***STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM***

Please complete a separate worksheet for each academic program (major, minor) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department. Worksheets are due to CASA this year by **June 15, 2017**. Worksheets should be sent electronically to kjsanders@eiu.edu and should also be submitted to your college dean. For information about assessment or help with your assessment plans, visit the Assessment webpage at <http://www.eiu.edu/~assess/> or contact Karla Sanders in CASA at 581-6056.

***SUMMARY FORM AY 2015-2017***

**Degree and Program Name: SPECIAL EDUCATION-UNDERGRADUATE**

**Submitted By: Kathlene S. Shank, Chair**

**PART ONE**

| **What Are the Learning Objectives?** | **How, Where, & When Are They Assessed?** | **What Are the Expectations?** | **What Are the Results?** | **Committee/Person Responsible? How Will the Results Be Used?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Major will have an appropriate knowledge base specific to students with disabilities.** **Majors will have the skills to establish environments which provide for the academic development of all learners. Majors upon program completion meet the following outcomes:*** **Design instruction to promote learning.**
* **Strive to develop student**

 **moral and ethical**  **behaviors.*** **Develop a desire for**

 **lifelong learning.*** **Provide for the**

 **uniqueness of the**  **individuals.** | **Capstone Knowledge base course: SPE 4900. Capstone Practica: SPE 4901.** | **Majors enrolled in 4900/4901 will meet performance expectations (earn a C) or exceed expectations (earn B or A).** | **SPE 4900 Fall 2015:****7 of 26 earned A's****13 of 26 earned B’s****6 of 26 earned C’s****Class average GPA was 3.04.****SPE 4901 Fall 2015:****14 of 26 earned A's****10 of 26 earned B’s****2 of 26 earned an F.****Class average GPA was 3.54.****SPE 4900 Spring 2016:****16 of 27 earned B's****10 of 27 earned C’s****1 of 27 withdrew****Class average GPA was 3.26.****SPE 4901 Spring 2016:****6 of 27 earned A's****14 of 27 earned B’s****5 of 27 earned C’s****2 of 27 withdrew****Class average GPA was 3.40.****SPE 4900 Fall 2016:****2 of 24 earned A's****21 of 24 earned B’s****1 of 24 earned C’s****Class average GPA was 3.04.****SPE 4901 Fall 2016:****8 of 24 earned A's****11 of 24 earned B’s****5 of 24 earned C’s****Class average GPA was 3.13.****SPE 4900 Spring 2017:****5 of 21 earned A’s****13 of 21 earned B’s****3 of 21 earned C’s****Class average GPA was 3.10.****SPE 4901 Spring 2017:****10 of 22 earned A's****6 of 22 earned B’s****6 of 22 earned C’s****Class average GPA was 3.18.** | **Chair/DCC/Instructors of 4900/4901 are responsible.****Department faculty analyze grades by course, not section, across semesters each semester. The DCC monitors to assure grades in 4900/4901 are tied to performance objectives, that rubrics are used for assignments and projects, and that grades are criterion referenced. Data is used to assess candidate performance and program improvement.**  |
| **2. Majors will have the appropriate knowledge base relative to diverse strategies to teach learners with disabilities.** **Majors will have the skills to establish environments to enhance learners with mild disabilities academic achievement. Majors upon program completion meet the following outcomes:** * **Design instruction to utilize cognitive processes.**
* **Achieve learning outcomes.**
* **Decide what will be**

 **learned.*** **Emphasizes higher-order critical thinking skills.**
* **Optimize academically**

**engaged time.*** **Utilize concepts of measurement and**

 **assessment.** * **Utilizes technology.**
 | **Capstone Knowledge base course: SPE 4900. Capstone Practica: SPE 4901.****Completion of edTPA during student teaching. The edTPA consists of “3 tasks”. Task 1, Planning for Instruction and Assessments; Task 2, Instructing and Engaging the Focus Learner; and Task 3, Assessing Learning.** **Completion of each “task” requires a knowledge base relative to diverse strategies to teach learners with disabilities.** | **Majors enrolled in 4900/4901 will meet performance expectations (earn a C or better) or exceed performance expectations (earned A or B).** **Majors will pass the State of Illinois LBS I content test.****Majors earning endorsement in Early Childhood Special Education will pass the State of Illinois Early Childhood Special Education test.****Majors during their student teaching semester will successfully complete the “3 edTPA Tasks” and earn an overall passing score on the edTPA.** | **See #1 above****Summary Pass Rate for on campus program completers on the LBS I State Test April 2016 through April 2017: 100% pass rate. On the State Early Childhood Special Education test, the pass rate was 100%.** **2015-2016, 66 special education candidates student taught and completed the edTPA. 59 of 66 passed on the first attempt. 6 of 7 who did not pass on the first attempt, passed on the 2nd attempt.****2016-2017, 54 of 55 passed on the first attempt with 1 candidate’s submission being scored as complete. The subsequent submission was successful.** | **Committee/Person Responsible:****Chair and 4900/4901 Instructors** **Chair and DCC will analyze grades earned (not by section but by course) in 4900/4901; See #1.** **Chair and faculty scrutinize licensure test results by subarea receiving summary of each test administration results.** **The University Teacher Certification Officer and the Special Education Chair share responsibility.** |
| **3. Majors will have an appropriate knowledge base relative to diversity in society and across and among communities. Majors will have the skills to establish effective educational environments in schools and communities.** **Majors upon program completion meet 16 Outcomes including the following outcomes:*** **Performs successfully**

