

2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT MA in Education, Special Education Concentration

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: MA in Education, Special Education Concentration

B2. Report author(s): Jean Gonsier-Gerdin, Program Coordinator

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: 97

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

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

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]**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1)*
X	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
X	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
X	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

* 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:

The Special Education graduate program has identified 25 program competencies relating to knowledge, skills and dispositions across five learning outcome domains: 1) Expertise in Special Education , 2) Leadership/Change Agent, 3) Intellectual Curiosity, 4) Research: Qualitative and Quantitative; and 5) Academic Writing. **These program competencies and learning outcomes domains specifically correspond to PLO assessment areas #2 Information Literacy, #3 Written Communication, #6 Inquiry and Analysis, #16, Integrative and Applied Learning, and #18 Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline. Please see Appendix I for more details regarding PLOs.**

This year, all five PLOs were assessed through two key assessments, one formative and one summative. These assessments are the Review of Literature (formative) and the Culminating Experience (summative-Thesis, Project or Comprehensive Exam).

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)?

	1. Yes
X	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?

	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.
	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.)

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
X	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]

Standards of performance and expectations:

The MA in Special Education has three possible culminating experiences: (1) a comprehensive examination; (2) completion of a thesis; or (3) completion of a project. All students must satisfactorily complete one of these experiences to receive the MA degree.

All five program learning outcomes are assessed by the comprehensive exam. Students respond in writing to two questions that are considered cross-categorical, assessing their broader knowledge of critical issues related to the field of special education in general, one question related to research paradigms and evidence-based practice, and two questions from their special education area of expertise (i.e., mild/moderate disabilities, moderate/severe disabilities, or early childhood special education). Students taking the exam must pass four out of five questions with a minimum score of 8.0 (out of a 10 point scale). **Please see Appendix II for the rubric utilized for the MA in Special Education Comprehensive Exam.** Two faculty members score each student response and both must rate a written response as 8.0 or above. If there is disagreement regarding a student response to a question where one faculty scores the response with 8.0 or above and the other faculty scores the response with below 8.0 (not passing), a third faculty member scores the student’s response. In addition, students must also pass EDS 298, Master’s Seminar in Special Education, a course taken to prepare for the written comprehensive exam, with a grade of B- or better.

The five program learning outcome are assessed informally by a student’s completion of a thesis or project. All theses and projects are approved by a faculty advisor and graduate coordinator In order to be approved, theses and projects must demonstrate the student’s competencies in information literacy, written communication, inquiry and analysis, integrative and applied learning and overall competencies in the major/discipline. Currently, a formal assessment of program learning outcomes has not been developed for students completing a thesis or project.

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

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

All program learning outcomes have been assessed this year through two key assessments that are used to make critical decisions about the candidate learning and competence prior to being recommended for an MA: Review of Literature and the Culminating Experience. Table 1 below provides additional details about the nature of each of these key assessments. **Please see Appendix II for the rubric utilized for the MA in Special Education Comprehensive Exam and Appendix III for the set of rubrics for the Review of the Literature.**

Table 1: Overview of Key Assessments for M.A. in Special Education Program

Assessment Tool	Type of Assessment (formative/summative)	When administered	Details about Administration	Learning Outcomes Addressed
Assessment #1. Review of Literature	Formative	During a course (EDS 250) often taken in the penultimate semester of the program	Course instructor assesses work based on a rubric designed by faculty (See Appendix II for example of rubric)	Program Learning Outcomes #2, 3 & 6
Assessment #2. Culminating Experiences (Thesis, Project or Comprehensive Exam	Summative	During courses (EDS 298, or 500, and 501) in the final phase of the program	Faculty advisors assess performance based on criteria designed by department and university (See Appendix III for guidelines/rubric for rating individual student responses to MA culminating exam questions)	Program Learning Outcomes #2, 3, 6, 16, & 18

In Table 2 below, we summarize the data related to performance as measured by the 2 key assessments detailed in Table 1.

