PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

Program Name: SPECIAL EDUCATION - MEd

College/School Name: College of Education & Psychology

Academic Year Assessed: 2020-21

Assessment Report Requirements:

1. **Program Goals, Student Learning Outcomes (SLO), and Criteria:** At *minimum*, your Program Assessment Plan should have 2 overarching goals and 3 major outcomes derived from the goals that assess the core of your program. Each SLO must have at least 2 criteria and each criterion must have at least one instrument.

2. **Assessment Across Program:** Your SLOs and criteria must assess <u>a majority of your students each year and assess from early in the program to the end</u>.
   o Assessing through the program gives you the ability to identify weak points for improvement.

3. **Instruments:** Attach ALL Instruments listed in your assessment plan in the APPENDIX at the end of the Plan/Report.

4. **Instruments Using Direct/Indirect Measures:** Your Program Assessment Plan should include both direct and indirect measures of learning, with direct measures in the majority.

5. **Validation through External Instruments:** *If possible*, use an external instrument as a direct measure (e.g., ETS/MFT, ACAT, NCLEX, OSAT) to validate your local direct measures.
   o *The Office of Institutional Effectiveness pays for external testing.*

6. **Analysis of Data by Faculty:** All faculty integral to the Program will meet to discuss and analyze the data at the end of the academic year to determine what the collected data says about the program's performance during the current year and how that new knowledge will translate into proposed actions/changes in the coming year(s).

7. **Completion of Template:** *You are required to complete all sections of this report template*. Follow the directions as written. Contact the Assessment Coordinator before modifying the template to match the specific elements of your program assessment plan.

8. **File Name**: Use the following format to name this file before uploading:
   o Program Name Degree Level Asmt Report AY XXXX-XX
   o e.g., Art BFA Asmt Report AY 2020-21
   o e.g., Ed Leadership MEd Asmt Report AY 2020-2021

9. **Upload to Teams:** Complete your plan/report using the template and upload it to your Team channel. Email your Vice President and the Assessment Coordinator to let them know you have finished. *IF you make further changes to your report in Teams, notify your Vice President and the Assessment Coordinator via email.*

See Glossary of Terms for further explanation:
UGRP_ECU Unit Assessment Team >> General channel >> Files.

Assessment Plan, Data, and Analysis

Mission Statements & Goals

EAST CENTRAL UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT:
We educate and empower students to understand and transform our world.

PROGRAM GOAL(S): 1. Prepare and equip graduates with the essential skills and knowledge to utilize the special education high leverage techniques as new teachers. 2. Produce graduates with the critical knowledge to problem-solve, engage in ongoing self-reflection, and implement professional learning activities. 3. Prepare graduates with the capacity to lead in advocacy, professional practice, ethical principles, and preparation standards.

ASSESSMENT ACROSS THE PROGRAM STATEMENT: The East Central University conceptual framework provides a progressive alignment for the CEP Graduate Program disposition evaluation. It is completed a minimum of three times during the program, based on the following areas: Professionalism, Respect, Efficacy, Expectations, Learning. In addition, The Student Learning Outcomes for this report are developed in a sequential order to evaluate students at the beginning, middle and end of their program. Finally, the 32-credit hour program is designed to build upon content knowledge and provide sufficient opportunities to develop and demonstrate appropriate pedagogical skills and preparation in high leverage practices.

EXTERNAL INSTRUMENT <u>AVAILABILITY</u> FOR PROGRAM:
Yes, OSAT-Mild-Moderate Disabilities. The OPTI was also considered an external instrument, but it has been discontinued by OSDE as of September 2021. The Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT) is replacing the OPTE as the certification exam assessing teacher candidate professional knowledge. This performance-based assessment will replace the OPTE as an external instrument beginning Fall 2022. *If data is available for the 2021-22 reporting period, it will be included.

<u>STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 1</u>:
[For instructions see *Glossary of Terms Pgm Asmt* in Teams.]
Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate competency in TWO Oklahoma Certification Examinations for educating students with mild-moderate disabilities.

