

2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: [Education Specialist Credential Program-Mild/Moderate Disabilities]

B2. Report author(s): [Pia Wong]

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: [78 in this program]

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment:
(<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
XX	2. Credential
	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

Brief description of program characteristics.

The Preliminary Mild/Moderate Education Specialist credential program at CSUS is designed to align with the 16 program standards and 6 specialty standards adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (Standards can be viewed here: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/special-education-standards.pdf>) Table One aligns the Baccalaureate Learning Goals with our state program accreditation standards and Table Two displays the ways in which all the relevant learner outcomes (WASC and CTC) are assessed by our program. Candidates enter the program with and without prior teaching credentials; this determines their individual program plan and the program experiences they must successfully complete. Program duration is between 3 and 6 semesters, with most candidates completing in 3 or 4 semesters. The fieldwork and student teaching are competency based. Students must demonstrate mastery before moving on to the next experience and the assessments identified in Table Two are designed to assess their attainment of key formative and summative benchmarks.

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed **in 2013-2014**.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess **in 2013-2014**? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

Assessed?	WASC Baccalaureate Standards	California Commission on Teacher Credentialing: Program (PS) and Mild/Moderate Specialization (MM) Standards
Y	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *	PS5, PS6, PS11, PS12, PS13, MM2
Y	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)	PS5, MM1, MM2, MM6
Y	3. Written communication (WASC 3)	PS4, PS5, PS9, MM2, MM6
Y	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)	PS4, PS5, PS9, MM3-5
Y	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)	PS5, MM2, MM6
Y	6. Inquiry and analysis	PS5, PS6, PS10, PS11, PS12, MM1-6
Y	7. Creative thinking	PS6, PS11, PS12, PS13, MM3, MM5
Y	8. Reading	PS9
Y	9. Team work	PS4, PS7, PS11, PS14, MM4-6
Y	10. Problem solving	PS4, PS7, PS11, PS13, PS14, MM2-6
Y	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global	PS10, MM1
Y	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency	PS3, PS10, PS11, PS13, PS14, MM1-6
Y	13. Ethical reasoning	PS2, MM6
Y	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning	PS2, PS13, PS14
NA	15. Global learning	
Y	16. Integrative and applied learning	PS9-16, MM1-6
NA	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge	
NA	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline	
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above:	

* One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance **at graduation** in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy**.

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

We have cross-referenced our state accreditation program standards and performance outcomes onto the Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (SSBLGs) and displayed this alignment in the table for Question 1.

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

X	1. Yes, by California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
	2. No (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q1.4)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile* (DQP) * to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No, but I know what DQP is. *Our program does not terminate in a degree but rather a credential.
	3. No, I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf and
<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html>.

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

X	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

We do not assess each PLO separately. Rather, within a single assessment, candidates are expected to demonstrate several PLOs. Table 2 below identifies the assessment tool, provides a brief description, delineates the CTC program and specialization standards assessed (with a WASC alignment included), and identifies the criteria for acceptable performance.

