**College of Education and Affiliated Programs**
**Annual Assessment Report**
**For Ed Specialist Level II Credential and Master of Science in Special Education Programs**


**Note: this report presents and analyzes data from the 2007-08 academic year. During that year, the College of Education and Affiliated Programs engaged in extensive efforts to refine and extend their assessment system. In many cases, data collected starting in Fall 2008 and beyond will look substantially different from the data being presented in this report.**

## Background

1. Describe your program (enrollment, number of faculty, general goals). Have there been any major changes since your last report?

   The Professional Level II Education Specialist Credential Program at CSULB prepares candidates to be authorized to teach in the areas of Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe disabilities, and received initial approval in November, 1999. The Level II program reflects the College of Education Mission and Theme to prepare educators for life-long learning, professional growth, and social responsibility. The program builds upon the foundational knowledge and skills developed in the Level I program. The goals of the Level I program are to assist candidates to become:

   • Effective and caring teachers
   • Partners with parents and others in the development of high quality educational programs
   • Life long learners engaged in program development reflective of practices in special education

   The Level II program builds upon these capacities and extends candidate competence in key program areas: Collaboration, Diversity, Literacy, Technology, & Transition. The Level II program is designed to allow candidates to continue to develop as reflective practitioners in advanced skill areas and knowledge. The Level II program is closely aligned with the Master of Science program in Special Education to encourage further professional growth and development. The Master of Science program in Special Education prepares candidates to attain leadership positions in public and private schools for individuals with disabilities. The program is aimed at developing advanced skills and knowledge of current research in special education, and demonstration of the ability to engage in reflective inquiry.

   Candidates in the Master of Science program complete all the 12 units of Level II coursework, and take an additional 18+ units of coursework (for a total of 30 units) which includes research methods, electives, and culminating experiences (i.e., a Master's thesis or comprehensive examination).

   There have been a few major changes to the Level II and Master of Science programs since the last CTC report in 2006-2007:

   1) Program faculty have revised the student learning outcomes for the program so that they align with the current CTC Education Specialist Level II standards, and also meet the program goals for our Master of Science candidates.

2) There has been some change in program faculty as new full-time faculty have been hired and existing faculty have taken on various administrative positions in the College (e.g., Department Chair, Associate Dean, Dean)
3) The program has had new coordinators in 2007-08, and in 2008-09.

**Student Learning Outcomes:**
The learning outcomes listed below form the foundation of our program. These learning outcomes were developed and refined in Spring 2008 as part of a college-wide assessment project. The data presented in this report are related to these outcomes, with some slight variation, since they were collected in 2007-08, while the SLOs were in development.

**Table 1**
**Program Student Learning Outcomes and Relevant Standards**

| SLOs | Outcome 1: Effectively apply theory to practice | Outcome 2: Analyze data to guide instructional decision-making. | Outcome 3: Determine effective behavioral, emotional, and environmental supports for student learning | Outcome 4: Effectively plan for transition | Outcome 5: Effectively collaborate and consult with teachers, parents, and other school professionals | Outcome 6: Demonstrate leadership skills in systems change efforts (Level 2 M/S ONLY) | Outcome 7: Analyze and synthesize research in special education through written communication (M.S. degree only) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Signature Assign-ment(s)** | Reflective practice assignment | Model Program project/case study | Model Program project/case study | Transition plan | MAPS assignment | Model Program project/case study | Exam |
| **National Standards** | | CEC Standard 4: Effective instructional Strategies CEC Standard 6: Language CEC Standard 7: Instructional Planning CEC Standard 8: Assessment | CEC Standard 5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions | | CEC Standard 10: Collaboration | CEC Standard 9: Professional and Ethical Practice | |
| **State Standards** | CTC Standard 15: Current | Practices CTC Standard13: | CTC Standard 14: Advanced | CTC Standard 16: Transition | CTC Standard 20: Collaboratio | CTC Standard 19: Leadership | CTC Standard 15: Current and |