Criterion 1.1: Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate competency on the Oklahoma Certification Subject Area Test (OSAT) in the following sub-areas: (a) Understanding Students with Mild-Moderate Disabilities (b) Assessing Students and Developing Individualized Education Programs and Individualized Family Service Plans (c) Learning Across the Curriculum (d) Working in a Collaborative Learning Community (e) Analysis of Data to Identify and Effectively Address Student Needs.

Population/Course: Special Education Teacher Candidates who take the OSAT and include the option to provide results to ECU.

Instrument/Measurement (copy/paste instrument in Appendix): Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) Sub-areas 1-4: Special Education Certification Exam.

Standard: Score at or above state average.

Data Table: [For instructions see *Glossary of Terms Pgm Asmt* in Teams.]

Academic Year	Range of Scores	Mean of Scores	Percent Pass Rate	n
2020-2021	ND	239	50	10
2019-2020	ND	259	100	3
2018-2019	ND	256	ND	4
2017-2018	ND	248	ND	2
2016-2017	ND	268	ND	1

NOTE: [The range of scores was not available at the time of this report. The percent pass rate was not available for 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19.]

Analysis Table: A response is required for each question in the table.

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	No, the standard was not met for this reporting period.
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	Based on the data, the mean of scores has decreased over the last five years. There have been significant changes in the program and the data is inconsistent at best. It is notable that the 2020-21 percent pass rate was 50 % but there were a more than double the test takers than recorded in the last five years. More students passed in the 2020-21 reporting period than took the test and passed, than in the previous 4 years.
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	Unfortunately, it is difficult to get the full picture when the variable affecting the data are inconsistent. This happens for a myriad of reasons such as, students who claim ECU at registration, when students take the test, which students took it, etc., I do believe there has been an incredible amount of stress on special education teachers over the last two years and preparing for exams becomes futile.
4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	The data shows the mean of scores decreasing in recent years. However, the 2020-21 percent pass rate was only 50 % but there were more than double the test takers than recorded in the previous four years. In fact, more students passed in the 2020-21 reporting period than took the test and passed, than in the previous 4 years. The trends are somewhat inconsistent. I look forward to additional data collection to examine trends.

5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	The available data (reported in the previous report) indicates Special Education Teacher Candidates met the standard, scoring at or above state mean for all years reported. However, based on the data for the 2020-21 reporting period, the standard was not met. It is the goal of the program is to increase the average mean score by continuous review of efficacy in addressing the following content areas (a) understanding students with mild-moderate disabilities (b) assessing students and developing Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and Individualized Family Service Plans (c) learning across the curriculum (d) working in a collaborative learning community (e) analysis of data to identify and effectively address student needs. At this time, Special Education Teacher Candidates are not required to take the OSAT, or submit scores, for program completion. It is a goal of the program to incorporate this component in the future. Therefore, the total number represented in the chart above may not correspond with the "N" reported in subsequent instruments. As mentioned, it is the goal of the program is to increase the average mean score and percent pass rate in future reporting periods. Based on the analysis discussed above, no ACTIONS or CHANGES are needed for this year.

Criterion 1.2: Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate competency on the Oklahoma Professional Teaching Examination (OPTE) in the following sub-areas: (a) Learners and Learning (b) Instructional Practice (c) Professional Environment (d) Managing the Learning Environment (e) Instruction for Students with Diverse Needs (f) Collaboration in the School Community.

Population/Course: Special Education Teacher Candidates who choose to take the OPTE and provide the results to ECU.

Instrument/Measurement (copy/paste instrument in Appendix): Oklahoma Professional Teaching Examination (OPTE) Sub-areas 1-6.

Standard: Score at or above state average

Data Table: [For instructions see *Glossary of Terms Pgm Asmt* in Teams.]

Academic Year	Range of Scores	Mean of Scores	Percent Pass Rate	n
2020-2021	ND	ND	ND	ND
2019-2020	ND	ND	ND	ND
2018-2019	ND	ND	ND	ND
2017-2018	ND	ND	ND	ND

Last revised 7/22/2021 Roberson

| 2016-2017 | ND | ND | ND | ND |

NOTE: The data is not available due to a decline in exam completion and lack of students who report their scores to ECU.