Table 2: Aggregate Data on Students and/or Program Completers

Assessment Tools	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
Assessment #1. Review of Literature Related to Special Education Issue/Topics	N=15 % earned grade of A= 73% % earned grade of A-= 7% % earned grade of B+= 7% % earned grade of B-= 13%	NA for this semester (Special Ed. MA students take in Fall semester)
Assessment #2. Culminating Experiences (% approved thesis or project; and/or % passed 4 out of 5 written comprehensive exam responses)	MA comprehensive exam only offered in Spring semester For MA Thesis/Project: N=1; % approved=100%	For MA comprehensive exam: N=17; % passed= 94% For MA Thesis/Project: N=3; % approved=100%

Overall, student performance on the key assessments reveal that the majority of students are meeting the expectations/standards of performance and achieving the program learning outcomes. For the Review of the Literature (formative assessment), all 15 students received a passing grade (B- or better) and demonstrated competency in the program learning outcomes of information literacy, written communication, and inquiry and analysis. For those who attempted the comprehensive exam, 16 out of 17 passed and demonstrated competency in the program learning outcomes of information literacy, written communication, integrated and applied learning and overall competencies in the major/discipline. The four students who had an approved MA thesis or project also demonstrated competencies in the five program learning outcomes.

One area of improvement continues to be in relation to the formative assessment, Review of the Literature that students complete while enrolled in EDS 250: Education Research. All students admitted into the MA in Special Education program as of Fall 2013 are required to take EDGR 260: Writing and Research Across the Disciplines to not only fulfill the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) and a prerequisite to EDS 250 and other core courses, but to assist students in strengthening their skills in evaluating, synthesizing and writing about research related to special education topics and issues. In the academic year 2014-2015, we will first be able to assess the impact of this course as students take EDS 250 in Fall 2014 and complete the Review of Literature assignment.

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].

Q3.4.1. First PLO: # 2 Information Literacy

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: #3 Written Communication

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.3. Third PLO: #6 Inquiry and Analysis

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.4. Fourth PLO: #16 Integrative and applied learning

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.5. Fifth PLO: #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

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? [5]

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
	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: Comprehensive exam

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]

Students taking the comprehensive exam respond in writing to two questions that are considered cross-categorical, assessing their broader knowledge of critical issues related to the field of special education in general, one question related to research paradigms and evidence-based practice, and two questions from their special education area of expertise (i.e., mild/moderate disabilities, moderate/severe disabilities, or early childhood special education). Students taking the exam must pass four out of five questions with a minimum score of 8.0 (out of a 10 point scale). **Please see Appendix II for the rubric utilized for the MA in Special Education Comprehensive Exam.** Two faculty members score each student response and both must rate a written response as 8.0 or above. If there is disagreement regarding a student response to a question where one faculty scores the response with 8.0 or above and the other faculty scores the response with below 8.0 (not passing), a third faculty member scores the student's response. 16 out of 17 students who attempted the comprehensive exam passed.

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?

	1. Yes
X	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
X	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

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)
X	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

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?

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

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

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

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

X	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:

Seventeen students took the comprehensive exams in Spring 2013 and all were used in the sample for assessment.

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?

	1. Yes
X	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)
	4. Others, specify:

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]

For PLO #16 Integrative and applied learning, the MA in Special Education Comprehensive Exam rubric was used to assess the written responses for all 17 students who attempted the comprehensive exam in Spring 2014. A group of six special education faculty read and score all the exams. Two faculty members score each student response and both must rate a written response as 8.0 or above. If there is disagreement regarding a student response to a question where one faculty scores the response with 8.0 or above and the other faculty scores the response with below 8.0 (not passing), a third faculty member scores the student's response.

Specific reliability and validity measures on the implementation of the rubric have not been utilized at this time.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? 1

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

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?

	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?