 **within contexts of schools**  **and community.*** **Models appropriate professional behavior.**
 | **A portfolio is submitted prior to student teaching. Artifacts in portfolio are completed in required special education major courses.****Completion of edTPA during student teaching. The edTPA consists of “3 tasks”. Task 1, Planning for Instruction and Assessments; Task 2, Instructing and Engaging the Focus Learner; and Task 3, Assessing Learning.** **Completion of each “task” requires a knowledge base relative to diverse strategies to teach learners with disabilities.** | **Artifacts included in portfolio must meet or exceed department faculty expectation of acceptability and must be included in the portfolio submitted prior to student teaching.** **Majors during their student teaching semester will successfully complete the “3 edTPA Tasks” and earn an overall passing score on the edTPA.** | **2015-2016, 87.7% of portfolio artifacts were acceptable in the first submission.****2016-2017, 87.5% of artifacts were acceptable in the first submission.****2015-2016, 65 of 66 successfully completed the edTPA. The average earned score was 44.5 with 35 being the passing score.****2016-2017, 55 of 55 majors successfully completed the edTPA. The average earned overall score was 45.0 with 35 being the passing score.** | **Student course products must meet or exceed the CEC national standards. As one criterion for approval of a given student to be allowed to Student Teach in Special Education, the portfolio must also be submitted and be rated as “acceptable.” Each artifact must be “acceptable” before candidate is approved to student teach.****The Teacher Certification Officer and Special Education Chair share responsibility.** |
| **4. Majors will have a Special Education knowledge base sufficient to be an effective entry-level teacher.** **Program completers will have demonstrated professional subject area knowledge and skills, including, but not limited to, having demonstrated the following outcomes:*** **Good communication skills.**
* **Mastery of basic skills in language arts and mathematics.**
* **Knowledge of past and**

