

## 2016-2017 Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our [website](#)  
or [contact us](#) for more help.

Please begin by selecting your program name in the drop down. If the program name is not listed, please enter it below:

MA Special Education

OR

### Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

#### Q1.1.

Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), and emboldened Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) **did you assess?** [Check all that apply]

- ☐ 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, Competency, and Perspectives
- ☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☐ 15. Global Learning and Perspectives
- ☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- ☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☒ 18. Overall Disciplinary Knowledge
- ☐ 19. Professionalism
- ☐ 20. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a.

b.

c.

#### Q1.2.

Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information including how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State **BLGs/GLGs**:

The MA in Education, Special Education Concentration Program Learning Outcomes has 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) Academic Communication through Oral and Written Presentation; 3) Critical and Creative Inquiry; 4) Research-Qualitative and Quantitative; and 5) Leadership/Change Agent.

These program learning outcome domains and competencies appear to correspond to the following 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, #11 Civic Knowledge and Engagement, #12 Intercultural Knowledge and Competency, #16 Interactive and Applied Learning, and #18 Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline.

In addition, the program learning outcome domains and competencies correspond to the six Institutional Graduate Learning Goals for Master's Programs: 1) Disciplinary Knowledge; 2) Communication; 3) Critical Thinking/Analysis; 4) Information Literacy; 5) Professionalism; and 6) Intercultural/Global Perspectives.

**SELECTED PLOs FOR THIS ASSESSMENT REPORT:** Written Communication and Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline (i.e., Special Education Content Expertise)

Special Education Graduate Students are able to demonstrate academic communication through oral and written presentation:  
Knowledge

- Demonstrate 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.

Special Education Graduate Students are able to demonstrate 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 and assessment practices.
- Demonstrate current knowledge of evidence-based instructional models and service delivery approaches for meeting the diverse 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.

#### 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
- ☐ 4. N/A
- ☐ 5. Other, specify:

#### 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 Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

- ☐ 1. Yes  
☒ 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)  
☐ 3. Don't know (skip 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", see <http://degreeprofile.org>) 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?

- ☒ 1. Yes  
☐ 2. No  
☐ 3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

## Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

**Q2.1.**

Select **OR** type in **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

Written Communication

If your PLO is **not listed**, please enter it here:

**Q2.1.1.**

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

Written Communication:

Special Education Graduate Students are able to demonstrate academic communication through oral and written presentation:

- 

**Knowledge**

- Demonstrate 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.

**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 **standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

The original assessment plan called for the specific PLO selected to be evaluated in the following MA required coursework/experiences:

- In EDS 250: Education Research, via guidelines for a research file and reference list and guidelines for a literature review paper on a topic of choice.
- In EDS 251: Education in a Democratic and Pluralistic Society, via a rubric for a research paper to explore a current problem in education using a critical pedagogical or social justice approach to view the problem.
- MA Written Comprehensive Exam--via a rubric developed to evaluate the comprehensive exam responses.

It is important to note some changes occurred to courses in Fall 2016 that impacted the assessment this year. First, there was low enrollment in EDS 250 and so the 5 students in the MA in Special Education program were required to enroll in EDC 250: Education Research. Due to the fact that the small number of students (n=5) and that the course was taught by an adjunct faculty, it was determined that for this year, an assignment for this course would not be used for program assessment purposes.

Secondly, again due to low enrollment in EDS 251, 8 students in the MA in Special Education program were required to enroll in EDTE 251: Education in a Democratic and Pluralistic Society. Since, the course was taught by the faculty member who usually teaches EDS 251, we decided to use the research paper from that course as an assignment to be used for program assessment purposes. However, the number of students (n=8) was small and due to changes in the program, some of the 8 (n=6) had previously taken a graduate writing intensive (GWI) course as a prerequisite and some (n=2) did not need to meet that requirement. These factors need to be taken into consideration when examining the assessment results from this course.

Finally, there were only 3 students who took the MA Written Comprehensive Exam in the academic year 2016-2017 so we believe the data from this source is too small to generalize or to be used to effectively evaluate the program.