Analysis Table: A response is required for each question in the table.

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	The standard was not met for the 2020-2021 reporting period.
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	Unfortunately, the data is not available.
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	Once students knew the OPTE was being replaced, they either rushed to take it or decided to wait until the replacement exam is available. I do believe the performance-based format is more appealing to students who are uncomfortable with standardized exams such as the OGET and OSAT.
4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	Unfortunately trends in data could not be determined.
5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	Data collection for this Criterion began in the 2019-2020 school year. Due to Covid-19, data was unavailable and then the population appeared to be zero for the 2019-20 reporting period. Data collection resumed during the 2020-2021 school year, however, it was recently announced that the OPTE would replace the PPAT as of September 2021. This Criterion will be discontinued as an external measure. Recent graduates and current students have consistently opted to postpone this requirement and complete the external measures over the summer, therefore, this SLO and Criterion will be updated to meet the state requirements for the PPAT and begin data collection summer 2022. The 2021-22 report will document this change to ensure the new criterion instrument is aligned with other programs using the PPAT as an outside measure. Based on the analysis discussed above, ACTIONS or CHANGES are needed for this year. The OPTE will be discontinued as of September 2021. PLANNING: Prepare to include the PPAT as an external measure, align with other graduate education programs and begin data collection in summer 2022.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 2: Aligned with the High Leverage Practices and the Initial Professional Preparation Standards developed by CEEDAR and CEC, Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate competency in the areas Assessment, Positive Behavior Support and Social-Emotional Learning, and Collaboration.

Criterion 2.1: Special Education Teacher Candidates will apply knowledge of Special Education Assessment by completing a series of course assessments, and a summative reflection, based on High Leverage Practices and the Initial Professional Preparation Standards. The Assessment Content Map includes the following sub-areas: (a) Using Assessment to Understand the Learner and the Learning Environment (b) Assessments Across Areas of Development and Environments in Order to Evaluate and Support Individual, Classroom and School-Side Systems of Intervention and Instruction (c) Identifying and Implementing Evidence-Based Practices (d) Response to Intervention and Progress Monitoring (e) Professional Learning for Individual Program Completion.

Population/Course: Special Education Teacher Candidates enrolled in EDUC 5353: Advanced Assessment and Program Development

> **Instrument/Measurement** (copy/paste instrument in Appendix): The instrument for measurement is a performance based, holistic rubric, adapted by the Program Director.
>
> **Standard**: Special Education Teacher Candidates will score a 93 % or above on the corresponding instrument. Scores will be compared across data collection periods to provide self-evaluation for the instructor, determine areas of strength and weakness in content, and ensure continued alignment to high leverage practice and accreditation standards.

Data Table: [For instructions see *Glossary of Terms Pgm Asmt* in Teams.]

Academic Year	Range of Scores	Mean of Scores	Percent Pass Rate	n
2020-2021	2-4	3.6	80 %	5
2019-2020	ND	ND	ND	ND
2018-2019	ND	ND	ND	ND
2017-2018	ND	ND	ND	ND
2016-2017	ND	ND	ND	ND

NOTE: [Data Collection for this Criterion began in the 2020-2021 school year.]

Analysis Table: A response is required for each question in the table.

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	The standard was not met for the 2020-21 reporting period.
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	The data shows 80 % of the population met the standard by scoring 93 % (the equivalent of a 4 on the corresponding rubric). The mean of scores (3.6) is promising however the range of scores (2-4) is concerning. Additional data collection of the current SLO is warranted to determine areas of strength and

	weakness in content with the goal of raising the mean of scores
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	Program rotation and new student enrollment naturally impact the population. However, since this course was offered in the fall 2020 semester, everything was exacerbated by Covid-19 as well.
4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	Data for Criterion 2.1 began with the 2020-21 school year. The data trend will continue to be examined in future reporting periods.
5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	Based on the analysis discussed above, no ACTIONS or CHANGES are needed for this year. PLANNING: Revisit the alignment to the new CEC practice-based standards when the course undergoes development through Wiley.