 **present issues in the field of Education.** | **Illinois Licensure Tests/Test of Academic Proficiency** | **Majors will pass the Test of Academic Proficiency or have an ACT of 22 or higher with writing or SAT score combined with Critical Reading/Math of 1030 and at least 450 on writing.****Majors will pass the State of Illinois LBSI content test and Early Childhood Special Education if applicable.** **Summary pass rate for all program completers is 100%.** | **Summary pass rate for all program completers is 100% 2015-2017.** | **Chair and faculty scrutinize test results by subareas. Candidates are not approved to continue in coursework sequence or student teach without achieving required scores and passing state tests.** |
| **5. Program completers will demonstrate basic skills: writing, reading, and math.**  | **edTPA****Test of Academic Proficiency or ACT of 22 or higher with writing or SAT of at least 1030 combined Critical Reading/Math score and at least 450 writing score.** | **Candidates performance on the edTPA will reflect they are ready for “effective entry level” practice (3.0 or higher on rubric rating).****Majors will pass the Test of Academic Proficiency or have an ACT of 22 or higher with writing or a SAT score of 1030 or higher with writing of 450 or higher in order to commence licensure course sequence.** | **2015-2016, the average rubric score for special education majors. 2016-2017, the average rubric score was also 3.0.****100% of majors/program completers passed the Test of Academic Proficiency (TAP) or had an ACT of 22 or higher with writing or had a 1030 or higher on the SAT. No one can complete the course sequence beyond the 5 semester hour introductory courses of SPE 2000/3000 unless this requirement is met.**  | **Certification Office and Special Education Chair.****Licensure is not possible without successful completion of the TAP or meeting the ACT/SAT score level.**  |
| **6. Program completers will have demonstrated they have met the following University Learning Goals: Writing and Critical Reading; Critical Thinking; Responsible Citizenship, Speaking and Listening, and Quantitative Reasoning.**  | **Effective Writing -** **Successful completion of three courses which focus on effective written communication: English 1001, 1002, and 3001.****Effective Writing -** **Demonstration of an average rating of 2.50 or higher on the EWP.** **Effective Writing -** **Demonstration of effective written language and professional writing on all required assessment products. Candidate writing will be organized, focused, and cohesive reflecting appropriate vocabulary, mechanics, grammar, and sentence structure.** **Critical Reading -** **Test of Academic Proficiency or ACT of 22 or higher with writing or SAT combined Critical Reading/Math of 1030.****Critical Thinking -****Demonstration of critical thinking as measured by the Watson – Glaser.****.****Critical Thinking -****Demonstrate critical and reflective thinking in “Reflective Journal.” Reflective Journal is done across the SPE 4901 capstone field experience.** **Responsible Citizenship -****Demonstration of knowledge and skills in EDF 2555 and STG 4000 pre-requisite to becoming a global citizen.** **Responsible Citizenship -****Demonstrations of characteristics of “responsible citizenship” including, understanding “global issues” and “ethical behavior across the semester long student teaching experiment.****Responsible Citizenship -****Candidates completing “Integrative Learning” survey in their capstone majors’ course prior to student teaching will perceive a “sense of social responsibility and actions.”** | **Majors earn a “C” or better in ENG 1001, 1002, 3001, and candidates demonstrate writing for specific purpose and audiences; writing is organized, focused, and cohesive.****Candidates will earn a 2.5 or higher average rating on the EWP.****Each of the required programming products is assessed specific to candidate writing competency. See product charts.** **Candidates will meet or exceed standards overall by earning a 3.0 or higher rating for the area “Writing Competence” across performance assessments.****Majors will pass the TAP or have an ACT of 22 or higher with writing combined Critical Reading/Math or an SAT of 1030 in order to commence licensure course sequence. The TAP, ACT and SAT have a significant sub area test requiring “Critical Reading”. Tests require understanding, analyzing, and synthesizing complex textual sources.****Candidates will meet or exceed college average on the Watson-Glaser.** **Overall in the “reflective journal” candidates will demonstrate professional “critical and reflective thinking” with ratings of 3.0 (meets expectations) or higher.****Candidates will earn a “C” or better in EDF 2555, “Diversity of Schools and Societies: School and Global Perspective”, and a “credit” in STG 4000, “Multicultural/Disabilities Practicum”.** **Special Education majors will demonstrate understanding “global issues” and “ethical behavior” across their student teaching semester.****Candidates will perceive that their knowledge base and educational experiences have had a moderately high to high impact on their “sense of social responsibilities and actions.”** | **All majors earned a “C” or better in English 1001 and 1002, meeting the requirement to enter the professional special education course sequence, commencing with SPE 3200/3201.** **All majors earned a “C” or better in English 3001 prior to graduation.****On the EWP Special Education majors earned an average rating of 3.45 in AY16; 3.56 summer 2015, 3.44 fall 2015; 3.36 spring 2016. In comparison, the average EWP scores across all EIU submissions AY 16 was 3.37.** **AY17 fall 2016 Special Education major average rating was 3.39 compared to EIU all student average of 3.375. spring 2017 the overall EIU average was 3.395; Special Education majors average was 3.23.****Each rubric for each performance assessment has a component specific to candidate demonstrated “writing competency.” The “Writing Competency” component includes assessment of “form,” “organization.” “style,” “development,” and “mechanics.” Each candidate is given an overall rating for “writing competency” of “Consistently Exceeds Standards” (5.0), “Exceeds Some Standards,” (4.0), “Meets All Standards” (3.0), “Inconsistently Meets Standards,” (2.0), or “Does not Meet Standards” (1.0).** **Across performance assessments used to assess 15 candidate products, Fall/Spring 2015 and Fall/Spring 2016 96.2% of candidates earned a 3.0, “Meets All Standards,” or higher rating specific to overall “writing competence”.** **100% of majors passed the TAP or had a minimum of a 22 ACT score with writing or an SAT score of 1030; no one can complete the course sequence beyond the 5 semester hour introductory courses of SPE 2000/3000 unless this test is passed.****On the Watson-Glaser, Special Education majors’ mean average AY16 was 25.37. The College average was 23.55.****The “Reflective Journal” overall mean rating for candidates during spring 2015 was 4.25. Fall 2015, mean rating was 4.42; spring 2016 mean rating was 4.44; and fall 2016, 4.50. Across 4 semesters on a 5.00 scale, the overall mean rating on the “reflective journal” was 4.40.** **All 2015-2017 candidates prior to licensure for graduation have earned a “C” or better in EDF 2555 and credit for STG 4000.****Earning a “C” or better in EDF 2555 and credit in STG 4000 require completion of assignments focused on diversity, including geographic, ethic, cultural and linguistic diversity.****The 14-15 and 15-16 student teaching evaluation summary data reflects 48 of 55 Special Education majors, AY14-15 and 108 of 126, AY15-16 earned a rating of 5.0, exceeds standards relative to “demonstration of ethical and responsible behavior”. Mean rating, 14-15, was 4.855 and 4.841, 15-16. (Note data is not mutually exclusive as some majors complete 2 district experiences and receive 2 evals rather than 1.)** **The language of the evaluation rubric was modified AY16-17. Relative to demonstration of “understanding local and global issues”, the mean rating was 4.292 on a 5.00 scale. Demonstration of “knowledge of cultures” resulted in a 4.264 mean.****On a scale of 1-3 with 3.0 being high impact, candidates fall 2014 mean rating of 2.81 reflects “high” impact. Fall 2015 candidates’ mean was 2.72. Fall 2016 the mean was 2.44 and spring 2017 it was 2.95.** | **Chair/Office Staff/Candidate Advisor****CASA/Chair****Faculty/Chair****Licensure is not possible without successful completion of this test.****CASA/CHAIR****Supervisors SPE 4901 capstone field experience and the Chair. Chair and faculty annually review all data such as this across the 14 performance assessments incorporated across the required special education course sequence.** **Chair Special Education and Advisors.** **Candidates earning less than a “C” are notified in writing and by advisor that course must be repeated and a “C” or better must be earned.** **Student Teaching Coordinators and Special Education Chair.****Chair and faculty** |