Please see the attached rubric for evaluating students' research papers in EDTE 251-Education in a Democratic and Pluralistic Society. The standard for performance is that a student will earn at least 80 out of 100 points (receive a grade of A or B).

Please see the attached rubric for rating individual student responses on the MA in Special Education Exam. The standard for performance is that in order to pass the exam students must pass four out of five questions with a minimum score of 8.0 (out of a 10 point scale).



EDTE 251-Education in a Democratic and Pluralistic Society-Rubric to Evaluate Research Paper.pdf  
30.37 KB



MA Comprehensive Exam-Rubric for Rating Individual Student Responses.pdf  
23.8 KB

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdnd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the <b>PLO</b> , the <b>standard</b> of performance, and the <b>rubric</b> that was used to measure the PLO:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. In <b>SOME</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. In <b>ALL</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. In the university catalogue
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Other, specify: <input type="text"/>

### 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?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to Q6)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to Q6)
- ☐ 4. N/A (skip to Q6)

#### Q3.1.1.

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

#### Q3.2.

Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to Q6)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to Q6)
- ☐ 4. N/A (skip to Q6)

#### Q3.2.1.

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:

In EDTE 251: Education in a Democratic and Pluralistic Society during the Fall 2016 semester, the instructor evaluated each student's performance using a specific rubric that addresses components of written communication. As previously discussed in Q2.3., due to low enrollment in EDS 251, 8 students in the MA in Special Education program were required to enroll in EDTE 251: Education in a Democratic and Pluralistic Society. Since, the course was taught by the faculty member who usually teaches EDS 251, we decided to use the research paper from that course as an assignment to be used for program assessment purposes. However, the number of students (n=8) was small and due to changes in the program, some of the 8 (n=6) had previously taken a graduate writing intensive (GWI) course as a prerequisite and some (n=2) did not need to meet that requirement. These factors need to be taken into consideration when examining the assessment results from this course.

Students in the Special Education program who select to have the MA Comprehensive Exam to be their culminating experience enrolled in EDS 298: Master's Seminar in Special Education in the Spring 2017 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 ability to synthesize literature regarding critical issues related to the field of special education in general: one question related to research paradigms and demonstration of evidence-based practice; and two questions related to their special education area of expertise (i.e., mild/moderate disabilities, moderate/severe disabilities, or early childhood special education). The Special Education MA faculty (four members) scored the exams. Previously, the faculty calibrated their scoring by reading and evaluating two practice exam responses. Two faculty members scored each student response to a question and both must rate a written response as 8.0 or above for the student to pass that particular question. When there was disagreement regarding a student response to a question where one faculty scored a response with a 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. As previously discussed in Q2.3., there were only 3 students who took the MA Written Comprehensive Exam in the academic year 2016-2017 so we believe the data from this source is too small to generalize or to be used to effectively evaluate the program.

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

### Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

#### Q3.3.

Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to Q3.7)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to Q3.7)

#### Q3.3.1.

Which of the following direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) were used?

[Check all that apply]

- ☒ 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
- ☒ 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
- ☐ 3. Key assignments from elective classes
- ☐ 4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
- ☐ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
- ☐ 6. E-Portfolios
- ☐ 7. Other Portfolios
- ☐ 8. Other, specify:

#### Q3.3.2.

Please **provide** the direct measure (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, THEN **explain** how it assesses the PLO:

See attachments offered in Q2.3.



No file attached



No file attached

#### Q3.4.

What tool was used to evaluate the data?

- ☐ 1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to Q3.4.4.)
- ☐ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to Q3.4.2.)
- ☒ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to Q3.4.2.)
- ☐ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to Q3.4.2.)
- ☐ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to Q3.4.2.)
- ☐ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to Q3.4.2.)
- ☐ 7. Used other means (Answer Q3.4.1.)

#### Q3.4.1.

If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

- ☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to Q3.4.4.)
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to Q3.4.4.)

- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to Q3.4.4.)
- ☐ 4. Other, specify:  (skip to Q3.4.4.)

**Q3.4.2.**

Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

**Q3.4.3.**

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

**Q3.4.4.**

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- ☒ 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?