**Table Two: Key Assessments for the Education Specialist/Mild-Moderate Disabilities
Credential Program PLOs**

Assessment Tool	Type of Assessment (formative/summative and direct/indirect)	When administered	Details about Administration	Passing Standard/Evaluation Criteria	CCTC Standards (Program-PS, Specialization-MM) and WASC Outcomes
Assessment #1: Reading/Spelling Analysis (RSA)	Formative/ Direct	In conjunction with first Literacy course, 1 st or 2 nd semester of program	Faculty use a rubric with 7 criteria and 3 levels	80/100	CTC-PS2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 13, 16 CTC-MM2, 3, 5 WASC1-10, 12, 14, 16
Assessment #2: Functional Behavioral Assessment/ Analysis Report (FBA)	Formative/ Direct	In conjunction with EDS230 taken in	Faculty use a rubric with 17 criteria and 3 levels	120/155	CTC-PS 4-6, 14-16 CTC-MM2, 4, 6 WASC1-7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16
Assessment #3: Positive Behavioral Intervention Support Plan (BIP)	Formative/ Direct	penultimate or final semester of the program	Faculty use a rubric with 16 criteria and 3 levels	40/50	CTC-PS 4-6, 14-16 CTC-MM2, 4, 6 WASC1-7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16
Assessment #4: IEP Initial Assessment Flowchart and Timeline, Procedures, and Exceptions Process	Formative/ Direct	In conjunction with EDS225, taken towards the end of the program	Faculty use a rubric with 13 criteria and 3 levels	20/25	CTC-PS 2, 4, 5, 8 CTC-MM1, 2, 6 WASC1-6, 9-14, 16
Assessment #5: Final student teaching evaluation	Summative/ Direct	During final semester at the midterm, and at the end of the semester	Mentor teacher and university supervisor evaluate performance using a rubric with 63 criteria and 3 levels	Majority of 3s, no scores of 1 or 0	Standards addressed: all Corresponds with WASC standards 1-14 and 16
Assessment #6: PACT Teaching Event <i>(only for candidates seeking Multiple Subject credential in addition to EDS-MM Credential)</i>	Summative/ Direct	During the final semester when Multiple Subject student teaching occurs	Scored by trained and calibrated assessors using a rubric with 12 criteria and 4 levels	No more than 2 scores of “1” and 50% of scores for each task above “1” on the 12 rubrics	Standards address: all WASC standards: 16

Q2.2. Have you published the PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q3.1)

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the PLOs/expectations/rubrics published? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
X	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce

	/develop/master the PLO(s)
X	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.3. If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

We do not assess each program learning outcome individually since much of how candidates are assessed are through authentic performances (student teaching, creating learning plans, analyzing student assessment data) where multiple skills and knowledge bases must be skillfully invoked and applied. Thus, rather than display data for each learning outcome, we have the scores for candidates (as an aggregate) on specific measures by which multiple learning outcomes are assessed.

Table Three. Program Learning Outcomes for Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Credential Candidates Completing the Program in Fall 2013 or Spring 2014

Assessment Tool	Fall 2013 Average Scores	Spring 2014 Average Scores
Assessment #1: Reading/Spelling Analysis (RSA)	98.5/100 (n=14)	99.7/100 (n=23)
Assessment #2: Functional Behavioral Assessment/ Analysis Report (FBA)	145/150 (n=17)	144/150 (n=28)
Assessment #3: Positive Behavioral Intervention Support Plan (BIP)	45.6/50 (n=18)	44.7/50 (n=28)

Assessment Tool	Fall 2013 Average Scores	Spring 2014 Average Scores
Assessment #4: IEP Initial Assessment Flowchart and Timeline, Procedures, and Exceptions Process	50/50 (n=5)	48/50 (n=13)
Assessment #5: Final student teaching evaluation	Professionalism: 2.65/3 Communication/ Collaboration: 2.27/3 Planning: 2.38/3 Managing St. Behavior: 2.33/3 Instruction: 2.36/3 Assessment: 2.1/3 (n=10)	Professionalism: 2.87/3 Communication/ Collaboration: 2.78/3 Planning: 2.81/3 Managing St. Behavior: 2.8/3 Instruction: 2.7/3 Assessment: 2.7/3 (n=15)
Assessment #6: PACT Teaching Event <i>(only for candidates seeking Multiple Subject credential in addition to EDS-MM Credential)</i>	Planning: 2.5/4 Instruction: 2.4/4 Assessment: 2.4/4 Reflection: 2.3/4 Academic Language: 2.1/4 (n=16)	Planning: 2.3/4 Instruction: 2.1/4 Assessment: 2.2 /4 Reflection: 2.3/4 Academic Language: 2.1/4 (n=4)

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

Yes, see data in Table 3.