| **What Are the Learning Objectives?** | **How, Where, & When Are They Assessed?** | **What Are the Expectations?** | **What Are the Results?** | **Committee/Person Responsible? How Will the Results Be Used?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Speaking-****Successful completion of CMN 1310 which focuses on effective oral communication and average or higher ratings on speeches given in CMN 1310 and senior seminar.** | **Majors earn a “C” or better in CMN 1310 and have average or higher speaking scores in CMN 1310 and senior seminar.** | **All majors 2015-2017 earned a “C” or better in CMN 1310, meeting the requirement to enter the professional special education course sequence, commencing with SPE 3200/3201.****The average speaking scores for Special Education majors as provided by CASA in spring 2015 was 3.00 for freshmen in CMN 1310 and 3.71 in Senior Seminars. For CMN all EIU freshmen the average speaking score was 3.21 and for seniors it was 3.65.** **Fall 2016 and spring 2017 the data for CMN1310 and Senior Seminar reflect that freshmen special education majors fall 2016 CMN average rating was 3.4 with University average of 3.15. For Senior Seminars, majors’ mean was 3.70 with a University average of 3.56. Spring 2017 the major freshmen CMN mean was 2.80; the senior mean was 4.0. University means were 3.13 and 3.47 respectively.****In fall 15, the average speaking scores for freshmen Special Education majors in CMN was 3.13 and for Special Education majors as seniors in senior seminar the average speaking score was 3.70. EIU freshmen average was 3.10 and senior average was 3.63****Spring 2016 for freshman special education majors in CMN1310 the average was 3.58 with an EIU average of 3.6. For Senior Seminar, the special education major average was 3.17 compared to 3.16 for EIU freshmen.** | **Chair/Office Staff/Candidate Advisor.****Candidate Advisor****CASA** |
|  | **Listening-****Candidates demonstrate using active and critical listening skills to understand and evaluate oral communication in SPE 4600, “Eligibility Role Play”.** | **Candidates will meet (3.0) or exceed meeting “Standards” (4.0 – 5.0) specific to “verbal and non-verbal” behaviors comments, collaboration, affirmation, engagement of colleagues and family members. Affirmation and engagement reflect active and critical listening.** | **Spring 2015 performance data for “Eligibility Role Play” 15 of 15 candidates met or exceeded meeting standards; mean rating was 4.73 on a 5.00 scale.****Fall 2015, 19 of 19 candidates exceeded standards (4.0 – 5.0) or met standards (3.0) with a mean of 4.4.5****Spring 2016, 100% (16 of 16) exceeded standards (4.0 – 5.0) with a mean performance of 5.00 on a 5.0 scale.****Fall 2016, 18 of 18 exceeded or met standards with a mean rating of 4.17.** | **Faculty/Chair** |
|  | **Quantitative Reasoning –****ACT of 22 or higher with writing or passing state of Illinois Test of Academic Proficiency (TAP).****Quantitative Reasoning –****“Quantitative Reasoning” is inherently required in the collection and use of data for purposes of instructional planning. Assessment skills which includes use of data from multiple sources is assessed across the special education program; including the FBA in SPE 3600 and the SPE 4800 “Assessment Summary Report”.** | **Majors will pass TAP or have an ACT of 22 or higher or SAT of 1030 to commence licensure course sequence. The TAP and ACT both have a significant sub area test that assesses performing basic calculations and measurements; applying qualitative methods; and reading interpreting, and constructing tables, graphs and charts.****Candidates are expected to demonstrate data collection skills using multiple data sources in planning and instructional decision making. Candidates are expected to demonstrate use of technology to collect and analyze assessment data.****The expectation is all candidates will meet (3.0) or exceed standards (4.0 – 5.0) across rubric components addressing skills of “quantitative reasoning” in development of FBA and ASR.** | **100% of majors passed the TAP or had a minimum of a 22 ACT with writing or SAT of 1030; no one can complete the course sequence beyond the 5 semester hour introductory courses of SPE 2000/3000 unless this test is passed.****100% of candidates spring 2015 exceeded or met standards (mean 3.90) in generation of data, use of data, and use of technology to generate analyze and depict data in development of FBA (Functional Behavior Assessment). Fall 2015 on the FBA, 22 of 22 exceeded meting standards, mean 4.00. Spring 2016 on the FBA, 19 of 19 exceeded meeting standards, mean 4.00. Fall 2016 on the FBA overall, 28 of 28 met or exceeded standards, mean 3.75.****92.5% of candidates across spring 2015, fall 2015, spring 2016 and fall 2016 met or exceeded standards (86 of 93) in development of the “Assessment Summary Report” (ASR).****93.6% (87 of 93) across the 4 semesters demonstrated use of technology in collecting, making tables, and analyzing data in completion of ASR at the meets (3.0) or exceeds standards level (4.0 – 5.0) of performance.** | **Licensure is not possible without successfully meeting this requirement.****Faculty/Chair** |