4

**Q3.5.1.**

How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

4

**Q3.5.2.**

If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

**Q3.6.**

How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?



All students matriculated in the MA in Education, Special Education Concentration program who enrolled in EDTE 251 during Fall 2016 and in EDS 298 during Spring 2017 were evaluated using the corresponding assessment measures. As previously discussed, due to low enrollment and other disparities within the sample, the results from the assessment may not be valid or effective in terms of evaluating the program.

**Q3.6.1.**

How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

Program faculty determined to evaluate all students matriculated in the MA in Education, Special Education Concentration program who enrolled in EDTE 251 during Fall 2016 and in EDS 298 during Spring 2017 using the corresponding measures in order to measure this PLO. As previously discussed in Q2.3., it was determined that the assignment from the Education Research course would not be appropriate to review this year due to the small number of students (n=5) and the fact that the course taken by the students (EDC 250) was taught by an adjunct faculty.

**Q3.6.2.**

How many students were in the class or program?

Fall 2016  
EDTE 251: 29 students  
enrolled in the course--8 of  
the students were from the

**Q3.6.3.**

How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

EDTE 251: Evaluated the 8  
students from the MA in  
Special Education program  
EDS 298: Evaluated the 3

**Q3.6.4.**

Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

## Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

**Q3.7.**

Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)
- ☐ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

**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 or focus groups
- ☐ 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:

**Q3.7.1.1.**

Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

 No file attached

 No file attached

**Q3.7.2.**

If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

**Q3.7.3.**

If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

**Q3.7.4.**

If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

Question 3C: 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?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
- ☐ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

**Q3.8.1.**

Which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

- ☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)
- ☐ 4. Other, specify:

**Q3.8.2.**

Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

**Q3.8.3.**

If other measures were used, please specify:



No file attached



No file attached

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

## Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

**Q4.1.**

Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in **Q2.1**:

Please see attached document.



Assessment Data for EDTE 251 Fall 2016 and EDS 298 (MA Comprehensive Exam) Spring 2017.pdf  
17.74 KB



No file attached

**Q4.2.**

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

Yes, based on the limited amount of data, the students are meeting or exceeding the performance standards for the PLO area of Written Communication.

It is important to note that due to the small number of students evaluated and the other changes to the program and disparities in students as discussed previously in Q2.3., we believe that these data are not sufficient to generalize or to be used to effectively evaluate the program.

The number of students in the core coursework and culminating experiences during 2016-2017 reflected the small number of students admitted to the MA in Special Education program in Spring 2015. The number admitted during subsequent admissions cycles (Spring 2016 and Spring 2017) has increased and it is anticipated that in future years, the number of students assessed will be larger and thus, the data should be sufficient to use for program assessment.

Also important to note, the faculty are in the process of developing a curriculum map and revising the program assessment plan to reflect recent changes in the program. For example, EDSP 290: Seminar for Culminating Experiences has been added to the program effective for students admitted for Fall 2017. In light of this change, EDS 250 will be revised. The students would not be taking the revised EDS 250 and the new EDS 290 until the academic year 2018-2019; however, the new curriculum, curriculum map, and program assessment plan is being developed and some aspects will be piloted during the 2017-2018 academic year.

[NOTE: As of Fall 2017, all courses for the MA in Education, Special Education Concentration program will have the code of EDSP.]



No file attached



No file attached

**Q4.3.**

For the 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/standard has been specified
- ☐ 6. Don't know

## Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

**Q4.4.**

Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

**Q4.5.**

Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

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

**Q5.1.**

As a result of the assessment effort and based on 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 (skip to Q5.2)  
☐ 3. Don't know (skip to Q5.2)

**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.

As previously discussed, we believe that the data collected to assess the PLO in 2016-2107 may not sufficeint to generalize or to be used to effectively evaluate the program.

Changes that we noted in last year's assessment report, as a result of data from previous years, is still in the process of being implemented as described in Q4.2. For that reason, what was shared in response to this question in the 2015-2016 program assessment report is still applicable and is shared below.