| SLOs | Outcome 1: Effectively apply theory to practice | Outcome 2: Analyze data to guide instructional decision-making. | Outcome 3: Determine effective behavioral, emotional, and environmental supports for student learning | Outcome 4: Effectively plan for transition | Outcome 5: Effectively collaborate and consult with teachers, parents, and other school professionals | Outcome 6: Demonstrate leadership skills in systems change efforts (Level 2 M/S ONLY) | Outcome 7: Analyze and synthesize research in special education through written communication (M.S. degree only) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | and Emerging Research and Practices | Data-based Decision Making Standard 18: Assessment (M/M) Standard 19: Curriculum & Instruction (M/M) CTC Induction Standard 19: Teaching EL Learners | Behavioral, Emotional, and Environmental Supports CTC Standard 15: Current and Emerging Research and Practices | and Transition Planning CTC Standard 15: Current and Emerging Research and Practices | n and Consultation (M/M only) CTC Standard 18: Advanced Communication Skills (M/S only) CTC Standard 15: Current and Emerging Research and Practices | and Management (M/S only) | Emerging Research and Practices |
| **Conceptual Framework** | Promotes Growth, Prepares Leaders, Research and Evaluation | School Improvement, Values Diversity | School Improvement, Values Diversity | School Improvement, Prepares Leaders | Prepares Leaders, Service and Collaboration | Promotes Growth, Service and Collaboration | Research and Evaluation |
| **NCATE Elements** | Pedagogical Content Knowledge | Pedagogical Content Knowledge, Student Learning | Pedagogical Content Knowledge, Student Learning | Pedagogical Content Knowledge | Professional Knowledge and Skills, Professional Dispositions | Professional Knowledge and Skills, Professional Dispositions | Pedagogical Content Knowledge |

**Table 2**
**Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)**

| | Transition Point 1 | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Admission to Program | | |
| | Applied | Accepted | Matriculated |
| | # | # | # |
| TOTAL | 52 | 50 | 47 |

**Table 3**
**Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)**

| | Transition Point 2 |
| --- | --- |
| | Advancement to Culminating Experience |
| | # |
| Thesis (698)[1] | 1 |
| Comps[2] | 18 |
| Project (695)[3] | 0 |
| Other (Advanced Credential Programs Only) | 0 |

---

[1] This is data on students who were enrolled in thesis work during Fall 2007 and Spring 2008. This figure may include students who actually "crossed into" this transition point prior to Fall 2007 and were still making progress on their theses at this time.

[2] This is data on the number of students who *applied* to take the comprehensive examination in Fall 2007, Spring 2008, or Summer 2008. The data include students who may not have taken or passed the examination(s).

[3] This is data on students who were conducting culminating projects during Fall 2007 and Spring 2008. This figure may include students who actually "crossed into" this transition point prior to Fall 2007 and were still making progress on their theses at this time.

**Table 4**
**Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)**

|  | Transition Point 3 |
| --- | --- |
|  | Exit |
|  | # |
| Degree | 16 |
| Credential[4] | 44 |

**Table 5**
**Faculty Profile 2007-08[5]**

| Status | Number |
| --- | --- |
| Full-time TT/Lecturer | 7 |
| Part-time Lecturer | 14 |
| Total: | 21 |

2. How many of the total full- and part-time faculty in the program reviewed and discussed the assessment findings described in this document? Please attach minutes and/or completed worksheets/artifacts to document this meeting.

Program evaluation and candidate assessment data were reviewed at a program meeting by full time faculty who taught core program courses. (We rarely have part-time instructors who teach our Level II/masters courses; therefore they were not included in this discussion.) Five of our full-time faculty participated in this meeting. Please see attached minutes that reflect attendance and discussion at this meeting.  (See Appendix A for minutes)

---

[4] Data for Initial and Advanced Credential Programs reflects students who have filed for their credential with the Credential Office. These data generally include students who have completed the program 1 or more years prior to filing their credential request, particularly related to the advanced credential programs.  Data are reported for Summer 2007, Fall 2007, and Spring 2008.

[5] Represents faculty in both Levels 1 and 2 programs.

## Data

3. Question 3 is in 2 main parts focused on *primary* data sources related to: student learning and program effectiveness/student experience:

   a. <u>Candidate Performance Data</u>: Provide *direct* evidence for the student learning outcomes assessed this year and describe how they were assessed (the tools, assignments, etc. used). Describe the process used for collection and analysis. Present descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, percentage passing as appropriate for each outcome.

   For the 2007-2008 academic year we had two main sources of candidate performance data: benchmark assignments related to SLOs and comprehensive exam data. The comprehensive exam data is only for candidates who completed the master's degree program. Table 3 shows the benchmark assignment data for Fall 2007 and Spring 2008. Benchmark assignments are directly related to the student learning outcomes. Table 4 displays the comprehensive exam data for candidates who completed the program in Spring 2008.

