THESE REFERENCES IN YOUR REPORT.	ERS TO SAC STATE BACCALAUREATE LEARNING GOALS. PLEASE IGNORE				
	m Learning Outcomes				
Question 1: Progra 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	Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university? x				
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.	Q1.5. Did your program use the <u>Degree Qualification Profile</u> (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)? 1. Yes 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 ab above and other information such as how your specific PLOs we State BLGs: This is the report for the Education Specialist-Moderate/Severe Disabil	ere explicitly linked to the Sac your PLOs?				

IN QUESTIONS 2 THROUGH 5, REPORT IN DETAIL ON UNE PLU THAT YOU ASSESSED IN 2014-2015

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the select	ed 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 develop diagnoses of student behavior and learning, to collect data on student behavior and performance, and to create learning and behavior intervention plans based on that process. Q2.2. Has the property adopted explication for this PLO? X 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't kn 4. N/A 4.	i t standards o	•	ance
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 data table and Appendix A			
See data table and Appendix A			
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 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	Q2.5	Q2.6	Q2.7
the rubric that measures the PLO:	(1) PLO	(2) Standards of Performance	(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			
3. In the student handbook/advising handbook	X	Х	Х
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 activities7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university	X	Х	Х
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:	ı		i
Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation	on of		

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the <u>Selected</u> PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collect 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) Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/method did you use to assess this PLO?		Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for this PLO in 2014-2015? X				
1		means were data collected (see Attachment II)? [Word limit: 300 The PLO is assessed as a part of the candidate's student teaching experience.				
		ignments, proje	, ,			
portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO? x 1. Yes 2. No (Go to Q3.7) 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.7)	1. Yes 2. No (Go to Q3.7) 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.7) 2. Key assignments from required classes in the programments from elective classes 3. 3. 2. Please attach the direct measure you used to collect ata. 2. Key assignments from elective classes 4. Classroom based performance assessments such simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques					
Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? [Select of the content of the co	ence (Go to Q3.5) ne faculty who teaches group of faculty y a group of faculty		o our state			
Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? x 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know 4. N/A	Q3.4.2. Was the direct assignment, thesis, et and explicitly with the x 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know 4. N/A	cc.) aligned directly	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			
Q3.5. How many faculty members participat assessment data collection of the selected Pl All faculty. This is a state mandated assessment p	LO?		as evaluated by multiple scorers, was there procedure to make sure everyone was			

Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student projects, portfolios, etc.]? All candidates are assessed. No sampling.	dent work [papers,	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?			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 M	leasures (survey	s, focus groups,	interviews, etc.)			
Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to asses 1. Yes x 2. No (Skip to Q3.8) 3. Don't know Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the s	ample size decided?	1. National stud 2. University co 3. College/Depa 4. Alumni surve 5. Employer sur 6. Advisory boa 7. Other, specifi	Ident surveys (e.g., NSSE) Inducted student surveys (e.g. OIR) Introducted student surveys Introducted student surveys Introducted student surveys Introducted student surveys Interviews I			
Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify your sample.	Thow you selected	Q3.7.4. II surveys w	ere used, what was the response rate?			
Q3C: Other Med	asures (external	benchmarking,	licensing exams,			
	standardize	d tests, etc.)				
Q3.8. Were external benchmarking data surlicensing exams or standardized tests used assess the PLO? 1. Yes 2. No (Go to Q3.8.2) 3. Don't know	1. Natio 2. Gene 3. Othe	eral knowledge and sk	s or state/professional licensure exams ills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc.) edge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc.)			
Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to asses 1. Yes 2. No (Go to Q3.9) 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.9)	ss the PLO?	Q3.8.3. If other mea	sures were used, please specify:			
	Q3D: Alignme	nt and Quality				
Q3.9. Did the data, including the direct mea different assessment tools/measures/meth PLO? x 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know			ALL the assessment es/methods that were used good measures now			

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 candidates on this assessment was 3.85 out of 4.0.
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 overall average score on this assessment approaches mastery (level 4) and indicates that our candidates have developed high quality skills in
this domain of professional practice.
 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

		/01 1	-1 -			
Question 5: Use of Assessm	nent Data	(Closing	the Loc	op)		
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)? 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]					
Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (2013 - 2014)	been used so	far? [Check all th	at applyl			
Q3.2. Now have the assessment data from last year (2013 - 2014)	(1) Very Much	(2) Quite a Bit	(3) Some	(4) Not at all	(8) N/A	
Improving specific courses						
2. Modifying curriculum						
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		1		1		
15. Strategic planning		1		1		
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. These data indicate an area of relative weakness for our program. As a faculty we have identified where specific knowledge and skills are introduced, practiced, deepened and evaluated in our program. But we have not yet fully operationalized all aspects of this program alignment process with respect to this performance domain.						
Additional Asses	ssment A	ctivities				

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 candidate performance indicators these assessments affirm that candidates are competent in the basic domain.					
these assessments arithmental candidates are competent in the basic domi	ans of effective teaching.				
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 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, rubric for analyzing inquiry and analysis skills					
	farmatia a				
Program In	itormation				
P1. Program/Concentration Name(s):	P2. Program Director:				
Education Specialist-Moderate/Severe Disabilties Teaching Credential	Pia Wong				

P1.1. Report Authors: 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 <u>Department Fact</u> <u>Book 2014</u> by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2014 enrollment: Fact Book does not reflect new college structure. Fall enrollment in the EDS-Mod/Severe program was 29.			<u>x</u>	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): Master D			Master Degree Program(s): P8. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has:							
P7.1. List all the name(s):			P8.	P8.1. List all the name(s):						
P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?				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			P10	P10. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has:						
P9.1. List all the names: Multiple subject, single subject, special education-mild/moderate, special education-moderate/severe, special education-early childhood, bilingual authorization				P10.1. List all the name(s):						
When was your assessment plan?	1. Before 2007-08	2. 2007-08	3. 2008-09	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								х		
							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?					х					
P15. Does the program have any capstone class?				х						
P16. Does the program have ANY capstone project?					х					

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

SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENT AND INSTRUCTION

Unsatisfactory	Emerging	Developing Proficiency	Proficiency
Is having difficulty understanding, not using feedback.	Is struggling to understand how to do this. Needs more work.	Beginning to develop skills in this area. Needs more practice.	Effectively develops systematic strategies for assessing a wide range of skills.
Is having difficulty understanding, not using feedback.	Skills are just emerging.	Beginning to develop skills in this area. Needs more practice.	Utilizes data and other team input to develop measurable and robust goals.
Does not see the need for this; having trouble understanding	Trying hard to understand how to do this.	Beginning to develop skills in this area. Needs more practice.	Designs systematic instructional plans for direct instruction across domains.
Still having difficulty with Systematic instruction. Needs More work.	Still struggling with the concepts, and not yet ready to train others.	Ready to begin to try to train others.	Trains other staff to implement systematic instruction.
Does not understand the need for this. Needs direct instruction.	Still struggling to take data.	Beginning to develop skills in this area. Needs more practice.	Utilizes data regularly within the context of instruction and to differentiate instruction and monitor progress.