Criterion 2.2: Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of Behavior, Social, and Emotional Learning by completing a series of course assessments, and a summative reflection, based on High Leverage Practices and the Initial Professional Preparation Standards. The Content Map for Positive Behavior, Social Skills and Emotional Growth includes the following sub-areas: (a) Establish a Culturally Responsive, Positive, and Respectful Learning Environment (b) Implement Proactive and Responsive Practices to Support Positive Behavior, Social Skills, and Emotional Growth (c) Identify the Purpose or Function of Problem Behavior to Develop, Implement, and Evaluate Behavioral Interventions and Social Skills Instruction (d) Utilize Strategies to Increase Student Motivation, Engagement, and Independence (e) Professional Learning for Individual Program Completion

Population/Course: Special Education Teacher Candidates enrolled in EDUC 5093: Identification and Strategies of Students with Behavior Disorders

Instrument/Measurement (copy/paste instrument in Appendix): The instrument for measurement is a performance based, holistic rubric, adapted by the Program Director.

Standard: Special Education Teacher Candidates will score a 93 % or above on the corresponding instrument. Scores will be compared across data collection periods to provide self-evaluation for the instructor, determine areas of strength and weakness in content, and ensure continued alignment to high leverage practices and accreditation standards.

Data Table: [For instructions see *Glossary of Terms Pgm Asmt* in Teams.]

Academic Year	Range of Scores	Mean of Scores	Percent Pass Rate	n
2020-2021	4-4	4	100 %	2
2019-2020	ND	ND	ND	ND
2018-2019	ND	ND	ND	ND
2017-2018	ND	ND	ND	ND
2016-2017	ND	ND	ND	ND

NOTE: [Data Collection for this Criterion began in the 2020-2021 school year.]

Last revised 7/22/2021 Roberson

Analysis Table: A response is required for each question in the table.

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	The standard was met for the 2020-21 reporting period.
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	The data shows that 100 % of the population met the standard by scoring 93 % (the equivalent of a 4 on the corresponding rubric). The mean of scores and range of scores are positive. However, it is very difficult to determine any real strengths or weaknesses of this Criterion based on the limited data. Since data collection for this Criterion began in the 2020-2021 school year, additional data with the current sub-areas are warranted with the goal of continued success in the meeting the standard.
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	The small population size is a factor as well as the temporary changes due to the previous semester.
4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	Data for Criterion 2.2 began with the 2020-21 school year. The data trend will be examined in future reporting periods.
5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	Although there is limited data, it appears the criterion is sound. Therefore, no ACTIONS or CHANGES are needed for this year. PLANNING: Revisit the alignment to the new CEC practice-based standards when the course undergoes development through Wiley.

Criterion 2.3: Special Education Teacher Candidates will apply knowledge of collaboration with families and professionals by completing a series of course assessments, and a summative reflection, based on High Leverage Practices and the Initial Professional Preparation Standards. The Collaboration Content Map includes the following sub-areas: (a) Family Engagement to Support Student Learning and Increase Student Success (b) Effective collaboration behaviors (e.g., sharing ideas, active listening, questioning, planning, problem solving, negotiating) to maximize student learning (c) Disability Awareness to Support Student Success and Community Involvement (d) Collaboration with Professionals for Instructional Planning and Services (e) Professional Learning for Individual Program Completion.

Population/Course: Special Education Teacher Candidates enrolled in EDUC 5023: Educational Aspects of the Exceptional Child.

Instrument/Measurement (copy/paste instrument in Appendix): The instrument for measurement is a performance based, holistic rubric, adapted by the Program Director.

Standard: Special Education Teacher Candidates will score a 93 % or above on the corresponding instrument. Scores will be compared across data collection periods to provide

self-evaluation for the instructor, determine areas of strength and weakness in content, and ensure continued alignment to high leverage practices and accreditation standards.

Data Table: [For instructions see *Glossary of Terms Pgm Asmt* in Teams.]