   **Table 6**
   **Benchmark assignment data for Fall 07 and Spring 08**

| SLO | Benchmark Assignment | Exceeds Expectations (4) | | Meets Expectations (3) | | Meets Some Expectations (2) | | Does Not Meet Expectations (1) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Reflective Practice F07 N=13 S08 N=18 | F07 38.5% | S08 44.4% | F07 38.5% | S08 33.3% | F07 15.4% | S08 16.7% | F07 7.7% | S08 5.6% |
| 2 | F07 Model Program N=11 Case Study N=19 | Model Program 81.8% | Case Study 52.6% | Model Program 0% | Case Study 31.6% | Model Program 9.1% | Case Study 0% | Model Program 9.1% | Case Study 15.8% |
| 3 | F07 Model Program N=11 Case Study N=19 | Model Program 81.8% | Case Study 52.6% | Model Program 0% | Case Study 31.6% | Model Program 9.1% | Case Study 0% | Model Program 9.1% | Case Study 15.8% |
| 4 | F07 Transition Plan N=19 | 100% | | 0% | | 0% | | 0% | |
| 5 | S08 MAPS N=36 | 88.9% | | 8.3% | | 2.8% | | 0% | |

| SLO | Benchmark Assignment | Exceeds Expectations (4) | Meets Expectations (3) | Meets Some Expectations (2) | Does Not Meet Expectations (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | F07 Model Program N=11 | 81.8% | 0% | 9.1% | 9.1% |
| 7 | F08 550 Exam N=17 | 58.8% | 29.4% | 5.9% | 5.9% |

**Table 7**

**Comprehensive Exam Data from Spring 2008**

| | Exceeds Expectations (4) | Meets Expectations (3) | Meets Some Expectations (2) | Does Not Meet Expectations (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Take home 1 (N=19) | 5.25% (1) | 89.5 (17) | 0 | 5.25%(1) |
| Take home 2 (N=18) | 11.1% (2) | 50% (9) | 33.3% (6) | 5.6% (1) |
| On campus (N= 18) | 0 | 55.6% (10) | 33.3%(6) | 11.1% (2) |

b. <u>Program Effectiveness Data</u>: What data were collected to determine program effectiveness and how (e.g., post-program surveys, employer feedback, focus groups, retention data)? This may be indirect evidence of student learning, satisfaction data, or other indicators or program effectiveness. Describe the process used for collection and analysis. Present descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, or summarized qualitative data, for each outcome.

Two data sources were used to examine program effectiveness: an employer survey and a candidate exit survey. The employer survey is distributed to the candidate's principal to complete. The survey asks how well the employer feels the candidate performs in regards to each of the CTC standards for the advance education specialist credential which are directly related to program SLOs (see Appendix B). The candidate exit survey is given to candidates at the end of the program. The candidates are asked to respond to 14 questions (see appendix C). Both surveys are likert scale surveys with 1-4 ratings. Data from both surveys was collected in Spring 2008.

**Table 8**
**Employer Survey Results (Disaggregated by authorization mild/moderate or moderate/severe)**

| Credential Authorization Moderate/Severe N=11 | Std 13 | Std 14 | Std 15 | Std 16 | Std 18 M/M | Std 19 M/M | Std 20 M/M | Std 18 M/S | Std 19 M/S |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mean | 3.72 | 3.82 | 3.64 | 3.82 | | | | 3.82 | 3.73 |
| SD | 0.47 | 0.41 | 0.51 | 0.41 | | | | 0.40 | 0.47 |
| **Credential Authorization Mild/Moderate N=19** | **Std 13** | **Std 14** | **Std 15** | **Std 16** | **Std 18 M/M** | **Std 19 M/M** | **Std 20 M/M** | **Std 18 M/S** | **Std 19 M/S** |
| Mean | 3.47 | 3.67 | 3.5 | 3.65 | 3.71 | 3.63 | 3.86 | | |
| SD | 0.61 | 0.58 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 0.45 | 0.50 | 0.33 | | |

**Table 9**
**Candidate Exit Survey Results [Disaggregated by program: Both level II and masters program (N=22) or Level II only (N=19)]**

| Question | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 | Q9 | Q10 | Q11 | Q12 | Q13 | Q14 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Level II and Masters** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.9 |
| SD | .40 | .58 | .48 | .30 | .31 | .42 | .83 | .60 | .54 | .42 | .60 | .61 | .47 | .14 |
| **Level II only** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.7 |
| SD | .37 | .61 | .48 | .60 | .32 | .61 | .81 | .59 | .62 | .50 | .47 | .46 | .61 | .49 |