|  | **OUTCOME MEASURE:****ASSESSMENT** |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Goals/Objectives** | **Assessment Used:**  | **Summary: Strengths/Needs Based on Outcome Measures** | **Improvements/Changes Planned Based on Outcome Measures** |
| **1. Design instruction to develop** **and utilize the cognitive processes by which pupils learn.** | **Lesson Plan****Student Teaching Evaluation** | **100% of all lesson plans implemented in SPE 4901 spring 2015, fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016 demonstrate candidates met or exceed instructional design and planning CEC standards. (4.0 or higher); mean across the three semesters was 4.19.****Student Teaching Evaluation data reflect candidates demonstrate knowledge and skills in their student teaching semester related to demonstration of skills to enhance student learning and develop higher thinking and critical thinking. Student teaching data for 3 academic years, 2014-2017 are included in the Appendices.**  | **See Parts D. “Improvements Changes” and E. “Changes in Progress”.** |
| **2. Design instruction to promote learning.** | **IEP** **edTPA****Student Teaching Evaluation** | **The portfolio data reflects that IEPs and Lesson Plans are exceedingly strong.****Across the past 4 semesters (spring 2015, fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016; data not yet available for spring 2017) on the IEP, all candidates’ performance met or exceeded standards related to planning; mean across the 4 semesters was 3.90 with a mean range of 3.81-4.00..** **Task 1 of the edTPA is “planning”; this task requires candidates demonstrate skills to “design instruction to promote learning”. 2015-2016 Special Education candidates had an average total score of 15.0. 2016-2017 the average total score was 15.3.****Student Teaching Evaluation data reflect candidates demonstrate this skill in their student teaching semester; see data charts included with this report. The rubric used AY14-15 and 15-16 had an indicator focused on candidate’s use of “accommodations to enhance learning”. The mean rating for Special Education majors 14-15 on this indicator was 4.69 (5.00 scale). AY 15-16 the mean was 4.62.****On the revised rubric used AY16-17, 2 indicators reflect candidate’s ability to promote learning. One of the two indicators is specific to “provision of different pathways for learning’; the mean for Special Education majors was 4.31 with a mode of 5.00. Another related indicator is specific to the student teacher engaging all students in “meaningful learning activities”. The mean for Special Education majors was 4.37 with a mode of 5.00.** |  |
| **3. Demonstrate alternative methods of achieving similar** **learning outcomes.** | **Student Teaching Evaluation** | **Student Teaching Evaluation data reflect candidates demonstrate this skill in their student teaching semester; see data charts included with this report. On the AY14-15 and 15-16 rubric, 2 indicators directly related to this outcome: Student Teacher use of varied learning activities and instructional materials and resources. Means for these 2 indicators were 4.6 and 4.619. In AY14-15, the means were 4.60 and 4.691.****The AY16-17 rubric has an indicator focused on candidate’s “differentiation of strategies, materials, pace, levels of complexity and language” to achieve learning outcomes. The mean was 4.283 with a mode of 5.00.** |  |
| **4. Decide what will be learned**  **and the process of learning.** | **Student Teaching Evaluation** | **Student Teaching Evaluation data reflect candidates demonstrate this skill in their student teaching semester. In fall 14, spring 15, fall 15 and spring 16, the indicator most directly related reflects candidate’s knowledge of students’ skills and learning modes. Means are a 5.00 scale were respectively 4.473 and 4.551. The indicator on the fall 16, spring 17 rubric reflects candidates’ knowledge and skills relative to student learning and determination of what to teach based on developmental levels. This indicator mean was 4.283 with a mode of 5.00.**  |  |
| **5. Demonstrate/exhibit** **sensitivity to students’ feelings.** | **Student Teaching Evaluation** | **Student Teaching Evaluation data reflect candidates demonstrate this skill in their student teaching semester. The indicator most directly related on the fall 2014-sprig 2016 student teaching rubric focused on “leader interaction with students”. The means were: 4.818 in 14-15 and 4.819 in 15-16. The fall 16/spring 17 indicator most closely related focused on teacher as advocate for well-being of each student; the mean for this indicator was 4.457 with a mode of 5.00.** |  |
| **6. Emphasize higher-order,** **critical thinking skills.** | **Student Teaching Evaluation** | **Student Teaching Evaluation data reflect candidates demonstrate this skill in their student teaching semester. No indicator on the student teaching evaluation directly related to this outcome fall 14-spring 16 but the revised rubric used 2016-2017 had two related to “higher order and critical thinking”. One focused on candidates’ supporting through instruction higher order thinking and the other focused on assisting students to “develop creative/critical thinking and problem solving”. The means for the two indicators were 4.236 (mode 4.00) and 4.264 (mode 5.00).** |  |
| **7. Manage the classroom to** **optimize academically engaged time.** | **Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA)** | **100% of all candidates met or exceeded standards on the Functional Behavioral Assessment across the past 4 semesters (data not yet available for spring 2017); mean rating of candidate performance across spring 2015, fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016 was 3.91 with a mean range of 3.75-4.00.** |  |
| **8. Strive to develop in student’s** **intellectual, social, ethical and moral skills and behaviors.** | **IEP – Impact on Student Learning** | **100% of all candidates met or exceeded standards specific to individualization and effectiveness of teaching (Impact on P-12). Spring 2015, fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016 mean rating of candidate performance across the 4 semesters was 3.90. The mean range was 3.81-4.00.**  |  |
| **9. Demonstrate good communication skills.** | **15 Programmatic assessments:** **(See Appendices for Data Charts)****Student Teaching Evaluation** | **Across 15 products, the overwhelming majority of candidates met or exceeded “writing competency” standards. (See product graphs: Writing Competency.)** **The fall 2014-spring 2016 student teaching evaluation indicators directly related rated candidates’ verbal and written language. Means were 4.691 and 4.741 fall 14-spring 15 and 4.732 and 4.683 fall 15-spring 16, verbal and written respectively. The revised rubric has 1 indicator. This indicator 16-17 reflects candidates’ ability to communicate information and ideas to “students, parents/guardians, peers, administrators and others”. The mean for Special Education student teachers was 4.434 with a mode of 5.0.** |  |
| **10. Use basic concepts of** **measurements and assess-** **ment in instructional** **decision-making.** | **Assessment Summary Report****And Curriculum Based Assessment (CBA)****edTPA** | **Across 4 semesters, 92.5% of candidates (86 of 93) on the “Assessment Summary Report” met or exceeded some standards or consistently exceeded all standards. 99 of 100 (99%) met or exceeded all standards on the “Curriculum Based Assessment” spring 2015, fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016 with a mean range of 3.67-4.12 and a mean rating across semesters of 3.95.** **Task 3 edTPA is specific to assessment. 2015-2016,the edTPA Task 3, the average task score was 13.7. In 2016-2017 it was 14.8.**  |  |
| **11. Provide for the uniqueness of**  **individuals, recognizing the**  **characteristics of culturally pluralistic and “at-risk” populations, and foster appreciation for those differences.** | **Student Teaching Evaluation** | **The 2014-2015 and 15-16 student teaching evaluations had an indicator specific to candidates’ knowledge of culture. Special Education student teachers earned an average rating of 4.615 14-15 and 4.611 15-16.** **The revised rubric used in 16-17 has an indicator specific to collecting, analyzing and application of knowledge of student’s cultures and facilitation of a respectful learning community. The mean rating was 4.264 with a mode of 5.00.** |  |
| **12. Perform successfully within** **the social and political** **contexts of schools and** **community.** | **Student Teaching Evaluation** | **Student Teaching Evaluation data reflect candidates demonstrate this skill in their student teaching semester. The one indicator fall 2014-spring 2016 most directly related assessed candidates’ demonstration of behaviors reflecting they valued “collaborative and cooperative relationships”. For this indicator fall 2014-spring 2015, the mean was 4.636; fall 15-spring 16 the mean was 4.646.** **The revised rubric indicator is more directly related. This indicator reflects extent to which candidates’ “effectively works” within the school/community context (0.8%). The mean 16-17 for Special Education majors was 4.371 with a mode of 5.00.**  |  |
| **13. Model appropriate**  **professional behavior…ethical,** **legal, social, and moral.** | **Student Teaching Evaluation** | **Student Teaching Evaluation data reflect candidates demonstrate this skill in their student teaching semester. Ethical, professional and responsible behavior was directly assessed in an indicator across 2014-2017. The means were 4.836 (14-15) and 4.772 (15-16). 2016-2017 the mean was 4.50 with a mode of 5.0.** |  |
| **14. Demonstrate a mastery of the** **basic skills in reading, writing** **and oral communication.** | **Student Teaching Evaluation** | **Student Teaching Evaluation data reflect candidates demonstrate this skill in their student teaching semester. While the 14-16 rubric did not directly assess this outcome, the 16-17 rubric does. Q.6 A and B means were 4.282 and 4.410 respectively each with a mode of 5.00.** |  |
| **15. Demonstrate knowledge of** **past and present developments, issues, research, social influences, laws and rules in**  **the field of education.** | **State LBS I Test****Student Teaching Evaluation** | **100% of the program completers passed the LBS I test.****Student Teaching Evaluation data reflect candidates demonstrate this skill in their student teaching semester. No indicators on the student teaching rubric 2014-2016 related very directly to this outcome (goal/objective). The revised rubric has two indicators that relate. One includes candidates’ knowledge and adherence to laws and rules while the other relates to candidates’ evaluation of best practices and research. The means 2016-17 for these two indicators were 4.519 and 4.352 respectively. Both had modes of 5.00.** |  |
| **16. Effective use of technology** **to increase teaching and learning.** | **Programmatic Performance Assessments****Student Teaching Evaluation** | **Performance assessment data across 15 products assessed each semester using a standard’s (State and CEC) based rubric reflect that across assessments 98.8% of candidates consistently exceeded or exceeded some standards in “Use of Technology” (see data graphs).** **Student Teaching Evaluation data reflect candidates demonstrate this skill in their student teaching semester. The 2014-2016 rubric had two indicators; one specific to responsible use of technology and one specific to use of technology for professional development and life-long practice. Means specific to responsible use 14-15 was 4.782 and in 15-16 mean was 4.748. Relative to us for professional development and practice, 14-15 mean was 4.694 and 4.672 15-16.** **The revised 16-17 rubric for student teaching has 3 indicators related to candidates’ use of technology. One speaks to use of assistive technology, mean 4.276; one addresses candidates’ modeling effective use, 4.302; and the third evaluates candidate use of technology (digital) as a resource to enhance student learning, mean 4.292.** |  |