	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			X		
2. Modifying curriculum			X		
3. Improving advising and mentoring			X		
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals			X		
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations			X		
6. Developing/updating assessment plan			X		
7. Annual assessment reports	X				
8. Program review			X		
9. Prospective student and family information					X
10. Alumni communication					X
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)			X		
12. Program accreditation					X
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning				X	
16. Institutional benchmarking				X	
17. Academic policy development or modification			X		
18. Institutional Improvement			X		
19. Resource allocation and budgeting				X	
20. New faculty hiring				X	
21. Professional development for faculty and staff				X	
22. Other Specify:					

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

The MA in Special Education program has used the assessment results from 2012-2013 to inform the development of the course curriculum for EDGR 260: Writing and Research Across the Disciplines. The MA in Special Education program coordinator was a member of the faculty group who developed the EDGR 260 course syllabus and who met with instructors of EDGR 260 prior to Fall 2013 when this course was offered for the first time. Specific areas of need from the formative and summative program assessments (e.g., skills in evaluating, synthesizing and writing about research) were identified and contributed to the course development.

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)?

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]

The most significant change anticipated will be for the faculty to review and revise our program learning outcomes in relation to the VALUE Rubrics, the WASC core areas (i.e., critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication and quantitative literacy), and the Degree Qualifications Profile. The program faculty will meet to review and discuss the core areas and to develop revised program learning outcomes that are more closely aligned to these five areas.

As previously mentioned in this report, program learning outcomes are assessed informally by a student's completion of a thesis or project. All theses and projects are approved by a faculty advisor and graduate coordinator. Currently, a formal assessment of program learning outcomes has not been developed for students completing a thesis or project. The program faculty will consider developing a more formal assessment tool to be used in evaluating a student's MA thesis or project. Finally, additional formative assessment measures can be developed for signature assignments completed in other core courses (i.e., EDS 251: Education in Pluralistic, Democratic Society and EDS 297: Current Issues in Special Education).

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

	1. Yes
X	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]

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

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
X	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
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above: a. b. c.

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
X	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	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?

	1. Yes
X	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: EDS 298, EDS 500, EDS 501

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

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

A7. Name of the academic unit: Special Education

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: Graduate and Professional Studies in Education – College of Education

A9. Department Chair's Name: Dr. Susan Heredia

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: 0

A12.1. List all the name(s): N/A

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? N/A

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master’s degree programs the academic unit has: 1

A13.1. List all the name(s): MA in Education, Special Education Concentration

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? 1

Credential Program(s):

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: 3

A14.1. List all the names: Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate Disabilities; Education Specialist, Moderate/Severe Disabilities; Education Specialist, Early Childhood Special Education

Doctorate Program(s)

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0

A15.1. List the name(s): N/A

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 I: Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for the Special Education Graduate Program

		Learning Outcomes
#1: Special Education Content Expertise	Knowledge	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands different models of curriculum design as well as the different schools of curriculum development to meet the needs of students with diverse abilities. PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/ discipline
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands different special education instructional models and corresponding accommodations and modifications. PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses technology to locate and access resources on special education curriculum and instruction. PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reads and analyzes literature on special education curriculum and instruction PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a special education theoretical framework for the coherence of all components in a curriculum, components being: student characteristics, content discipline, standards and frameworks, materials, instructional strategies, environment, and evaluation. PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis, PLO 16 Integrative and applied learning, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	Dispositions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approaches knowledge as dynamic, not static. PLO #6 Inquiry and analysis
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Becomes reflective professional able to evaluate special education policies and practices critically using research to support position PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis, PLO 16 Integrative and applied learning, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Becomes empowered to make decisions on curriculum and instruction that meets the needs of students with diverse abilities. PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis, PLO #16 Integrative and applied learning, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline

# 2: Leadership/ Change Agent	Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands the school as an American institution with a history of social inequity. PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis, PLO #16 Integrative and applied learning, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands the nature of institutional change per special education. PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis, PLO #16 Integrative and applied learning, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does a critical review and analysis of special education issues and trends. PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis, PLO 16 Integrative and applied learning, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops a logical argument as to changes that can be made in special education through curriculum development and implementation. PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis, PLO #16 Integrative and applied learning, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	Dispositions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborates with others in informing public about special education problems with schools. PLO #16 Integrative and applied learning, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takes the initiative in planning for an effective staff development on special education curriculum and instruction that is research based. PLO #16 Integrative and applied learning, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline
#3: Intellectual Curiosity	Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands how past and current political and economic factors (among others) affect special education and its implementation. PLO #6 Inquiry and analysis, PLO #16 Integrative and applied learning, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline

#3: (cont.) Intellectual Curiosity	Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studies and questions existing special education practices and looks for appropriate solutions. . PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis, PLO #16 Integrative and applied learning, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assesses existing curriculum and its impact on student learning and overall goals of special education. . PLO #6 Inquiry and analysis, PLO #16 Integrative and applied learning, PLO #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	Dispositions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Values and problematizes the scientific method of gathering information and gaining knowledge. PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis, PLO #16 Integrative and applied learning
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takes a broad-minded approach to special education issues and suspends . PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis, PLO #16 Integrative and applied learning closure.

#4: Research: Qualitative and Quantitative	Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knows the basic processes of experimental research and other quantitative methods. PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knows the principles of a variety of qualitative methods including ethnography, action research, and narrative research. PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis
	Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can apply basic statistical tools to interpret numerical data . PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can apply principled qualitative data collection and analysis strategies and tools. PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis
	Dispositions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Values the importance of using valid and reliable data collection tools. PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Values the importance of making valid conclusions and inferences from data. PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis

#5: Academic Writing	Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knows the conventions of a variety of academic genres (e.g. the teacher research report, the traditional journal article, the review of literature.) PLO #2 Information literacy, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understands APA format and principles regulating titles and headings, documentations, and related matters. PLO #3 Written communication
	Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can apply productive informal writing strategies as tools for learning and for research. PLO #3 Written communication
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can compose academic prose for a variety of audiences including peers, professors, and the larger scholarly and professional community. PLO #3 Written communication
	Dispositions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcomes participation in the special education academic discourse community. PLO #3 Written communication, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcomes collaboration, peer review (in classrooms and out), vigorous and rigorous analysis of evidence. PLO #3 Written communication, PLO # 6 Inquiry and analysis

Appendix II: Rubric for MA in Special Education Comprehensive Exam

Please put the Student's Code Number here: _____

Indicate which question you are scoring here: _____ (for example, Cross categorical # 3)

Special Education Master's Comprehensive Exam

Guidelines for Rating Individual

Student Responses

<p>Student does not attempt to answer the question or only restates the question; content is deficient. Student response is significantly below passing.</p>	<p>Ratings: 0-3.0</p>
<p>Student attempts to answer the question but misses the point of the question, fails to address significant components of the question, includes misinformation on important points or fails to respond in a coherent manner. Citations are missing or inaccurate. Student response is significantly below passing.</p>	<p>Ratings: 3.1-6.0</p>
<p>Student answers the question partially. Minor points may be incorrect, but most points are accurately described and cited.</p>	

<p>On the whole, the answer is coherent, but it does not demonstrate an ability to analyze or synthesize information. It may be simply a list of definitions or citations. It may be characterized by poor organization, many grammatical errors, diction problems or confused word choice. Student response is below passing/marginal.</p>	<p>Ratings: 6.1-7.9</p>
<p>Student answers the question adequately. Minor points may be incorrect or missing, but important points are accurately explained and cited. The answer is not sophisticated but demonstrates basic knowledge of the topic and ability to analyze and synthesize. There may be some grammatical errors, but they do not interfere with the discussion. Student is Marginal/passing.</p>	<p>Ratings: 8.0-8.4</p>
<p>Student answers the question, addressing all major points. The answer is organized, coherent accurately cited, and generally well-written. The discussion demonstrates an understanding of the issues and an ability to analyze and synthesize information. A personal position is provided but may not be clearly supported by the discussion. Student response is passing.</p>	<p>8.5-8.9</p>
<p>Student answers the question fully and demonstrates an ability to synthesize information from a variety of sources. The response is well-written and generally error-free. It includes accurate citations and clear and convincing support as rationale for a personal position. Student response is a high pass.</p>	<p>9.0-9.4</p>
<p>Student answers in a sophisticated style using citations, data and/or other sources to effectively support arguments. Essentially, the response is error-free and may be highly creative. The answer demonstrates an exceptional ability to integrate theory and practice in support of a personal position which may or may not be controversial student response is worthy of acknowledgement as a merit pass.</p>	<p>9.5-10</p>