**Table 10**
**Candidate Exit Survey Results [Disaggregated by credential authorization: Mild/moderate (N=29) or Moderate/severe (N=14)]**

| Question | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 | Q9 | Q10 | Q11 | Q12 | Q13 | Q14 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Mild/Moderate** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.8 |
| SD | .35 | .56 | .56 | .54 | .33 | .57 | .72 | .55 | .46 | .60 | .40 | .61 | .59 | .41 |
| **Moderate/Severe** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.7 |
| SD | .43 | .65 | .47 | .42 | .42 | .86 | .65 | .60 | .48 | .65 | 0 | .45 | .51 | .49 |

*Note: Two candidates were obtaining both authorizations and their data is reported in both credential authorizations

4. **Complementary Data**: Appendices attached.

## Analysis and Actions

5. What do the data for each outcome say regarding candidate performance and program effectiveness? Please note particular areas of strength or areas in need of improvement.

*Transition point 2: Advancement to culminating experience*
Performance data analyzed for advancement to comprehensive exams and/or exit interview include benchmark assignments in key course that are displayed in table 3. The reflective practice project in 546C has two semesters of data. The other benchmark assignments have only one semester of data because the courses were only offered one time in the 07-08 year. The data for all benchmark assignments were included in the analysis.

For each of the signature assignments, 75% of candidates exceeded or met expectations. In discussing the data with program faculty, we were not surprised that the majority of our candidates exceeded or met expectations considering the *expectation* in the program is that candidates maintain As and Bs in all coursework. However, we do realize that we have approximately 25% of candidates who on some benchmark assignments did not meet expectations. In discussing this with program faculty, we articulated that there are several interventions that are implemented when candidates are not meeting expectations. These interventions include reviewing drafts, individual appointment, tutorials in APA or punctuation/grammar, referral to graduate workshops and/or writing center. For most benchmark assignments, candidates do have the opportunity to redo assignments if they do not meet expectations. The data we reported was for first time submission of assignments only. However, if we were to examine revised assignments the number of candidates meeting expectation would increase.

For all benchmark assignments except the Reflective Practice Assignment, 80% of the candidates exceeded or met expectations. There is slight differential in the percent of candidates who exceeded or met expectations on the Reflective Practice benchmark assignment. Again, in discussing this with program faculty, there could be a couple reasons for this slight difference. First, there is a definite change in the demand of courses from the Level 1 program to the Level II/Master's program, and since EDSP 546C is the first course in the series of courses for the Level II and Master's program, candidates may be adjusting to these new demands and not performing as well. Second, this assignment also requires the candidates to write a literature review. For many of our candidates this is the first time they have had to write a literature review. In our discussion of the data for this assignment, faculty suggested that it could be that Level II only are the ones who are performing lower on this assignment candidates (the course is required for both the Level II only and for candidates in both the Level II and Master of Science programs). The Level II is an advanced credential program that prepares special education teachers to become more proficient practitioners. As such, the learning outcomes for candidates in the Level II program do not target advanced research and writing skills. Additionally, the requirements for admittance and requirements for completion of the Level II program are different as compared to the candidates who are working toward a Master's degree. However we cannot make this determination with the aggregated data we collected for 07-08 as we did not have the data linked to student identification numbers. In the future, we will have data linked to student identification numbers and will be able to track if they are Level II only candidates or Level II and master's candidates.

In examining trends in the data, we found that for three of benchmark assignments, EDSP 546C reflective practice project, EDSP 550 Exams, and EDSP 565 case study project, there is more of a distribution between candidates exceeding and meeting expectation. On the other hand, the 535 MAPs project, 566 transition plan, and 563 model program project have 80% or more of the candidates exceeding expectations. In discussing this as a faculty, one reason for this may be that in the former assignments the criteria include a synthesis and critical analysis of the literature, whereas the latter do not. The additional level of difficulty of these assignments may have led to more distribution across student level of performance. As a faculty we realize that this means there is not consistency in the demand of these assignments. For many of the projects we agreed that this was acceptable because the assignments are meeting different SLOs. However, this was a concern to us particularly with the 563 model program project and 565 case study project since they meet the same SLOs for candidates in either the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe authorization areas. In the areas for improvement, the ideas we have to remedy this problem are discussed.