The MA in Special Education faculty have identified the need for a structured course to assist in competencies related to written communication and facilitate students' adequate progress toward the completion of the MA culminating experiences (thesis, project or comprehensive exam). Therefore, EDSP 290: Seminar for Culminating Experiences (3 units) has been added to the program effective with the students admitted for Fall 2017. [NOTE: As of Fall 2017, all courses for the MA in Education, Special Education Concentration program will have the code of EDSP.]

This seminar course will focus on topics, elements, and expectations for the culminating experience (thesis/project or comprehensive exam) that all relate to written communication.

For thesis or project options, the seminar will emphasize: abstract writing; development of organizational schemes for a literature review; data base literature searches; formal requirements; range and breadth of evidence for a comprehensive review; connecting the review with thesis/project; writing style and quality; revisions and critical feedback; thesis/project planning and time management; social/psychological dimensions of thesis/project process. Successful completion of the course for this option requires completion of Chapters 1 and 2 of the thesis/project and the beginning of Chapter 3.

For the culminating exam option, the seminar will emphasize: test preparation; exam writing; practice exam questions; time management; and community building with other students. Students will complete reading and writing assignments related to each exam area and prepare for an exam question related to approved elective topics of their choice. Students will submit an exam petition to be approved by the department exam committee, including an annotated bibliography and position papers related to the focal topics.

The program will assess the impact of these changes by evaluating students' performance on the MA Culminating Exam, the MA thesis and the MA project. The faculty are in the process of revising the rubric for the MA culminating exam and developing a formalized assessment to evaluate a student's MA thesis or project.

The revised curriculum, curriculum map, and program assessment plan is being developed and some aspects will be piloted during the 2017-2018 academic year.

**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

**Q5.2.**

Since your last assessment report, **how have the assessment data from then been used** so far?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Modifying curriculum	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Improving advising and mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals					

	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Annual assessment reports	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Program review	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Prospective student and family information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Alumni communication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Program accreditation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
13. External accountability reporting requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
15. Strategic planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
16. Institutional benchmarking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
17. Academic policy development or modifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
18. Institutional improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. New faculty hiring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Recruitment of new students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. Other, specify:	<input type="text"/>				

**Q5.2.1.**

Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

As described in Q5.1.1, the MA in Special Education faculty have used the assessment data from previous program assessment to propose changes to the program. In particular, the need for a structured course to assist in competencies related to written communication and to facilitate students' adequate progress toward the completion of the MA culminating experiences (thesis, project or comprehensive exam) was identified. Therefore, EDSP 290: Seminar for Culminating Experiences (3 units) has been added to the program effective with the students admitted for Fall 2017.

This seminar course will focus on topics, elements, and expectations for the culminating experience (thesis/project or comprehensive exam) that all relate to written communication.

For thesis or project options, the seminar will emphasize: abstract writing; development of organizational schemes for a literature review; data base literature searches; formal requirements; range and breadth of evidence for a comprehensive review; connecting the review with thesis/project; writing style and quality; revisions and critical feedback; thesis/project planning and time management; social/psychological dimensions of thesis/project process. Successful completion of the course for this option requires completion of Chapters 1 and 2 of the thesis/project and the beginning of Chapter 3.

For the culminating exam option, the seminar will emphasize: test preparation; exam writing; practice exam questions; time management; and community building with other students. Students will complete reading and writing assignments related to each exam area and prepare for an exam question related to approved elective topics of their choice. Students will submit an exam petition to be approved by the department exam committee, including an annotated bibliography and position papers related to the focal topics.

The revised curriculum, curriculum map, and program assessment plan is being developed and some aspects will be piloted during the 2017-2018 academic year. The goal is to have an updated curriculum map and program assessment plan that reflects and evaluates the MA in Education, Special Education Program Learning Outcomes (the five learning outcome domains and the 33 program competencies relating to knowledge, skills and dispositions across the five domains).