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year? [22]

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning

X	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [Check all that apply]

	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
X	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
X	8. Other measure. Specify: Student teaching evaluation protocol (performance measure), PACT Teaching Event (for candidates also seeking Multiple Subject Credential)

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

See Appendix A

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes, with multiple PLOs
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class

	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
X	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
X	5. Use other means. Specify: Use rubric aligned to CTC program standards, pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty to evaluate student teaching; rubric approved by CTC to evaluate the PACT Teaching Event

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [Select one only]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
X	4. Use other means. Specify: A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty but also aligned to our CTC program standards

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (except for evaluators of the PACT Teaching Event)
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (except for evaluators of the PACT Teaching Event)
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

No sampling conducted; all candidates were assessed.	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

All candidates were assessed.

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews

	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.6)

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
X	4. Others, specify: CTC program and specialization standards

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (Go to Q4.7)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.7)

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Candidates submit work associated with Assessments 1-4 as part of course requirements. These items are scored by the individual faculty members, but using a common rubric that they have developed with reference to the CTC program and specialization standards. Scores are recorded in Excel files and sent to the department chair at the conclusion of each semester. Assessments 5 and 6 are performance assessments and are evaluated by university supervisors and trained/calibrated PACT assessors, respectively. Evaluations are uploaded into online data management systems and the department chair generates reports at the end of each academic year for the faculty to review.

The validity of the assessments is robust; all evaluation criteria are tied to CTC standards and reflect, in the judgment of the faculty, required knowledge and skill bases for effective teaching in public school settings. The reliability of Assessments 1 - 4 and 6 is also fairly high. For Assessments 1-4, faculty use a common rubric and meet regularly to review the items and the ratings. If there are reliability issues, they are addressed. Assessment 6 is monitored by the CTC and we regularly conduct calibration sessions and

internal monitoring to assure reliability. The reliability of Assessment 5 (student teaching evaluation) could be improved by more frequent training and calibration of evaluators. This is something that is planned for fall 2014, sparked by a transition to completing this evaluation online, using the TaskStream platform.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [_5 or 6_]

NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

FIVE for candidates pursuing the educational specialist credential only; SIX for candidates pursuing the education specialist with multiple subject credential.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses					
2. Modifying curriculum					
3. Improving advising and mentoring					
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals					
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations					
6. Developing/updating assessment plan					
7. Annual assessment reports		X			
8. Program review					
9. Prospective student and family information					
10. Alumni communication					
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)		X			
12. Program accreditation		X			
13. External accountability reporting requirement					
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					
15. Strategic planning		X			
16. Institutional benchmarking					
17. Academic policy development or modification					
18. Institutional Improvement					
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					

20. New faculty hiring					
21. Professional development for faculty and staff		X (TaskStream)			
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

In general, our assessment data indicate that our candidates are meeting our program standards for performance. Of the group that is exiting this spring 2014, there is one candidate who did not pass two summative assessments (final student teaching, the PACT Teaching Event) and she will return in the fall to engage in these experiences for a second time. While we are pleased with these outcomes, we do note a need to improve the reliability of our student teaching evaluation process. We will begin using TaskStream to store evaluation data about candidates' performance in student teaching. As a consequence, we will train our university supervisors and faculty to use TaskStream and in doing so, will also add a calibration session on the student teaching evaluation instrument.

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

Yes, see response to Q5.1.1.

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

A TaskStream training will be required for university supervisors and faculty. This training will also include calibration work on the evaluation instrument. The supervisors and faculty will implement the new TaskStream process fall 2014. The new process will allow for the creation of new reports. The potential for this kind of program change lies in the ability – via the online data management system – to quickly and easily access candidate data so that changes can be made more responsively. We anticipate that the pilot phase will occur in fall 2014, modifications will be made in spring 2015 and then the basic system will be in place for fall 2015. At that point, we should be able to determine whether having more easily accessible data and data that are more robust results in information that can more readily generate ideas for program improvements.