**SUMMARY OF PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT DATA**

**PORTFOLIO QUANTITATIVE DATA**

 **2015-2016 2016-2017**

**Total Number of Portfolios Reviewed = 116 64 52**

**Portfolio: 87.7% of the products in the portfolio were acceptable on the first review, 2015-2016. 87.5% were acceptable in first review in 2016-2017.**

**In 2015-2016, 7.3% of the ten products were unacceptable on first review, with all products acceptable on resubmission. Across 2015-2016 portfolios, 5% of the candidate products were missing due to timing of required submission and completion of the product in a class in which candidate was currently enrolled. These products were submitted and reviewed in subsequent submissions.**

**In 2016-2017, 6.5% of the ten products were unacceptable on first review, with all products being acceptable on resubmission. 6% of the products were missing on first submission due to current enrollment in classes in which product was required.**

**Portfolio Products include: Assessment Report, Curriculum Based Assessment, IEP, Behavioral Recording Assignment, Behavior Intervention Plan, Classroom Management Plan, Unit Plan, Lesson Plan, Curriculum and Material Adaptation, and Reflective Matrices.**

**Program Strengths as Shown by Portfolio Products**

* **Curriculum Based Assessments are thorough reflecting candidate knowledge and understanding of the instructional cycle.**
* **Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) reflect data use of in development of the IEP.**
* **Classroom management plans reflect understanding of principles of classroom management.**
* **Unit plans reflect knowledge and skills essential to instructional planning.**
* **Lesson plans reflect candidates’ knowledge and skills specific to the instructional process.**
* **Assessment summary reports are thorough.**
* **Overall, across the two academic years, artifacts represented quality work and “portfolio” artifacts reflect a thorough sampling of candidates’ work in varying courses and at varying developmental stages of their progress through course sequences. The “Assessment Summary Report”, the “IEP”, the Curriculum Based Assessment, The Unit and the “Lesson Plan” reflect knowledge and skills of assessment, both formal and informal, and skills of planning instruction are strong across candidates 2015-2017.**

**SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT DATA**

**Each of the departmental programmatic assessments are rated relative to the following elements: writing competency, professional presentation, required components, and use of technology. An overall rating is also determined. Rubrics used to grade all products are on a five point scale with 5 being “meets all standards,” 3 being “consistently meets standards” and 1 being “does not meet standards.”**

**Each rubric is aligned to the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards for Special Education teachers and the State of Illinois Special Education Standards. If the rating on the rubric reflects that the candidate meets all standards, this means the candidate’s performance has been assessed using the rubric aligned to standards as having met each of the specified CEC standards, resulting in a 5.0 rating. A rating of 3.00 reflects the product or its required components “consistently meets standards” which means the preponderance of the standards have been met by the candidate but not all have been met. “Does not meet” (1.00) means the candidate has not met the CEC standards at an acceptable level.**

**Graphs reflecting candidate data for each of the programmatic performance assessments for spring 2015, fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016 are included with this report.**

**STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION DATA**

**The student teaching evaluation is aligned with the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards. The “student teaching evaluation” entered into LiveText is the final evaluation and it is jointly written by the cooperating teacher and the University coordinator. The majority of Special Education majors complete two discrete 8-week assignments and an evaluation is entered for each. LiveText data for student teaching is generated component by component and no holistic data across items is generated. This data analysis capacity/limitation is inherent in LiveText.**

**The student teaching data sets in this report were generated based on two diverse evaluation rubrics. The rubric used 2014 through spring 2016 went through a significant revision to assure it was aligned to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS) and in TASC standard in apparent ways and to further refine and define performance levels. The redesigned rubric was used fall 2016 and spring 2017. It went through review and revisions spring 2017 based on fall 2016 use that resulted in language modifications and addition of indicators. For this reason, there are indicators for which there is no data 16-17 as these were indicators added during the spring 17 re-review and revise process.**

**INTEGRATIVE LEARNING ASSESSMENT AND DATA**

**In fall 2011 the Department piloted a programmatic assessment of integrative learning. The assessment designed was a survey; its purpose was to ascertain the impact of varying integrative learning experiences on candidates’ and graduates’ perception of the varying integrative learning experiences extent of impact specific to relating coursework to their professional practice. The pilot of the survey, spring 2012, resulted in revisions to the survey. The revised survey has been used 2013-2017.**

**“Integrative Learning Survey” results reflect that fall 2015 candidates in their capstone field experience course required to student teach, SPE 4901, collectively perceive that the SPE 4901 field experience and the practicum in their other Special Education courses (e.g. SPE 3600, 4800, 3201, 3220, and 4920) have had the “highest impact” on their integration of learning. On a 5.00 scale with 5.0 being “high impact” and 4.00 being “moderately high” SPE 4901 field experience had a mean of 4.56; other practicum had a mean of 3.84. Fall 2016 the mean relative to input of the SPE 4901 field experiences was 4.5 (5.0 scale) reflecting “high impact” and a mean of 4.29 was reflected for all other course embedded field experiences. Spring 2017, means were 4.76 (4901) and 4.62 (all other experiences).**

**Special Education majors fall 2015 perceived themselves to be “integrative learners,” mean of 2.680 (3.0 scale). Fall 2016 candidates in SPE 4901 also perceived themselves to be “integrated learners”, mean of 2.44. Candidates perceptions were even more strong spring 2017 with a mean of 2.76 on a 3.0 scale.**

**SUMMARY OF PROGRAMMATIC PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT DATA**

**Aggregated data for 15 of the programmatic performance assessments is provided at the conclusion of this narrative for spring 2015, fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016. Data for spring 2017 is not yet available. The summary sheets, rubrics, and data reflect the standards that are assessed by given elements of the rubrics. On the data charts, CEC stands for Council for Exceptional Children Standards. IGC reflects the CEC Individualized General Curriculum knowledge and skills, and IIC stands for CEC Individualized Independence Curriculum. IPTS reflects the Illinois Professional Teaching Standard (2013) alignment.PART TWO:**

**Specific to the previous report which was submitted in June of 2014, the CASA Director made no suggestions or comments specific to suggested changes or assessment system modifications. An undergraduate report was not required June 2015 or in 2016; data collected, analyzed, and included in this report reflects spring 2015, fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016. Spring 2017 data was not available by the due date of this report.**

**PART THREE**

**Summarize changes and improvements in curriculum, instruction, and learning that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program.**

1. **Program strengths reflected in portfolios and analysis of performance assessment data:**
	* **The majority of candidates meet or exceed standards across the elements of the varying assessments and portfolio artifacts.**
* **Candidate performance on EWP and speaking (CMN) and Senior Seminar meet or exceed University averages.**
* **The majority of portfolio products are acceptable on first submission.**
* **Program assessment system is very extensive with all facets of the assessment system aligned to the CEC and State of Illinois Standards.**
* **Candidates have been successful in passing edTPA.**