### Q5.3.

To what extent did you apply **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Program Learning Outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Standards of Performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Measures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Rubrics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Alignment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Data Collection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Use of Assessment Data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

### Q5.3.1.

Please share with us an example of how you applied **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:

Due to course changes and small number of students enrolled in the core courses and culminating experiences for the MA in Special Education program in 2016-2017, the feedback received from OAPA in response to last year's report were not really able to be applied effectively. One recommendation that was applied in this report is that no identifiable student information was included in the assessment report.

However, as the faculty revise the program assessment plan to be piloted in 2017-2018 and then implemented fully in 2018-2019, all of the recommendations from OAPA in response to the 2015-2016 assessment report will be taken into consideration. The following are some examples of how the faculty will be using the feedback. The MA Comprehensive Exam Scoring Rubric will be revised to more effectively assess writing skills and specific content knowledge in separate measures (i.e., not in a single measure). Specific program standards (i.e., 80% of students will score 8 or above on all parts of the Comprehensive Exam.) will be set, rather than relying on individual student performance standards. In addition to the assessments being developed in the new course (EDSP 290) in relation to assessing student written communication skills, critical thinking, and special education content expertise, we plan to assess how other core courses (250, 251, 297) and elective courses specifically teach written communication skills, critical thinking, and special education content expertise.

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

## Additional Assessment Activities

### Q6.

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

NA



No file attached



No file attached

### Q7.

What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? **[Check all that apply]**

- ☒ 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, Competency, and Perspectives
- ☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☐ 15. Global Learning and Perspectives



- ☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- ☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☒ 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- ☐ 19. **Professionalism**
- ☐ 20. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

- a.
- b.
- c.

**Q8.** Please attach any additional files here:



MA in Education, Special Education Concentration Program Learning Outcomes (May 2016).pdf  
66.92 KB



No file attached



No file attached



No file attached

**Q8.1.**

Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

EDTE 251: Education in a Democratic and Pluralistic Society--Rubric to Evaluate Research Paper

MA Comprehensive Exam--Rubric for Rating Individual Student Responses

Assessment Data for EDTE 251 Fall 2016 and EDS 298 (MA Culminating Exam) Spring 2017

MA in Education, Special Education Concentration Program Learning Outcomes aligned to Institutional Graduate Learning Objectives (last updated May 2016)

## Program Information (**Required**)

**Program:**

(If you typed your program name at the beginning, please skip to Q10)

**Q9.**

Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name appears above]

MA Special Education

**Q10.**

Report Author(s):

Dr. Jean Gonsier-Gerdin

**Q10.1.**

Department Chair/Program Director:

Dr. Elisabeth Liles (Department Chair)/Dr. Jean Gonsier-Gerdin (Program Coordinator)/Dr. Albert Lozano (Graduate Coordin...

**Q10.2.**

Assessment Coordinator:

None

**Q11.**

Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Education - Graduate

**Q12.**

College:

College of Education

**Q13.**

Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

Approximately 40 students

**Q14.**

Program Type:

- ☐ 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
- ☐ 2. Credential
- ☒ 3. Master's Degree
- ☐ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
- ☐ 5. Other, specify:

**Q15.** Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

N/A

**Q15.1.** List all the names:

**Q15.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

N/A

**Q16.** Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

**Q16.1.** List all the names:

MA in Education, Special Education Concentration

**Q16.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

1

**Q17.** Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

0

**Q17.1.** List all the names:

**Q18.** Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?


0

**Q18.1.** List all the names:

When was your <b>assessment plan...</b>	1. Before 2011-12	2. 2012-13	3. 2013-14	4. 2014-15	5. 2015-16	6. 2016-17	7. No Plan	8. Don't know
<b>Q19.</b> developed?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<b>Q19.1.</b> last updated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**Q19.2. (REQUIRED)**

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:

 No file attached


**Q20.**

Has your program developed a **curriculum map**?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

**Q20.1.**

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:

 No file attached

**Q21.**

Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

**Q22.**

Does your program have a capstone class?