Academic Year	Range of Scores	Mean of Scores	Percent Pass Rate	n
2020-2021	1-4	3.2	71 %	6
2019-2020	ND	ND	ND	ND
2018-2019	ND	ND	ND	ND
2017-2018	ND	ND	ND	ND
2016-2017	ND	ND	ND	ND

NOTE: Data Collection for this Criterion began in the 2020-2021 school year

Analysis Table: A response is required for each question in the table.

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	The standard was not met for the 2020-21 reporting period.
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	In relation to the standard, the data shows that 71 % of the population met the standard. The rubric scores ranged from 1-4 with a mean score of 3.2. The data is concerning. There are five sub-areas in this Criterion. The data shows there are two specific sub-areas that brought down the overall pass rate. This is definitely something that needs to be addressed if the data is similar in the next reporting period.
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	The larger population size can have a positive impact on the quality of the course, however, the consistent inconsistency during Covid-19 seems to negatively affect the outlook and population buy-in of several of the sub-areas. In short, students were not engaged with assignments relating to family engagement and effective collaboration behaviors.
4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	Data for Criterion 2.3 began with the 2020-21 school year. The data trend will be examined in future reporting periods
5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	Due to the limited trend of data on this Criterion, No ACTIONS or CHANGES are needed for this year. PLANNING: Compare the new CEC practice-based standards to the current sub-areas and determine necessary changes to alignment at the next reporting period. The goal of the program is always to increase the mean of scores and the percent of population with passing scores.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 3: Aligned with the High Leverage Practices and the Initial Professional Preparation Standards developed by CEEDAR and CEC, Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate competency in evidence-based instructional strategies, specialized

curricular knowledge, and the development and implementation of high-quality Individualized Education Programs.

Criterion 3.1: Special Education Teacher Candidates will apply knowledge of high-quality Individualized Education Programs Development by completing a series of course assessments, and a summative reflection, based on High Leverage Practices and the Initial Professional Preparation Standards. The Content Map includes the following sub-areas related to the development of high-quality Individualized Education Programs: (a) IEP Purpose and Process (b) IDEA Guiding Principles (c) Pre-Referral Process (d) Substantive Measurable Goals (e) and Individualized Supports and Services

> **Population/Course**: Special Education Teacher Candidates enrolled in EDUC 5333 Legal Aspects of Special Education.

> **Instrument/Measurement** (copy/paste instrument in Appendix): The instrument for measurement is a performance based, holistic rubric, adapted by the Program Director.

> **Standard**: Special Education Teacher Candidates will score a 93 % or above on the corresponding instrument. Scores will be compared across data collection periods to provide self-evaluation for the instructor, determine areas of strength and weakness in content, and ensure continued alignment to high leverage practices and accreditation standards.

Data Table: [For instructions see *Glossary of Terms Pgm Asmt* in Teams.]

Academic Year	Range of Scores	Mean of Scores	Percent Pass Rate	n
2020-2021	4	4	100	4
2019-2020				
2018-2019				
2017-2018				
2016-2017				

NOTE: Data Collection for this Criterion began in the 2020-2021 school year

Analysis Table: A response is required for each question in the table.

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	Yes, the standard was met for the reporting period
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	In relation to the standard, the data shows that 100 % of the population met the standard by scoring a 93 % (the equivalent of a 4 on the corresponding rubric). The rubric scores are steady at 4 with a mean score of 4.
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	The population happened to include the top students in the program for the 2020-21 reporting period, which may have positively impacted the data. However, it may just be the success of the criterion. Hopefully this trend continues in future reporting periods.

4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	Data for Criterion 3.1 began with the 2020-21 school year. The data trend will be examined in future reporting periods
5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	Given the current data, No ACTIONS or CHANGES are needed for this year. PLANNING: Compare the new CEC practice-based standards to the current sub-areas and determine necessary changes to alignment at the next reporting period.