**Improvements/Changes Planned and Accomplished**

* **Rubrics refinement to align to the 2012 CEC Standards occurred during the academic years included in this report. Data is systematically collected, analyzed and used for purposes of program improvement. The data sets generated through SPSS AY 15-16 and fall 2016 are included in this report.**
* **Across the time period since the June 2014 Submission, course activities and assignments have been revised to assure candidates are prepared to successfully complete and submit the State required edTPA.**
1. **Program Strengths as reflected in edTPA, Integrated Learning Survey, Illinois State Licensure Tests, and national accreditation recognition.**
* **100% of undergraduate candidates passed the edTPA on first attempt 2016-2017.**
* **The two departmental programs were fully recognized on first review by the Council for Exceptional Children spring 2015. This recognition will extend until March 15, 2022.**
* **The “Integrated Learning Survey” reflects that the program is successfully integrating learning across the curriculum and extra-curricular activities.**
* **Additional strengths include candidate performances on state licensure exams and the sustained accreditations of both the Standard Special and Early Childhood Special Education options**
1. **Candidates are demonstrating mastery of the Eastern Illinois University Learning Goals. Data including candidate grades in Communication/language classes, performances on Electronic Writing Portfolio, writing across the curriculum; speaking assessments; and assessments of “quantitative reasoning” demonstrate that Special Education candidates develop and demonstrate:**
* **Critical thinking**
* **Writing and critical reading**
* **Speaking and listening**
* **Quantitative reasoning**
* **Responsible citizenship**
1. **Improvements/Changes Planned Based on Analysis of Licensure Test Results**
* **No program changes are planned based on the LBS I test results as 100% of Eastern’s Special Education candidates have passed this test since the test was implemented by the State of Illinois in 2002. Relative to the state assessment of “basic skills”, all individuals as of Fall 2002 have had to pass a state “basic skills” assessment in order to continue in the teacher education sequence; thus, non-passers cannot be program completers.**
1. **Changes in Progress**
* **The Council for Exceptional Children revised the national Special Education Standards in 2012. Since the previous “Undergraduate Student Learning Assessment Report”, June 2017, all programmatic assessments (summary sheets and rubrics) have been revised to align with the 2012 CEC Standards and elements. All course syllabi and rubrics used in the candidate programmatic performance assessment system, commencing spring 2015, have been revised to align with the 2012 CEC Initial standards.**
1. **What have we learned through the assessment process and plans for the future**
* **Faculty annually reviews all data generated through the Department Assessment System. The assessment system includes: State of Illinois Licensure Tests; edTPA; portfolio; 19 product focused performance assessment embedded in courses; 7 clinical practice performance assessments; and the student teaching evaluation. In addition specific to candidates earning a credential to teach “Early Childhood Special Education”, there are an additional 9 performance assessments.**

**Faculty review results in generation of considerations related to the curriculum to be considered by the Department Curriculum committee in the next academic year. Considerations resulting from the most recent faculty and Chair review reflect what has been learned and plans for the future.**

1. **What has been learned:**
* **Candidate performance is demonstrated to be strong across the data generated by the “Programmatic Assessment System”.**
* **There is more variation in candidate performance ratings reflected in data collected specific to assessments and clinical experiences in 3000 level courses. In addition to these being 3000 level, these courses also do not require “Admission to Teacher Education” criteria be met. Assessments with most variation of candidate performance are embedded in Special Education 3000, 3200, 3220 and 3600.**
* **Candidates perform more strongly on implementing lesson plans (SPE 4901/4920) than on the assessment of their written lesson plans (SPE 4900/4920).**
* **Candidates in the Early Childhood Special Education courses demonstrate difficulty with writing and components of goals and objectives.**
* **The Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) and the Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) ratings are less strong in more recent semesters and are less consistent in more recent semesters.**
* **Clinical assessments (field experience) support candidates demonstrate skills in field experiences. Performance is more even and predictable on the 7 clinical assessments versus the 19 product performance assessments.**
* **Technology is generally rated as “exceeds standards (5.0)”; what is being assess is not consistent across rubrics relative to knowledge versus use or demonstration of skills.**
* **Candidate performance involving use of data and use of assessment data to make instructional decisions is less strong across assessments than other performance attributes.**
* **Candidate use of knowledge of learning environments is a performance area that needs to be addressed.**
1. **Plans for the Future:**
	* **The faculty noted that with the 2016-2017 use of revised rubrics there seemed to be more inconsistency in ratings depending on the faculty person teaching the course in which the assessment was embedded. To address this, commencing fall 2017 the Department Curriculum Committee will consider issues of inter-rater reliable and other ways to address the inconsistency.**
	* **Faculty noted concerns that if a rubric did not have performance indicator language for the “2” or “4” rating; the ratings seemed to be less consistent across semesters. An issue as also noted relative to the two rubrics being used in Special Education 4600 for the “IEP Role Play” and the “Resource Notebook” as neither is designed consistent with other rubrics. Given this, revisions of the SPE 4600 rubrics and rubrics lacking “2” and “4” indicator language need to be initiated in 2017-2018.**
	* **Examination of the “FBA” and BIP” assignments and the design of the course content of Special Education 3600, given “Teacher Education” requirements may or may not be met by candidates when taking this course, needs to occur 2017-2018.**
	* **Candidate use of data for instruction and use of knowledge of learning environments across the curriculum needs to be addressed and strengthened. Writing goals and objectives and related “steps” will be strengthe4ned in the ECSE sequence (SPE 4720/4920).**
	* **Faculty discussions of expectations relative to “writing”, particularly mechanics versus content, and technology, knowledge and use, need to be initiated 2017-2018.**
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