**PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORTS**

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

**MASTER DEGREE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**

**Goals and Objectives:**

The School of Education serves to prepare confident, caring, and reflective educators within a Christian environment for both pre-service educators as well as advanced preparation for inservice educators.

The specific goals and objectives of the Master of Education programs are to provide students with opportunities to become confident, caring, reflective educators by:

1. earning academic credentials that may allow them to advance in the chosen field of employment;
2. experiencing personal growth and understanding through in-depth study in the area of concentration and certification;
3. expanding the student’s Christian values through course work and campus activities;
4. specializing in a chosen area or discipline;
5. building upon their undergraduate studies and work experience to broaden their knowledge base in the teaching field; and
6. becoming strong professional leaders in their chosen discipline and area of certification.

**M.Ed. Art of Teaching (MAT) Mild and Moderate Disabilities**

**Mission: The M.Ed. Art of Teacher (MAT) Mild and Moderate Disabilities degree is designed to provide advanced graduate training in the area of Mild and Moderate Disabilities (Diagnosis, Current Research, IEPs, Program Development, and Interventions). Professional special educators are guided by the CEC professional ethical principles, practice standards, and professional policies in ways that respect the diverse characteristics and needs of individuals with exceptionalities and their families. The students build upon their undergraduate studies and work experiences in Elementary and/or Secondary Education to broaden their knowledge base in a new certification area to be a better advocate for diversity. This will add K-12 Mild and Moderate Disabilities endorsement to the educator’s license.**

1. **Within the institution’s mission to provide academic programs to promote student learning (WCU 1) and to provide an environment that supports student learning (WCU 2), the M.Ed. Mild and Moderate Disabilities has five singular, specific, and measureable SLOs.**
   1. **Court Case Summary:** Students will summarize and analyze six legal cases, providing Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004) regulations for each case, legal outcomes, and implications for educators, and personal reflection: As shown by the Legal Court Case rubric, the students when completing the legal care analyses will each a score of 3.0 or higher on each performance indicator. There are five indicators.
      1. Facts – List the critical facts in each case
      2. Decision – Summarize the court’s decision
      3. Rationale – Review and summarize the judge’s discussion of the judicial decision
      4. Scope – Determine the score (implications) of the judicial decision’s effect on school districts
      5. Personal Reflection – Reflect on the impact of this decision on school life

Table 1. Legal Case Summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Facts | 3.9 | 4.0 | -- |
| Decision | 3.9 | 4.0 | -- |
| Rationale | 3.8 | 4.0 | -- |
| Scope | 3.5 | 4.0 | -- |
| Personal Reflection | 4.0 | 4.0 | -- |

* 1. **Five-Day Instructional Unit:** Students will design a five-day instructional unit, covering all major subject areas, include enrichment and remediation activities, differentiated instruction, accommodations/modifications, procedures, resources, student-made materials, goals/objectives, aligned with state standards, assessment tools, and procedures. As shown by the Instructional Unit rubric, the students when designing the five-day unit will score 3.0 or higher on each performance indicator.
     1. Frameworks – College and Career Readiness Standards
     2. Specific Learning Outcomes – Performance-based actions and rubrics
     3. Procedures – Detailed steps for implementation of the unit
     4. Materials – Supplies, equipment, and technologies required
     5. Assessment – Pre- and Post-Assessment tools, informal, formal, and authentic
     6. Differentiated Instruction – Meeting the specific needs and interests of all students

Table 2. Results – Five Day Unit

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Frameworks | 3.9 | -- | 3.7 |
| Specific Learning Outcomes | 3.8 | -- | 3.5 |
| Procedures | 3.8 | -- | 3.5 |
| Materials | 3.9 | -- | 3.7 |
| Assessment | 3.8 | -- | 3.7 |
| Differentiated Instruction | 3.5 | -- | 3.7 |

* 1. **Individualized Education Plan:** The student will design an Individual Educational Plan which is a blueprint for each student’s identified needs: academically, physically, emotionally, and socially. Using a three point rubric, the students when designing the IEP will score 2.5 or higher on each performance indicator.
     1. Basic Information – Student’s demographics: age, birthday, and specific learning problems
     2. Annual Short Term Goals – Outcomes that are measurable and effective
     3. Measured Progress – Results from the former and current years
     4. Service Placement – Inclusion or self-contained or hybrid
     5. Percentage of student’s non-participation – School activities and extra-curriculum activities
     6. Supplemental Aids and Services- Technologies, therapies, equipment, and outside resources
     7. State and District Assessments – Informal and formal academic assessments
     8. Extended School Year – Additional days in school

