ability to see one's own contribution to identified challenges in the classroom and to make changes as needed.
<b>DISPOSITION: Critical Thinking</b>
Utilizes assessment data to adjust instruction, choice of curriculum and methods of evaluation.
Candidate's work (e.g., case studies, group process evaluations, article critiques) indicates an ability to identify problems and solutions.
Intentionally applies and encourages higher order thinking skills, such as analysis, synthesis, problem recognition and problem solving with students in the classroom.
Solicits and gives thoughtful consideration to alternative and contradictory opinions.
Inquiring, creative, seeks solutions
<b>DISPOSITION: Professional ethics</b>
Recognizes the importance of consulting research to inform instruction for students with special needs
Shows commitment to ethical conduct: turns in assignments on time, is punctual and reliable in attendance, maintains professional appearance
Utilizes positive behavioral supports when managing student behavior.
Actively advocates for students and encourages student self-advocacy.
Utilizes non-biased assessments.
<b>DISPOSITION: Valuing Diversity</b>
Diagnoses learners' needs by interpreting data from diverse sources (e.g., formal/informal assessments, student behavior and feedback, and parent responses)
Develops lessons that are interesting and engaging utilizing a variety of instructional strategies to accommodate all learners, including those from diverse backgrounds, experiences, and cultures.
Facilitates the academic and social inclusion of students with special needs in various inclusive activities and environments.
Differentiates instruction to allow students who differ widely in terms of their background, knowledge, learning styles/preferences, and orientation to school norms to reach common standards.
<b>DISPOSITION: Collaboration</b>
Demonstrates the ability to work creatively and collaboratively with colleagues, parents, and the community.
Values families as full partners in the educational process
Collaborates with general education teachers in the modification of instruction, curriculum and assessment of students with special needs.
Communicates on a regular basis the progress of students with special needs to parents and general education teachers.
Plans and collaborates to ensure that appropriate supports for smooth transitions are in place.
<b>DISPOSITION: Life-long Learning</b>
Seeks out opportunities for professional development (e.g., attendance at workshops, inservice trainings, conferences, membership in professional organizations) using the information learned to improve teaching practice.
Seeks out opportunities to serve the school, students, and community (e.g., extracurricular activities, Big Brothers, Big Sisters).
Demonstrates a positive attitude toward learning, intellectual and academic curiosity.
Presents on an area of expertise or interest to teachers and/or parents at local, state, national or international conferences or trainings.

## Data

Scale 1-4 [1 = no/limited evidence/application, 2 = some evidence/application 3 = satisfactory evidence/application, 4 = exceptional evidence/application]  
Target is scores of 3 and 4.

SPED 235/236	# Ss	Reflection	Critical Thinking	Professional Ethics	Valuing Diversity	Collaboration	Life-Long Learning
Spring 2014	12	3.60	3.52	3.80	3.59	3.69	3.31
Fall 2014	8	Data not available					
Spring 2015	9	3.70	3.60	3.75	3.64	3.31	3.38

SPED 235/236	# Ss	Reflection	Critical Thinking	Professional Ethics	Valuing Diversity	Collaboration	Life-Long Learning
Fall 2015	13	3.31	3.12	3.4	3.61	3.42	3.39
Spring 2016	8	3.33	3.39	3.6	3.42	3.33	3.42

## Results

The dispositions are addressed in coursework throughout our credential program. Upon the completion of the Professional Clear coursework, each candidate completes a self-evaluation on the Candidate Dispositions form. The results show that over time candidates perceive themselves as slightly decreasing in competence in all areas except Life-long Learning. This may be due in part to changes in the Professional Clear program admission criteria. Previously, credential candidates enrolled in the Professional Clear program as part of their credential program at Fresno State. Recently, candidates from universities other than Fresno State have been admitted to the Professional Clear program and may be entering without the skills to feel competent in many areas of the dispositions. In addition, it is known (Futernich, 2007) that teachers in their first and second year of teaching are facing many challenges and this may reflect their employment circumstances, support, or even their greater insight into the professions' expectations. Regardless of the reason for the slightly decreasing scores, the mean in each dispositional area is still well above satisfactory. Faculty will continue to address the dispositions in signature assignments throughout all coursework.

#### 4. What changes did you make as a result of these findings?

Faculty in the SPED program will continue to meet monthly and more often when needed to address issues and make changes. Across the SOAP years, the program made many changes in signature assignments and data collection. Changes made based on the results of assessment activities will be documented in meeting minutes for program review. Data collection should be a meaningful routine and on-going process in Special Education Program for improvement purposes.

Changes based on results:

New rubrics developed for SPED 233 and SPED 243

Assignment changes made in SPED 219 to reflect best /researched proven practices in family collaboration and support

APA expectations and instructions infused across the program

Methodology Assignment revised to provide more support in SPED 243

Individual Induction Plan development provided more structure and instruction. IIP also improved for support from district support provider.

Three MA tracks developed to meet the needs of students who transfer with a credential and international students. Approval process through the Kremen School and will be at the Graduate committee level in Fall 2016

For the future SOAP faculty in the SPED program will meet at least once a month as a program and more often when needed to address issues and make changes. These are suggested changes:

1. Develop a streamlined method of data collection system in an online collaborative document. Data collection should be a meaningful routine and on-going process in Special Education Program for improvement purposes.
2. Revision of the program to meet new state credential standards/requirements (link to CCTC - clear)
3. Implementation of new courses and signature assignments (link to courses)
4. Updating the website (link to website)
5. Improving recruitment and advising documents [link to Kremen website- Special Education- advising forms]
6. Increasing the use and the student's skills in technology through the use of tablets and phones to collect data and share results, Blackboard, and other applications.
7. Increasing student involvement in research – SPED 243 was a new course in the 2013-2106 SOAP developed to scaffold and improve the students' use of research in instruction as well as in class assignments. The program identified key research to be shared with the candidates in the MA program. Students participated in local presentations and the Grad EXPO. In addition during these years three students entered doctoral programs: UT Austin, Ohio State, and CSU San Diego. This work needs to continue.