Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1. Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) **did you assess in 2014-2015**? **[Check all that apply]**

	1. Critical thinking
	2. Information literacy
	3. Written communication
	4. Oral communication
	5. Quantitative literacy
x	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement
	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. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above:

    a.
    b.
    c.

Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

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

Q1.4. Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC)?

x	1. Yes
	2. No (Go to **Q1.5**)
	3. Don't know (Go to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1. If the answer to Q1.4 is yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

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

Q1.5. Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
x	2. No, but I know what the DQP is
	3. No, I don't know what the DQP is.
	4. Don't know

Q1.6. Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable (See Attachment I)?

Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs were **explicitly** linked to the Sac State BLGs:
This is the report for the Education Specialist Mild-Moderate Disabilities and Multiple Subject Dual Teaching Credential Program.

Q1.2.1. Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

	1. Yes, for all PLOs
x	2. Yes, but for some PLOs
	3. No rubrics for PLOs
	N/A, other (please specify):

IN QUESTIONS 2 THROUGH 5, REPORT IN DETAIL ON ONE PLO THAT YOU ASSESSED IN 2014-2015

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the selected PLO

Q 2.1. Specify one PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you checked the correct box for this PLO in Q1.1):
We assessed candidates' ability to analyze data related to student learning and make instructional decisions based on that process.

Q2.2. Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know
	4. N/A

Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s) and standard of performance that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix: **[Word limit: 300]**
See Appendix A. A majority of scores of "2" is considered passing.

Q2.4. Please indicate the category in which the selected PLO falls into.

	1. Critical thinking
	2. Information literacy
	3. Written communication
	4. Oral communication
	5. Quantitative literacy
x	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement
	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. Other:

Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard of performance, and the rubric that measures the PLO:

	Q2.5 (1) PLO	Q2.6 (2) Standards of Performance	Q2.7 (3) Rubrics
1. In **SOME** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO			
2. In **ALL** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO	x	x	X
3. In the student handbook/advising handbook	X		x
4. In the university catalogue			
5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters			
6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources or activities	x	x	x
7. In 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. Other, specify:			

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO in 2014-2015?	Q3.2. **If yes**, was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO in 2014-2015?
[x] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No (Skip to **Q6**) [ ] 3. Don't know (Skip to **Q6**) [ ] 4. N/A (Skip to **Q6**)	[x] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No (Skip to **Q6**) [ ] 3. Don't know (Skip to **Q6**) [ ] 4. N/A (Skip to **Q6**)
Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? 1	Q3.2A Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected (see Attachment II)? **[Word limit: 300]** The PLO is assessed in EDS221/Language and Literacy in Inclusive Classrooms.

Q3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios)

Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO?	Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures were used? **[Check all that apply]**
[x] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No (Go to **Q3.7**) [ ] 3. Don't know (Go to **Q3.7**) Q3.3.2. Please attach the direct measure you used to collect data. See Appendix B	[ ] 1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences [x] 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program [ ] 3. Key assignments from elective 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 [ ] 8. Other measure. Specify:

Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? **[Select only one]**

[ ] 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (Go to **Q3.5**)
[ ] 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
[ ] 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
[ ] 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
[ ] 5. The VALUE rubric(s)
[ ] 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
[x] 7. Used other means. Specify: Used rubric approved by our state accreditation agency.

Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?	Q3.4.2. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric?	Q3.4.3. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?
[x] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No [ ] 3. Don't know [ ] 4. N/A	[x] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No [ ] 3. Don't know [ ] 4. N/A	[x] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No [ ] 3. Don't know [ ] 4. N/A

Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO? All faculty. This is a state mandated assessment process.	Q3.5.1. If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)? [x] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No [ ] 3. Don't know

Q3.6. How did you **select** the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]? All candidates are assessed. No sampling.	**Q3.6.1.** How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program? 13	**Q3.6.3.** How many samples of student work did you evaluate? all	**Q3.6.4.** Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate? [x] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No [ ] 3. Don't know

Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO? [ ] 1. Yes [x] 2. No (Skip to **Q3.8**) [ ] 3. Don't know	**Q3.7.1.** Which of the following indirect measures were used? **[Check all that apply]** [ ] 1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE) [ ] 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR) [ ] 3. College/Department/program 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. Other, specify:
Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided?	
Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample.	**Q3.7.4. If** surveys were used, what was the response rate?

Q3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8. Were external benchmarking data such as licensing exams or standardized tests used to assess the PLO? [x] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No (Go to **Q3.8.2**) [ ] 3. Don't know	**Q3.8.1.** Which of the following measures were 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. Other, specify: Licensure standards
Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO? [ ] 1. Yes [x] 2. No (Go to **Q3.9**) [ ] 3. Don't know (Go to **Q3.9**)	**Q3.8.3.** If other measures were used, please specify:

Q3D: Alignment and Quality

Q3.9. Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO? [x] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No [ ] 3. Don't know	**Q3.9.1.** 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 4: Data, Findings and Conclusions

Q4.1. Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions: (see Attachment III)
[Word limit: 600 for selected PLO]

The overall average score for this assessment was 95.75% (out of 100%). 76% of the candidates scored in the top quartile of scores. Candidates received extensive feedback on initial drafts of this assessment and they are prepared both in the course through their field experience. Because the assessment evaluates a foundational teaching skill, it is imperative that they demonstrate mastery, as the assessment scores indicate they have.

Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

The candidates are doing well and have met the program standard. These data suggest that our candidates are exiting our program with a strong foundation for teaching literacy to students with disabilities.