Criterion 3.2: Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate evidence-based instructional strategies, and specialized curricular knowledge, to support the implementation of high-quality Individualized Education Programs by completing a series of course assessments, and a summative reflection, based on High Leverage Practices and the Initial Professional Preparation Standards. The Content Map includes the following sub-areas related to evidence based instructional strategies and specialized curricular knowledge: (a) Systematically Design Instruction to Connect Standards-Based Curriculum to Instructional Planning (b) Differentiate Instruction Based on Students' Readiness Level, Interests, and Learning Needs, for three Instructional Components (c) Address Appropriate Accommodations and Modifications to Support Access to the General Education Curriculum and to Assessments (d) Creating a Learning Environment that Challenges and Engages All Students through the Four Components of UDL (e) Explicitly Teach Cognitive and Metacognitive Processing Strategies to Support Memory, Attention, and Self-Regulation of Learning.

Population/Course: Special Education Teacher Candidates enrolled in EDUC 5163 Advanced Methods in Mild-Moderate Disorders

Instrument/Measurement (copy/paste instrument in Appendix) :): The instrument for measurement is a performance based, holistic rubric, adapted by the Program Director

Standard: Special Education Teacher Candidates will score a 93 % or above on the corresponding instrument. Scores will be compared across data collection periods to provide self-evaluation for the instructor, determine areas of strength and weakness in content, and ensure continued alignment to high leverage practices and accreditation standards

Data Table: [For instructions see *Glossary of Terms Pgm Asmt* in Teams.]

Academic Year	Range of Scores	Mean of Scores	Percent Pass Rate	n
2020-2021	2-4	3.3	67 %	3
2019-2020				
2018-2019				
2017-2018				
2016-2017				

NOTE: [Data Collection for this Criterion began in the 2020-21 school year]

Analysis Table: A response is required for each question in the table.

Last revised 7/22/2021 Roberson

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	The standard was not met for the 2020-21 reporting period.
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	In relation to the standard, the data shows that 67 % of the population met the standard. The rubric scores ranged from 2-4 with a mean score of 3.3. The data is concerning. There are five sub-areas in this Criterion, all of which are in-depth and require multiple methods of assessment
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	There are five sub-areas, all of which are challenging. The population was expected to work with students, which was a challenge given the online format for so many of students. The in-depth sub areas and multiple methods of assessment is something to monitor in future data reporting periods.
4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	Data for Criterion 3.2 began with the 2020-21 school year. The data trend will be examined in future reporting periods
5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	PLANNING: Compare the new CEC practice-based standards to the current sub-areas and determine necessary changes to alignment at the next reporting period. The goal of the program is always to increase the mean of scores and the percent of population with passing scores

Summary Table of Student Learning Outcomes/Criteria/Instruments				
Student Learning Outcomes	**Criteria/Instrument** (modify table to fit your plan)	**Direct/ Indirect Measure**	**Met**	**Not Met**
SLO1: Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate competency in TWO Oklahoma Professional Certification Examinations in educating students with mild-moderate disabilities	1.1: Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate competency on the Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT) in the following sub-areas: (a) Understanding Students with Mild-Moderate Disabilities (b) Assessing Students and Developing Individualized Education Programs and Individualized Family Service Plans (c) Learning Across the Curriculum (d) Working in a Collaborative Learning Community (e) Analysis of Data to Identify and Effectively Address Student Needs. *(OSAT): Special Education Certification Exam. Recommended end of program.	Direct		X
	1.2: Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate competency on the Oklahoma Professional Teaching Examination (OPTE) in the following sub-areas: (a) Learners and Learning (b) Instructional Practice (c) Professional Environment (d) Managing the Learning Environment (e) Instruction for Students with Diverse Needs (f) Collaboration in the School Community. *(OPTE) Oklahoma Professional Teaching Examination. Recommended middle of program.	Direct		X
SLO2: Aligned with the High Leverage Practices and the	2.1: Special Education Teacher Candidates will apply knowledge of Special Education Assessment	Direct		X