- ☒ 1. Yes, indicate: EDS 298: Master's Seminar in Education; EDS 500: Masters of Arts Thesis-Special Education: EDS 501 Masters of Arts Project-Special Education
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

**Q22.1.**

Does your program have **any** capstone project?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

ver. 5.15/17

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 <b>significantly below passing</b>.</p>	<p><b>Ratings: 0-3.0</b></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 <b>significantly below passing</b>.</p>	<p><b>Ratings: 3.1-6.0</b></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 <b>below passing/marginal</b>.</p>	<p><b>Ratings: 6.1-7.9</b></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 <b>Marginal/passing</b>.</p>	<p><b>Ratings: 8.0-8.4</b></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 <b>passing</b>.</p>	<p><b>8.5-8.9</b></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 <b>high pass</b>.</p>	<p><b>9.0-9.4</b></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 <b>merit pass</b>.</p>	<p><b>9.5-10</b></p>

## **Assessment Data for EDTE 251 Fall 2016 & EDS 298 (MA Comprehensive Exam) Spring 2017**

### **EDTE 251: Education in a Democratic and Pluralistic Society—Grades for Students in MA in Special Education Program based on Rubric of Research Paper**

Student 1	A-
Student 2	A-
Student 3	A
Student 4	A-
Student 5	A-
Student 6	A-
Student 7	A
Student 8:	A

### **EDS 298 MA Comprehensive Exam Scores**

Student 1	Pass (All responses with at least minimum scores of 8.0 out of 10 point scale)
Student 2	Pass (All responses with at least minimum scores of 8.0 out of 10 point scale)
Student 3	Pass (All responses with at least minimum scores of 8.0 out of 10 point scale)

## MA in Education, Special Education Program Learning Outcomes (updated May 31, 2016)

Institutional Graduate Learning Objectives	Program Learning Outcomes
<p><b>Disciplinary Knowledge:</b> Master, integrate, and apply disciplinary knowledge and skills to current, practical, and important contexts and situations.</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Professionalism:</b> Demonstrate and understanding of professional integrity</p>	<p><b>Special Education Content Expertise</b></p> <p><b>Knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Demonstrate current knowledge of evidence-based instructional models and service delivery approaches for meeting the needs of students with disabilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Skills:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses technology to identify, locate and access resources on special education curriculum and instruction.</li> <li>• Reads and analyzes literature in key content areas (mild/moderate disabilities, moderate/severe disabilities, or early childhood special education).</li> <li>• Evaluates special education policies and practices critically using research to support position.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Dispositions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approaches knowledge as dynamic, not static.</li> <li>• Uses professional ethics, standards and policies as well as laws and regulations to make decisions on curriculum and instruction that meets the needs of students with diverse abilities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Communication:</b> Communicate key knowledge with clarity and purpose both within the discipline and in broader contexts.</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Information Literacy:</b> Demonstrate the ability to obtain, assess, and analyze information from a myriad</p>	<p><b>Academic Communication through Oral and Written Presentation</b></p> <p><b>Knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates the conventions of academic writing (e.g., the traditional journal article, the review of literature).</li> <li>• Utilizes current APA format and principles regulating titles and headings, documentation, citations, and related matters.</li> </ul> <p><b>Skills:</b></p>