Q4.3. For **selected** PLO, the student performance:

x	1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
	2. **Met** expectation/standard
	3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
	4. **Did not meet** expectation/standard
	5. No expectation or standard has been specified
	6. Don't know

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2014-2015** and based on the prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

x	1. Yes
	2. No (Go to **Q6**)
	3. Don't know (Go to **Q6**)

Q5.1.2. Do you have a plan to assess the impact of the changes that you anticipate making?

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

Q5.1.1. Please describe what changes you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes. **[Word limit: 300 words]**

These candidates in the dual credential program scored somewhat lower on this assessment than those in the mild/moderate credential program only. Because they are receiving additional instruction (relative to the other group) and complete more field experience, it is reasonable to anticipate they would have higher scores. Faculty will need to examine specific contextual factors about when the assessment is administered to the two groups, any relative strengths or weaknesses of individual students in the two groups, etc. to try to explain this counter-factual result.

Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (**2013 - 2014**) been used so far? **[Check all that apply]**

	(1) Very Much	(2) Quite a Bit	(3) Some	(4) Not at all	(8) N/A
1. Improving specific courses		x			
2. Modifying curriculum		x			
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					
8. Program review					
9. Prospective student and family information					
10. Alumni communication					
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					
12. Program accreditation					
13. External accountability reporting requirement					
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					
15. Strategic planning					
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			
22. Recruitment of new students					
23. Other Specify:					

Q5.2.1. Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above.

The data are reviewed by program faculty and the faculty discuss specific changes that can be made. One change that resulted from the last cycle of program improvement was to have candidates design their own assessment rather than using one provided by a textbook publishers. We believe that this will help to further hone candidates' skills in assessment.

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to PLOs (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on the program elements, please briefly report your results here. **[Word limit: 300]**

Our program collects data on a range of program elements not included in this report. Candidates are assessed throughout the program, both in course work and in their field experience. Overall, our results indicate that candidates are developing the competencies needed to be effective beginning teachers in special education and general education settings.

Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking
	2. Information literacy
	3. Written communication
	4. Oral communication
	5. Quantitative literacy
x	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement
	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. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above:

a.
b.
c.

Q8. Have you attached any appendices? If yes, please list them all here:
A

Program Information

P1. Program/Concentration Name(s): Education Specialist-Mild/Moderate Disabilities Teaching Credential **P1.1.** Report Authors: Pia Wong	**P2.** Program Director: Pia Wong **P2.1.** Department Chair: Pia Wong
P3. Academic unit: Department, Program, or College: Teaching Credentials	**P4.** College: Education
P5. Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit *(See [Department Fact Book 2014](#) by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2014 enrollment:* Fact Book does not reflect new college structure. New students in the EDS dual program in fall 2014 totaled 21.	**P6.** Program Type: **[Select only one]** ☐ 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major [x] 2. Credential ☐ 3. Master's degree ☐ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d) ☐ 5. Other. Please specify:
Undergraduate Degree Program(s): **P7.** Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: **P7.1.** List all the name(s): **P7.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?	***Master Degree Program(s):*** **P8.** Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: **P8.1.** List all the name(s): **P8.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program?
Credential Program(s): **P9.** Number of credential programs the academic unit has: 6 **P9.1.** List all the names: Multiple subject, single subject, special education-mild/moderate, special education-moderate/severe, special education-early childhood, bilingual authorization	***Doctorate Program(s)*** **P10.** Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: **P10.1.** List all the name(s):

When was your assessment plan?	1. Before 2007-08	2. 2007-08	3. 2008-09	4. 2009-10	5. 2010-11	6. 2011-12	7. 2012-13	8. 2013-14	9. 2014-15	10. No formal plan
P11. Developed										
P12. Last updated								x		

	1. Yes	2. No	3. Don't Know
P13. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?	x		
P14. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?	x		
P15. Does the program have any capstone class?		x	
P16. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?	x		

Appendix A: Rubric for assessing candidates' ability to conduct inquiry and analysis

ASSESSMENT		ANALYZING STUDENT WORK FROM AN ASSESSMENT	
EM6: **How does the candidate demonstrate an understanding of student performance with respect to standards/objectives?** (TPEs 1,3)			
Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
• The criteria/rubric and analysis have **little connection** with the identified standards/objectives. OR • Student **work samples do not support the conclusions** in the analysis.	• The criteria/rubric and analysis **focus on what students did right or wrong** in relationship to identified standards/objectives. • The analysis of whole class performance describes **some differences in levels** of student learning for the content assessed.	• The criteria/rubric and analysis **focus on patterns of student errors, skills, and understandings** to analyze student learning in relation to standards and learning objectives. • Specific patterns are identified for **individuals or subgroup(s)** in addition to the whole class.	All components of Level 3 plus: • The criteria/rubric and analysis focus on **partial understandings** as well. • The analysis is **clear and detailed.**

ASSESSMENT		USING ASSESSMENT TO INFORM TEACHING	
EM7: **How does the candidate use the analysis of student learning to propose next steps in instruction?** (TPEs 3,4)			
Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
• Next steps are **vaguely related to or not aligned with the identified** student needs. OR • Next steps are **not described in sufficient detail** to understand them. OR • Next steps are **based on inaccurate conclusions** about student learning from the assessment analysis.	• Next steps focus on improving student performance through **general support that addresses some identified student needs**. • Next steps are **based on accurate conclusions about student performance** on the assessment and are described in sufficient detail to understand them.	• Next steps focus on improving student performance through **targeted support** to individuals and groups to address specific **identified-needs**. • Next steps are **based on whole class patterns** of performance and **some patterns for individuals and/or subgroups** and are described in sufficient detail to understand them.	All components of Level 3 plus: • Next steps demonstrate a **strong understanding** of both the identified **content and language standards/objectives** and of **individual students and/or subgroups**.