Last revised 7/22/2021 Roberson

Initial Professional Preparation Standards developed by CEEDAR and CEC, Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate competency in the areas of Assessment, Positive Behavior Support and Social Emotional Learning, and Collaboration.	by completing a series of course assessments, and a summative reflection, based on High Leverage Practices and the Initial Professional Preparation Standards. The Assessment Content Map includes the following sub-areas: (a) Using Assessment to Understand the Learner and the Learning Environment (b) Assessments Across Areas of Development and Environments in Order to Evaluate and Support Individual, Classroom and School-Side Systems of Intervention and Instruction (c) Identifying and Implementing Evidence-Based Practices (d) Response to Intervention and Progress Monitoring (e) Professional Learning for Individual Program Completion. *Wrap Around Content Map completed in EDUC 5353- recommended middle of program.			
	2.2: Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of Behavior, Social, and Emotional Learning by completing a series of course assessments, and a summative reflection, based on High Leverage Practices and the Initial Professional Preparation Standards. The Content Map for Positive Behavior, Social Skills and Emotional Growth includes the following sub-areas: (a) Establish a Culturally Responsive, Positive, and Respectful Learning Environment (b) Implement Proactive and Responsive Practices to Support Positive Behavior, Social Skills, and Emotional Growth (c) Identify the Purpose or Function of Problem Behavior to Develop, Implement, and Evaluate Behavioral Interventions and Social Skills Instruction (d) Utilize Strategies to Increase Student Motivation, Engagement, and Independence (e) Professional Learning for Individual Program Completion. * Wrap Around Content Map completed in EDUC 5093- recommended beginning of program	Direct	X	
	2.3 Special Education Teacher Candidates will apply knowledge of collaboration with families and professionals by completing a series of course assessments, and a summative reflection, based on High Leverage Practices and the Initial Professional Preparation Standards. The Collaboration Content Map includes the following sub-areas: (a) Family Engagement to Support Student Learning and Increase Student Success (b) Response to Intervention, Disproportionate Representation, and Special Education Services (c) Disability Awareness to Support Student Success and Community Involvement (d) Collaboration with Professionals for Instructional Planning and Services (e) Professional Learning for Individual Program Completion. * Wrap Around Content Map completed in EDUC 5023- recommended middle of program.	Direct		X
SLO3: Aligned with the High Leverage Practices and the Initial Professional Preparation Standards developed by CEEDAR and CEC, Special Education	3.1 Special Education Teacher Candidates will apply knowledge of high-quality Individualized Education Programs Development by completing a series of course assessments, and a summative reflection, based on High Leverage Practices and the Initial Professional Preparation Standards. The Content Map includes the	Direct	X	

Teacher Candidates will demonstrate competency in evidence-based instructional strategies, specialized curricular knowledge, and the development and implementation of high-quality Individualized Education Programs.	following sub-areas related to the development of high-quality Individualized Education Programs: (a) IEP Purpose and Process (b) IDEA Guiding Principles (c) Pre-Referral Process (d) Substantive Measurable Goals (e) and Individualized Supports and Services. * Wrap Around Content Map completed in EDUC 5333- recommended beginning of program.			
	3.2: Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate evidence-based instructional strategies, and specialized curricular knowledge, to support the implementation of high-quality Individualized Education Programs by completing a series of course assessments, and a summative reflection, based on High Leverage Practices and the Initial Professional Preparation Standards. The Content Map includes the following sub-areas related to evidence based instructional strategies and specialized curricular knowledge: (a) Systematically Design Instruction to Connect Standards-Based Curriculum to Instructional Planning (b) Differentiate Instruction Based on Students' Readiness Level, Interests, and Learning Needs, for three Instructional Components (c) Address Appropriate Accommodations and Modifications to Support Access to the General Education Curriculum and to Assessments (d) Creating a Learning Environment that Challenges and Engages All Students through the Four Components of UDL (e) Explicitly Teach Cognitive and Metacognitive Processing Strategies to Support Memory, Attention, and Self-Regulation of Learning. *Wrap Around Content Map completed in EDUC 5163- recommended end of program	Direct		X

Student Information for this Academic Year	
Total, *unduplicated* number of students assessed this academic year	15
Program census for Fall	18
Program census for Spring	20
Total number of Fall Program graduates	1
Total number of Spring/Summer graduates	5
Mean major GPA of Fall graduates	4.0
Mean major GPA of Spring/Summer graduates	3.53

NOTE: With the exception of the unduplicated number assessed (yellow), student information is provided by Office of Institutional Effectiveness and is made available in your Teams folder. For help with determining unduplicated number, contact the Assessment Coordinator.