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

X	1. Yes, see response to Q5.2.1 above
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS] NA

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

Assessed in 2014-2015?	WASC Baccalaureate Standards	California Commission on Teacher Credentialing: Program (PS) and Mild/Moderate Specialization (MM) Standards
Y	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *	PS5, PS6, PS11, PS12, PS13, MM2
Y	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)	PS5, MM1, MM2, MM6
Y	3. Written communication (WASC 3)	PS4, PS5, PS9, MM2, MM6
Y	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)	PS4, PS5, PS9, MM3-5
Y	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)	PS5, MM2, MM6
Y	6. Inquiry and analysis	PS5, PS6, PS10, PS11, PS12, MM1-6
Y	7. Creative thinking	PS6, PS11, PS12, PS13, MM3, MM5
Y	8. Reading	PS9
Y	9. Team work	PS4, PS7, PS11, PS14, MM4-6
Y	10. Problem solving	PS4, PS7, PS11, PS13, PS14, MM2-6
Y	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global	PS10, MM1
Y	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency	PS3, PS10, PS11, PS13, PS14, MM1-6
Y	13. Ethical reasoning	PS2, MM6
Y	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning	PS2, PS13, PS14
NA	15. Global learning	
Y	16. Integrative and applied learning	PS9-16, MM1-6
NA	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge	
NA	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline	
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above:	

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
X	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet developed a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008

	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
X	9. Have not yet updated the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [EDS233]

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: [Education Specialist/Mild-Moderate Disabilities Credential Program]

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: [Teaching Credentials]

A9. Department Chair's Name: [Pia Wong]

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [1]

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
X	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)

	9. Other, specify:
--	--------------------

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [__ __]

A12.1. List all the name(s): [_____]

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [__ __]

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [__ __]

A13.1. List all the name(s): [_____]

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [_____]

Credential Program(s):

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [__3__]

A14.1. List all the names: [Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, Mild/Moderate with Moderate/Severe, Education Specialist/Mild-Moderate with Multiple Subject]

Doctorate Program(s)

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [_____]

A15.1. List the name(s): [_____]

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

	1. Yes
X	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: _____

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: _____

APPENDIX A: Primary Student/Candidate Assessments.

Reading/Spelling Analysis (RSA): Candidates assess a student who is at the lower end of learning or who is having difficulty with reading and language arts. Candidates administer a battery of assessments and complete a very detailed and thorough diagnostic report which determines the areas of difficulty the student is having in reading in language arts. By analyzing the results of each assessment and writing samples, candidates determine what the student can do, is struggling to do, and can then determine how best to help the student. Candidates prepare a written analysis of all assessments that were administered, create a remediation plan, and also includes a reflection section of the diagnostic report sharing what learned from doing this multilayered diagnostic assignment.
Functional Behavioral Assessment/Analysis Report (FBA): Candidates collect information about student behavior using a range of tools (diagnostic, descriptive, direct observation, indirect description, parent/teacher interview, etc.) to create a profile of the student's behavior with specific attention to trends and contextual factors that may influence student actions and/or reactions. Candidates conduct an in-depth analysis of these data in order to produce a thorough report that is used for subsequent consultations about appropriate interventions for the student.
Positive Behavioral Intervention Support Plan (BIP): Using information from the FBA, candidates develop a concrete plan of action for managing a student's behavior. This plan is communicated to educators and others who work with the student.
IEP Initial Assessment Flowchart and Timeline, Procedures, and Exceptions Process: The writing of each student's IEP takes place within the larger context of the special education process under IDEA. Candidates are required to demonstrate an understanding of how a student is identified as having a disability and needing special education and related services and, thus, an IEP. The first step in the special education process is a referral. Each candidate is required to create an IEP Assessment flowchart (or creative visual) of the IEP initial assessment process, from beginning to end, including timelines and all the essential participants and information related to the IEP process.
Final Student Teaching Evaluation: A performance-based rubric with 63 criteria and 3 levels, used for evaluation purposes by the university supervisor and feedback purposes by the mentor teacher. Mid term and final evaluations use this instrument.
Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) Teaching Event: state-mandated summative assessment in which candidates plan an instructional sequence (3-5 lessons), teach it, collect and analyze student work produced during it. The entire experience is documented through a narrative (roughly 40-50 pages) and a 20 minute video clip.