Appendix III: Rubrics for Review of the Literature [MA in

Review of the Literature: A Set of Rubrics EDS 250

This set of rubrics are intended to support special education graduate students in writing an effective review of the literature to serve as Chapter 2 in a thesis or project or alternative culminating experience in the College of Education at California State University, Sacramento. The set is not exhaustive and does not address all of the issues a faculty adviser or faculty second reader may consider, especially regarding content, reasoning, and analysis. Further, if there is a conflict between any aspect of this rubric and aspects pointed out by the faculty adviser and/or department chair, students are expected to privilege the advice of the adviser and/or chair.

The rubrics are built around five guiding questions, each of which is discussed generally below:

- How well does the review discuss the literature?
 - The emphasis in this question is placed on the word “discuss.” Academic discussions usually develop themes, elaborate on connections, raise concerns and questions, point out similarities and differences, evaluate the logic and force of theoretical arguments, and the like. Reviews that simply list or summarize studies need revision.
- How well does the review express ideas and reduce bias in language?
 - This question focuses on elements of writing including diction, cohesion and coherence, syntactic conventions and style, and sensitivity to fairness in references to people in groups of various kinds.
- How well is the information organized?
 - This question asks writers to consider the overall structure of the text with particular attention to cues that guide readers to the varying levels of importance of ideas.
- How well and fully documented is the review?
 - This question gets at the heart of a review of the literature in that it asks writers to do a thorough yet carefully focused search of the literature as a foundation for the discussion. It also requires writers to understand the nature of plagiarism and to avoid it in the paper. Finally it requires writers to construct and present full citations in a Reference List according to APA guidelines.
- How well does the review follow APA Editorial Style?
 - This question points to the need to pay close attention to the surface elements of text to ensure that conventions valued by the academic community are not violated (e.g., punctuation, hyphenation, spelling, abbreviations, headings, etc.)

Guiding Question 1: How well does the review discuss the literature?

Needs Revision	Acceptable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discusses literature tangentially relevant to the research question or problem or includes literature for purely historical reasons • Cites irrelevant work or leaves the task of discovering relevance to the reader • Emphasizes irrelevant findings and conclusions or includes nonessential details • Lists summaries or reports of referenced works as isolated pieces of information • Provides too much or insufficient elaboration (writes for a non-professional or narrow audience) • Treats controversies or other information in the research with bias or engages in ad hominem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discusses the literature pertinent to the research question or problem while avoiding an exhaustive historical review • Cites works directly relevant to the issues under study and explains or highlights their relevance • Emphasizes relevant findings and conclusions from previous research while avoiding nonessential details • Develops logical connections among referenced works past and present as they relate to the research question or problem (i.e., uses the literature to build a theoretical argument or framework) • Elaborates on ideas sufficiently for the widest possible professional audience while avoiding “a complete digest” (APA, p. 71)

attacks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treats controversies in the research fairly and avoids ad hominem attacks
---------	---

Guiding Question 2: How well does the review express ideas and reduce bias in language?

