

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]

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Critical thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Information literacy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3. Written communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Oral communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Creative thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. Team work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Problem solving |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15. Global learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 19. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above: |

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

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

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

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?

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
 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)? **Yes**

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:

During the 2014-2015 academic year, the MA in Education, Special Education Concentration program faculty revised our five learning outcome domains and the 33 program competencies relating to knowledge, skills and dispositions across the five domains. **The five program learning outcome domain areas are: 1. Special Education Content Expertise; 2. Leadership/Change Agent; 3. Critical and Creative Inquiry; 4. Research: Qualitative and Quantitative; and 5. Academic Communication through Oral and Written Presentation.** Please see Appendix I for the details regarding the 33 program competencies corresponding to the five learning outcome domains.

These learning outcome domains and program competencies appear to correspond to PLO assessment areas: #1 Critical thinking, #2 Information literacy, #3 Written communication, #4 Oral communication, #5 Quantitative literacy, #6 Inquiry and analysis, #7 Creative thinking, #9 Team work, #10 Problem solving, #16 Integrative and applied learning, and #18 Overall competencies in the major/discipline.

This year, we selected to directly assess Academic Communication, specifically Written Presentation/Communication.

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

- 1. Yes, for all PLOs
- 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):
The PLO selected to illustrate how we conducted our assessment is **Academic Communication, specifically Written Presentation/Communication.** This year, the Special Education faculty directly assessed **Academic Written Communication** through one key summative assessment—MA Comprehensive Exam (the majority, 16 out of 17 MA students who completed the program this academic year selected this culminating experience).

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

- 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]**

Please see attached rubric in Appendix II used to evaluate the MA in Special Education Comprehensive Exam responses. Students taking the exam must pass four out of five questions with a minimum score of 8.0 (out of a 10 point scale).

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 the rubric that measures the PLO:

	Q2.5	Q2.6	Q2.7
	(1) PLO	(2) Standards of Performance	(3) Rubrics
1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO	X	X	X
2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO			
3. In the student handbook/advising handbook			
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?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (Skip to **Q6**)
- 3. Don't know (Skip to **Q6**)
- 4. N/A (Skip to **Q6**)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO in 2014-2015?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (Skip to **Q6**)
- 3. Don't know (Skip to **Q6**)
- 4. N/A (Skip to **Q6**)

<p>Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methods/measures in total did you use to assess this PLO? 1</p>	<p>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]</p> <p>Students in the Special Education program who select to have the MA Comprehensive Exam be their culminating experience enrolled in EDS 298: Master’s Seminar in Special Education in Spring 2015 semester. The first week in May, they completed the exam in a computer lab on campus. Students responded in writing to two questions that are considered cross-categorical, assessing their broad 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 or moderate/severe disabilities).</p> <p>The Special Education MA faculty (five members) scored the exams. Prior to the exam, the faculty met to calibrate their scoring by reading and evaluating three practice exam responses. Two faculty members scored each student response and both must rate a written response as 8.0 or above. When there was disagreement regarding a student response to a question where one faculty scored the response with 8.0 or above and the other faculty scored the response below 8.0 (not passing), a third faculty member scored the student’s response.</p>
---	---

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

<p>Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.7) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don’t know (Go to Q3.7)</p>	<p>Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures were used? [Check all that apply]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Key assignments from elective classes <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques <input type="checkbox"/> 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects <input type="checkbox"/> 6. E-Portfolios <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Other portfolios <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8. Other measure. Specify: Comprehensive Written Culminating Exam</p>
<p>Q3.3.2. Please attach the direct measure you used to collect data. Please see Appendix II for the rubric utilized for the MA in Special Education Comprehensive Exam.</p>	

<p>Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? [Select only one]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (Go to Q3.5) <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (see Appendix II for rubric) <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty <input type="checkbox"/> 5. The VALUE rubric(s) <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Used other means. Specify:</p>		
---	--	--

<p>Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don’t know <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A</p>	<p>Q3.4.2. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don’t know <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A</p>	<p>Q3.4.3. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don’t know <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A</p>
---	--	---