<p>of sources <b>And</b></p> <p><b>Professionalism:</b> Demonstrate and understanding of professional integrity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Synthesizes a body of literature on a topic demonstrated by writing a literature review.</li> <li>• Composes academic prose and oral presentation for a variety of audiences, including peers, professors, and the larger scholarly and professional community.</li> </ul> <p><b>Dispositions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Values academic discourse related to special education issues.</li> <li>• Values collaboration, peer review, and professional feedback toward improving written and oral communication.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Critical Thinking/Analysis:</b> Demonstrate the ability to be creative, analytical, and critical thinkers.</p>	<p><b>Critical and Creative Inquiry</b></p> <p><b>Knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates knowledge of problem solving for individual child, classroom and school systems levels.</li> </ul> <p><b>Skills:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyzes a problem in the field of special education and identifies appropriate solutions through critical thinking and examination of current research.</li> <li>• Assesses existing curriculum and its impact on student learning and overall goals of special education.</li> <li>• Demonstrates the scientific method of gathering information and gaining knowledge</li> </ul> <p><b>Dispositions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understands and values the need for research in special education as an ongoing dynamic field.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Information Literacy:</b> Demonstrate the ability to obtain, assess, and analyze information from a myriad of sources</p>	<p><b>Research—Qualitative and Quantitative</b></p> <p><b>Knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates knowledge of quantitative research methods.</li> <li>• Demonstrates knowledge of qualitative research methods.</li> </ul> <p><b>Skills:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applies basic descriptive, statistical tools to interpret numerical data.</li> <li>• Applies and interprets qualitative data collection and analysis in research studies</li> <li>• Reads and interprets numerical data in research studies and applies appropriate statistical methods for analysis to research proposals.</li> </ul> <p><b>Dispositions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understands the importance of internal and external validity methods, including social validity.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understands the importance of making valid conclusions and inferences from data.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Critical Thinking/Analysis:</b> Demonstrate the ability to be creative, analytical, and critical thinkers.</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Professionalism:</b> Demonstrate and understanding of professional integrity</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Intercultural/Global Perspectives:</b> Demonstrate relevant knowledge and application of intercultural and/or global perspectives</p>	<p><b>Leadership/Change Agent Knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates knowledge of the U.S. public school system, including its history of social inequities for individuals with various cultural backgrounds and abilities as well as knowledge of international perspectives and systems of special education.</li> <li>• Demonstrates knowledge of the nature of systems change per special education.</li> </ul> <p><b>Skills:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writes a critical review and analysis of special education issues and trends.</li> <li>• Based on a logical position, proposes recommendations for change to further system improvement within special education service delivery.</li> <li>• Demonstrates cultural competence in both written and oral communication.</li> </ul> <p><b>Dispositions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborates with others in informing public about special education issues and concerns within schools.</li> <li>• Determines ways to facilitate change and collaborate in their work environment.</li> </ul>

## EDTE 251 Writing Rubric

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title of Research: \_\_\_\_\_

Attribute	Exceeds Expectation	Meets Expectation	Below Expectations
<b>Organization:</b> *Introduction inviting  *Clear thesis statement  *Conclusion leaves reader with general lesson learned on topic-not repetitive	Organization enhances readability &/or understandability of report.  All components included in logical manner with substantial information.	Organization content appropriate to all section of report.  All components included with basic information.	Some organization content – not clearly define.  Some components included with limited information
Clarity of Purpose	Motivation for pursuing topic and its relevance are clearly & persuasively established by relating topic to current educational issues	Motivation for pursuing topic and its relevance are addressed. Discussion reasonably clear but not compelling	Little or no discussion of motivation or relevance.
Depth of Content	Accurate & complete explanation of key concepts or theories made, drawing on relevant research and insights gleaned from multiple readings	Accurate & complete explanation of key concepts and theories is made, drawing on some relevant research	Insufficient explanation, incomplete or confusing, limited relevant research
Word Choice, Grammar, Sentence Structure  Supportive paragraphs build thesis  Demonstrate Academic Language	Sentences are complete and grammatical, flow together easily, supporting meaning  Emphasis meaning. Use of academic language demonstrated  Focus writing on issues as a critical thinker/writer	Sentences somewhat complete and grammatical flow together easily  Any errors are minor and do not take away from meaning.  Some critical thinking/writing demonstrated	Errors in sentence structure and grammar are frequent enough to distract from meaning  Limited critical thinking/writing demonstrated

Length	Meets requirements	10%-20% too long or too short	More than 20% too long or too short
Use of References. Adhere to APA format	Prior work is acknowledged by referring to multiple sources.  References are exact	Some oversight on prior work acknowledged by referring to sources.  Some minor reference unclear	Little attempt made to acknowledge work of others.  References are inaccurate
Visual Format: Use of Space, Table, Charts	Visually appealing. Easy to follow  White space used appropriately to separate sections and add emphasis.  Uses tables, charts where appropriate	Uses of white space help reader follow the document.  Some use of tables, charts	Visually appealing lacking.  No charts, tables used

(Adapted from CRCD Project, ESL Language Writing)