Needs Revision	Acceptable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents ideas more or less randomly with some discontinuity in words, concepts, and thematic development • Communicates information with abrupt shifts between topics or subtopics • Demonstrates one or more of the following: “redundancy, wordiness, jargon, evasiveness, overuse of the passive voice, circumlocution, and clumsy prose” (APA, pp. 67-68) • Present ideas unconventionally either occasionally or consistently • Uses words that are not fair to individuals/groups (describes at appropriate level of specificity, is sensitive to labels, acknowledges participation, avoids ambiguity in sex identity/role, uses preferred terms to refer to sexual orientation, demonstrates specificity and sensitivity in references to racial/ethnic identity, uses “nonhandicapping” language refers appropriately to age (APA, pp. 71-77) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents ideas in an order and “...aim[s] for continuity in words, concepts, and thematic development from the opening statement to the conclusion” (APA, p. 65) • Communicates information smoothly through transitions from one topic or subtopic to the next • Presents ideas economically and avoids “redundancy, wordiness, jargon, evasiveness, overuse of the passive voice, circumlocution, and clumsy prose” (APA, p. 67) • Presents ideas conventionally (use of verbs, subject-verb agreement, pronoun-antecedent agreement, use of modifiers, use of relative pronouns and subordinate conjunctions, parallel construction) (APA, pp. 77-86) • Uses words that are fair to individuals/groups (describes at appropriate level of specificity, is sensitive to labels, acknowledges participation, avoids ambiguity in sex identity/role, uses preferred terms to refer to sexual orientation, demonstrates specificity and sensitivity in references to racial/ethnic identity, uses “nonhandicapping” language, refers appropriately to age (APA, pp. 71-77)

Guiding Question 3: How well is the information organized?

Needs Revision	Acceptable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops ideas in one continuous chunk or in overlapping chunks or in sections not clearly marked • If sections are present, may have one or more sections with only one subheading • Outline of the hierarchy of ideas is not clear nor marked by headings and subheadings • May present topics or ideas of equal importance at unequal heading levels or may not mark topics or ideas of equal importance at all • May not use tables or figures when appropriate or may use them but not tell the reader what to look for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops ideas in clearly marked sections • Develops each section with either no subsections or at least two subsections (APA, p. 62) • Outlines the hierarchy of ideas in the review by using headings to convey the sequence and levels of importance (APA, p. 62) • Presents topics of equal importance at the same heading level throughout the review (APA, pp. 62-63) • Uses tables and/or figures to summarize ideas when appropriate and “always tell[s] the reader what to look for... and provides sufficient explanation to make them readily intelligible” (APA, p. 125)

Guiding Question 4: How well and fully documented is the review?

Needs Revision	Acceptable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cites and discusses few or no reports of empirical studies relevant to the research question or problem • Refers to and discusses few relevant review articles when these articles are available • Cites and uses few or no relevant theoretical articles, methodological articles, and case studies when these articles are available • Uses quotations when paraphrase is appropriate or quotes inaccurately and/or unconventionally or distorts meaning through ellipsis • Does not credit all sources (plagiarism) • Uses reference citations in text inappropriately • Presents an incomplete reference list or presents a bibliography or presents citations unconventionally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cites and discusses reports of empirical studies relevant to the research question or problem • Refers to and discusses relevant review articles • Cites and uses relevant theoretical articles, methodological articles, and case studies as appropriate • Uses quotations appropriately, accurately, and conventionally (APA, pp. 117 – 120) • Credits all sources whether paraphrasing or quoting • Uses reference citations appropriately in text (APA, pp. 207 – 214) • Presents a reference list (not a bibliography) including “works that specifically support” the review (APA, p. 215)

Guiding Question 5: How well does the review follow APA Editorial Style?

Needs Revision	Acceptable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates occasional or consistent noncompliance with the APA Editorial Guidelines “to ensure clear, consistent presentation of the printed word” in matters of punctuation, hyphenation, spelling, abbreviations, tables, headings, grammar, citations, and references (APA, p. 77) • Presents statistics in text in a manner that conflicts with APA conventions (pp. 138 – 147) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates compliance with the APA Editorial Guidelines “to ensure clear, consistent presentation of the printed word” in matters of punctuation, hyphenation, spelling, abbreviations, tables, headings, grammar, citations, and references (APA, p. 77) • Presents statistics in text in accordance with APA conventions (pp. 138 – 147)