Table 3. Individual Education Plan Results

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Basic Information | 2.9 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Annual Short Term Goals | 2.9 | 3.5 | 4.0 |
| Measured Progress | 2.9 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Service Placement | 2.9 | 3.7 | 4.0 |
| % of Student’s Non-Participation | 2.9 | 3.9 | 4.0 |
| Supplemental Aids and Services | 2.9 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| State and District Assessment | 2.9 | 3.7 | 4.0 |
| Extended School Year | 2.9 | 3.9 | 4.0 |
| **\*15-16 Basic of 3 point Likert Scale; Changed to a 5 point Likert scale in 16-17** | | | |

* 1. **Functional Behavioral Analysis:** The student will design a Functional Behavioral Analysis (FBA) on a selected student under his/her supervision. The completed project must meet all requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Act, 2004. The ultimate goal of the FBA is to increase positive behavior from the student. Using a three-point rubric, students will score 2.5 or higher on the eight indicators of the FBA.
     1. Behavior Targets – Describing isolated behaviors which will serve as targets
     2. ABC Model – What happened before the behavior occurred, behavior itself, consequences
     3. Hypothesis – Considered prediction of a possible solution
     4. Replacement Behaviors – PB Plan with replacement actions
     5. Intervention Strategies – Descriptions of teacher actions to intervene in behavior
     6. Evaluation Plan – Teacher designed strategies to review the impact on behavior
     7. Emergency Plan – Contingencies for serious behavior incidents
     8. Mechanics and Organization – Procedures to implement the interventions

Table 4. Functional Behavioral Analysis

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Behavior Targets | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.8 |
| ABC Model | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Hypothesis | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Replacement Behaviors | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.2 |
| Intervention Strategies | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| Evaluation Plan | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.2 |
| Emergency Plan | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Mechanics and Operations | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.8 |

* 1. **Assessing Student Learning:** Students will assess their students’ learning through analysis of informal and formal performance indicators, feedback, monitoring and guiding students. The students will have a group mean of 3.0 or higher on a four point Likert scale.
     1. Analyzing Student Work ACEI 4.0
     2. Using Assessment to Inform Instruction ACEI 3.1
     3. Using Feedback to Guide Further Learning ACEI 4.0
     4. Monitoring Student Progress and Adjusting Instruction ACEI 4.0
     5. Understanding Language Demands and Resources

Table 6. Assessing Student Learning

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 |
| Analysis | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Informing Instruction | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Feedback | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Monitoring | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Understanding Language | 4.0 | 4.0 |

\*This assessment started in EDU 640 in 2016.

1. **What students learned as documented by learning measurements.**

This degree program was designed for new and seasoned educators who wish to broaden their certification into special education. Students in the M.Ed. Mild and Moderate Disabilities program became effective special education educators in their new certification field. The S.L.O. performance indicators covered the range of skills required for the special educator: Diagnosis, Intervention Strategies, Behavioral Analysis, Management of Individual Education Plans, and development of the Assessment Schedule.

1. **Documented evidence of what students learned and did not learn based on SLOs.**

**What students learned?**

* Court Case Study – four of the five indicators were met – students showed proficiency in summarizing court cases, the facts in the case, decision, and rationale of the court.
* Instructional Unit – students demonstrated their abilities to begin their planning identifying the needs of their students and aligning them to the state frameworks, designing assessment (informal, formal, and authentic), creating instructional strategies aligned with the frameworks, and demonstrating the ability to write detailed procedures.
* Individualized Education Plan – all indicators were met by 90% of the students showing that they were able to build an effective individual educational instruction plan for children based on their documented needs analysis, with special attention to innovative interventions to build each child’s strengths and to accommodate their weaknesses with effective learning activities.
* Functional Behavior Analysis – this is a technique which demands intensive behavioral analysis based on observations, interviews, and screening instruments. Students performed at high rates in the development of action plans to meet the ineffective and disruptive behaviors exhibited by children.

**What students did not learn based on SLOs?**

* Concerning judicial decisions, students had difficulty comprehending the scope of the impact on school districts.
* Students were not as capable in designing differentiated instruction in their instructional units.
* Autism and its behavior aspects has become an increasing issue as the school population grows. Students were not as informed on evidence of autistic behavior and its implications.

1. **Evidence of continuing appropriate programmatic SLOs.**

All S.L.O.s will be continued with additional strengthening of content information in Autism due to the fact that a faculty member has been added to the program who is a statewide expert in Autism Diagnosis, Treatment, and Programming.

1. **Evidence of programmatic revision or improvement for weak results on SLOs.**

* The Court Case project has been strengthened through additional examples and discussions to increase student comprehension in the impact of the decision’s scope on a school district.
* Videos will be produced to better describe the IEP process and the development of action plans.
* Instruction in Autism and its related issues will be increased in the special education classes within the degree.
* Differentiated Instruction demands more examples and a wider range of instructional resources made available. A much heavier emphasis on technology resources will be implemented. The students will add internet searches to find more strategies and software available for implementation into the classroom.
* Co-Teaching, while not assessed, has become an important trend in inclusion classrooms across the nation. The M.Ed. program will implement co-teaching strategies showing examples of elementary and secondary classrooms.