<p>Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO? 5</p>		<p>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)?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	
<p>Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]? We assessed 16 out of 16 students who completed the MA comprehensive exam.</p>		<p>Q3.6.1. How did you decide how many samples of student work to review? Special Education MA Program faculty decided to assess all the students who planned to take the MA comprehensive exam in Spring 2015.</p>	
<p>Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program? 16 students were enrolled in EDS 298: Master's Seminar in Special Education which culminates in students taking the MA comprehensive exam.</p>	<p>Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluate? 16</p>	<p>Q3.6.4. Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	
<p>Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)</p>			
<p>Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Skip to Q3.8) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know		<p>Q3.7.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply]</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE) <input type="checkbox"/> 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. College/Department/program student surveys <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Other, specify:	
<p>Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided?</p>		<p>Q3.7.4. If surveys were used, what was the response rate?</p>	
<p>Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample.</p>			
<p>Q3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)</p>			
<p>Q3.8. Were external benchmarking data such as licensing exams or standardized tests used to assess the PLO?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.8.2) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know		<p>Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures were used?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams <input type="checkbox"/> 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Other, specify:	

Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.9) <input type="checkbox"/> 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? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	Q3.9.1. Were ALL the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 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]

Table 1: Results for PLO Academic Communication-Written Presentation/Communication

Assessment Tool	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
Culminating Experience: % passed 4 out of 5 written comprehensive exam responses	MA comprehensive exam only offered in Spring Semester	N=16; passed = 100%

--	--	--

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 key assessment analyzed was student performance on the culminating experience, MA Comprehensive Written Exam. Based on the standards and the criteria from the Special Education Master's Comprehensive Exam Rubric in Appendix II, all 16 of the MA in Special Education students passed the exam and met the standard for the PLO, Academic Communication, specifically Written Presentation/Communication.

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

- 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)?

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 (**In Development**)
 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]

This year, the PLOs were assessed through one key summative assessment, the MA Culminating Experience (Comprehensive Exam). Based on this assessment, all 16 students met the criteria/standard for the program learning outcome of academic communication, written presentation/communication.

Due to recent changes in the program, it was determined that it would not be reliable data if we used our previous formative assessment, the Review of Literature, for the 2014-15 assessment plan. Previously, we used the Review of the Literature that students completed while enrolled in EDS 250: Education Research. as a signature assignment . As of Fall 2013, all students admitted into the program are required to take EDGR 260: Writing and Research Across the Disciplines to not only fulfill part of the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) and a prerequisite to EDS 250 and other core courses, but also to assist students in strengthening their skills in evaluation, synthesizing and writing about research related to special education topics and issues. In the academic year 2014-2015, there was still a number of students enrolled in EDS 250 that had not been required to take EDGR 260 (i.e., admitted prior to Fall 2013). It is predicted that all of our students enrolled in EDS 250 during the 2015-2016 year will have taken EDGR 260 and therefore, we are planning to assess student performance on Review of Literature assignment completed in EDS 250 this coming academic year.

Special Education MA faculty are in the process of using the data from 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 to develop a curriculum map, modify core course curriculum (i.e., EDS 250: Education Research; EDS 251: Education in a Pluralistic, Democratic Society; and EDS 297: Current Issues in Special Education) and to identify additional signature assignments to offer formative assessment measures of students during the program.

Special Education MA faculty are also in the process of developing a formalized assessment tool to evaluate a student's MA thesis or project (the other options for the culminating experience).

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			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. Recruitment of new students			X		
23. Other Specify:					
<p>Q5.2.1. Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above.</p> <p>Special Education MA faculty used the data from 2013-2014 to revise the program learning outcomes and related competencies.</p> <p>Special Education MA faculty are in the process of using the data from 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 to modify core course curriculum (i.e., EDS 250: Education Research; EDS 251: Education in a Pluralistic, Democratic Society; and EDS 297: Current Issues in Special Education) and to develop signature assignments to offer formative assessment of students.</p> <p>Special Education MA faculty are also in the process of developing a formalized assessment tool to evaluate a student's MA thesis or project (the other options for the culminating experience).</p>					

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]**

NA

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

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1. Critical thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Information literacy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3. Written communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Oral communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Creative thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. Team work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Problem solving |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15. Global learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 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:

Appendix I: Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)—MA in Education, Special Education Concentration (Revised February 2015)