Faculty Meeting: List meeting date(s) and a roster of those in attendance. Program results are shared with faculty and stakeholders through the Teacher Education Committee which meets approximately four times annually and through an annual Education Department Retreat. The retreat has representation from all stakeholder groups.

Sharing with Stakeholders:

1. Stakeholders for this Program include: [**list** all within and without the ECU community] Stakeholders of university faculty meet on an annual basis to analyze data at the annual Education retreat. A committee of faculty has been formed to help steer program development and assessment. This committee, which began fall 2015, will also be the standing graduate committee for program candidates. An additional committee was formed in March 2017 to assess the effectiveness of program assessment. This committee is comprised of community stakeholders (program completers who are in both university programs and PK-12 and one community PK-12 superintendent). Current program assessment reports will be made available on the website of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness: https://www.ecok.edu/academic-affairs-programs/institutional-effectiveness

2. Current program assessment reports are available on the website of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness:
   https://myecu.ecok.edu/ICS/Institutional_Reporting/Assessment_Reporting_and_Outcomes.jnz
   This link will change Fall 21 since MyECU is being phased out – I will let you know what to change it to.

SUMMARY OF LAST 5 YEARS' ACTIONS/CHANGES/REVIEWS & UPDATES

For instructions see *Glossary of Terms Pgm Asmt* in Teams.

Academic Year	Summary of Actions/Changes from Report
2020-2021	SLO 1.2 IS DISCONTINUED. THE PPAT, (ALSO AN EXTERNAL MEASURE) WILL REPLACE IT. CRITERION WILL BE ESTABLISHED AND DATA COLLECTION WILL BEGIN SUMMER 2022.

2019-2020	UAC Report approved with conditions for 2019-2020. UAC Coordinator and Program Director agreed to revisit this report after it is updated and modified for the new reporting period.
	Report submitted for review September 2020 with the following changes:
	Update of
	    Program Mission
	    Program Goals
	    Assessment across Program Statement
	Changes to Data
	    SLO 7.1 modified: Criterion 7.1 updated; Criterion 7.2 is new.
	    SLO 8.1 replaced: Criterion 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 are new and correlate to SLO
	    SLO 9.1 replaced: Criterion 9.1, 9.2 are new and correlate to SLO.

2018-2019	No Changes requested for 2018-2019
2017-2018	No Changes requested for 2017-2018

2016-2017	No Changes requested for 2016-2017

Academic Year	Summary of Annual Reviews of Dean and/or UAC (Reviews found in Teams folder; UAC *does not* review annually)	Updates in Response to Reviews

2019-2020	UAC Report approved with conditions for 2019-2020. UAC Coordinator and Program Director agreed to revisit this report after it is updated and modified for the new reporting period. Report submitted for review September 2020 with the following changes:
	 Update of
	  Program
	  Mission
	  Program
	  Goals
	  Assessment across Program
	 Statement Changes to Data
	  SLO 7.1 modified: Criterion 7.1 updated; Criterion 7.2 is new.
	  SLO 8.1 replaced: Criterion 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 are new and correlate to SLO
	  SLO 9.1 replaced: Criterion 9.1, 9.2 are new and correlate to SLO.	

2018-2019	No Changes requested for 2018-2019	
2017-2018	No Changes requested for 2017-2018	
2016-2017	No Changes requested for 2016-2017	
2015-2016	No Changes requested for 2015-2016	

APPENDIX

Copy/paste screenshots or narrative of blank instruments (rubrics, surveys, data report requests, prepared spread sheets, etc.) here.

Last revised 7/22/2021 Roberson