Appendix II: Rubric for MA in Special Education Comprehensive Exam

Program Information

<p>P1. Program/Concentration Name(s): MA in Education, Special Education Concentration</p> <p>P1.1. Report Authors: Jean Gonsier-Gerdin</p>	<p>P2. Program Director: Jean Gonsier-Gerdin (Program Coordinator)</p> <p>P2.1. Department Chair: Susan Heredia (Graduate Coordinator and Dept. Chair)</p>										
<p>P3. Academic unit: Department, Program, or College: Graduate and Professional Studies in Education</p>	<p>P4. College: Education</p>										
<p>P5. Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit (See Department Fact Book 2014 by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2014 enrollment): 65</p>	<p>P6. Program Type: [Select only one]</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30px;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>2. Credential</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>3. Master's degree</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>5. Other. Please specify:</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Credential	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3. Master's degree	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d)	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Other. Please specify:
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major										
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Credential										
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3. Master's degree										
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d)										
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Other. Please specify:										
<p>Undergraduate Degree Program(s): P7. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has:</p> <p>P7.1. List all the name(s):</p> <p>P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?</p>	<p>Master Degree Program(s): P8. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: Approximately 15</p> <p>P8.1. List all the name(s): Multicultural Education; Child Development; Counselor Education (Career; Marriage & Family; School/Pupil Personnel; Vocational Rehabilitation); Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (K-12; High Education); Special Education; School Psychology and Teacher Education (Curriculum & Instruction; Gender Equity; Educational Technology, i-MET; Language & Literacy).</p> <p>P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? 1</p>										

Credential Program(s): P9. Number of credential programs the academic unit has: P9.1. List all the names:			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								X		
P12. Last updated									X	
								1. Yes	2. No	3. Don't Know
P13. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?									X (plan to develop for 2015-16)	
P14. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of student learning occurs in the curriculum?								X (but in process of being revised)		
P15. Does the program have any capstone class?								X		
P16. Does the program have ANY capstone project?								X		

**Appendix I: Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) --
MA in Education, Special Education Concentration
(final revisions February 2015)**

#1: Special Education Content Expertise

Knowledge:

- Demonstrate current knowledge of evidence-based practices in the field of special education, including but not limited to the following: positive behavioral supports, universal design for learning, inclusive education, literacy instruction, teaching English Language learners with and without disabilities, special education law and policies, transition planning, assessment practices.
- Demonstrate current knowledge of evidence-based instructional models and service delivery approaches for meeting the needs of students with disabilities.

Skills:

- Uses technology to identify, locate and access resources on special education curriculum and instruction.
- Reads and analyzes literature in key content areas (mild/moderate disabilities, moderate/severe disabilities, or early childhood special education).
- Evaluates special education policies and practices critically using research to support position.
- Demonstrates knowledge of Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards and how to apply these standards to curriculum and instruction of students with and without disabilities.

Dispositions:

- Approaches knowledge as dynamic, not static.
- Becomes empowered to make decisions on curriculum and instruction that meets the needs of students with diverse abilities.

#2: Leadership/Change Agent

Knowledge:

- Demonstrates knowledge of the U.S. public school system, including its history of social inequities for individuals with various cultural backgrounds and abilities.
- Demonstrates knowledge of the nature of systems change per special education.

Skills:

- Writes a critical review and analysis of special education issues and trends.
- Based on a logical position, proposes recommendations for change to further system improvement within special education service delivery.
- Demonstrates cultural competence in both written and oral communication.

Dispositions:

- Collaborates with others in informing public about special education issues and concerns within schools.
- Determines ways to facilitate change and collaborate in their work environment.

#3: Critical and Creative Inquiry**Knowledge:**

- Demonstrates knowledge of problem solving for individual child, classroom and school systems levels.

Skills:

- Analyzes a problem in the field of special education and identifies appropriate solutions through critical thinking and examination of current research.
- Assesses existing curriculum and its impact on student learning and overall goals of special education.
- Demonstrates the scientific method of gathering information and gaining knowledge

Dispositions:

- Understands and values the need for research in special education as an ongoing dynamic field.

#4: Research—Qualitative and Quantitative**Knowledge:**

- Demonstrates knowledge of quantitative research methods.
- Demonstrates knowledge of qualitative research methods.

Skills:

- Applies basic descriptive, statistical tools to interpret numerical data.
- Applies and interprets qualitative data collection and analysis in research studies
- Reads and interprets numerical data in research studies and applies appropriate statistical methods for analysis to research proposals.

Dispositions:

- Understands the importance of internal and external validity methods, including social validity.
- Understands the importance of making valid conclusions and inferences from data.

#5: Academic Communication through Oral and Written Presentation**Knowledge:**

- Demonstrates the conventions of academic writing (e.g., the traditional journal article, the review of literature).
- Utilizes current APA format and principles regulating titles and headings, documentation, citations, and related matters.

Skills:

- Synthesizes a body of literature on a topic demonstrated by writing a literature review.
- Composes academic prose and oral presentation for a variety of audiences, including peers, professors, and the larger scholarly and professional community.

Dispositions:

- Values academic discourse related to special education issues.
- Values collaboration, peer review, and professional feedback toward improving written and oral communication.

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. 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>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>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>8.5-8.9</p> <p>9.0-9.4</p> <p>9.5-10</p>
---	--