*Transition point 3: Culminating experiences*
*Exit Surveys: Principal and Candidate.* Principal Surveys indicate for each of the state standards which are directly related to the SLOs that our candidates meet or exceed the competencies (see table 5). This is true for candidates obtaining the mild/moderate authorization and the moderate/severe authorization. It appears that the means for candidates obtaining the moderate/severe authorization perform slightly higher on many of the shared competencies according to their principals. However, once standard deviations are calculated these differences are not statistically significant.

Candidate exit surveys indicate that for each of the 14 questions regarding the effectiveness of our program preparation the candidates ranked the program very highly. We examined the data by disaggregating the data by program, Level II and Master's or Level II only (see table 6) and then also by authorization mild/moderate or moderate severe (see table 7). This allowed us to examine differences in candidate response on the effectiveness of their program preparation based on both variables. The program and the authorization determine which courses candidates take and therefore can provide us information on both strengths and areas to improve.

Average scores ranged from 3.9-3.4 for candidates receiving their master's degrees in special education and level II credential and from 3.9-3.3 for candidates only receiving their level II credentials. Although the means were slightly higher for candidates in the level II/master's degree, overall there were not significant differences in the scores between the two groups of candidates. In examining the data by authorizations, there were not significant differences in candidate's reporting on the effectiveness of program preparation. However, one question, question 6, did have a large mean difference between candidates in the two authorizations. This question asks the candidates to tell the quality of the program preparation in the area of advanced methods for students with disabilities. For this question, candidates in the moderate/severe authorization overall rated the program preparation lower than those in the mild/moderate authorization. Over the years candidates in the moderate/severe authorization have rated this area lower. There are two possible reasons for this. First, this is a larger issue in the field of special education in that there is limited number of evidence based practices in the area of moderate/severe disabilities, particularly in comparison to practices for students with

mild/moderate disabilities. Second, the advanced methods course for moderate/severe candidates focuses on inclusion of students in the general education classroom. For many of our candidates, the schools where they work do not have inclusive classrooms, which presents a challenge for the candidates both practically and theoretically as they work through the disparity between best practices and what actually happens in schools.

*Comprehensive exam results.*

Candidates in our master's of science program in special education who take the comprehensive exam option are given three comprehensive exam questions: two are take-home in which they have a week to complete and one that is one day exam on campus. Overall, comprehensive exam data indicate that the majority of our candidates are meeting expectations on the comprehensive exams with a few exceeding expectations and very few not meeting expectations. For these exams, the rubric we used considered a "2, meets some expectations" as passing. We actually used the term "pass with reservations". On the first take home exam, the great majority of candidates met expectations with only one student exceeding and one student not meeting expectations. On the second take home, 11.1 % candidates exceeded expectations, 50% met expectation and 33% met some expectations. For the on-campus exam, 55.5% met expectations, 33% met some expectations, and 11.1% did not meet expectations. Our data indicate there is a difference in distributions across the three exams. Since the exam questions are different across the three exams and the demands are different this is to be expected. What is surprising is that candidates are provided feedback on the previous exam prior to taking the next exam questions, so we would expect the candidates would do better on the latter two exams or at least on the second take-home exam. However, because this was not the case it forces us to critically our questions and how well we are preparing the candidates for the questions in both the seminar for the comprehensive exam and the core program courses.

**Program Strengths**

1. Signature assignment data from 07-08 indicate that the majority of the candidates exceeded or met expectations for all six SLOs. More specifically for three of the SLOs (4, 5, and 6) over 80% of our candidates *exceeded* expectations.
2. Although we only have one SLO (SLO 1) that is measured across both semesters, data indicate that there is consistency in the number of candidates who exceeded and met expectations. Across the two semesters different instructors taught the class. This suggests that there is reliability across instructors.
3. For candidates not meeting expectations, the program implements a variety of interventions designed to meet candidates' unique needs e.g., instructor review and explanation, instructor reading drafts of assignments and providing feedback, peer editing and support, student study groups, online writing tutorials, referral to on-campus writing resources, etc.
4. Employers of our candidates indicate that the candidates of our program on average meet or exceed expectations of state standards which are directly related to SLOs.
5. Upon exit our candidates feel well prepared in the program goals areas as well as the state standards and the related SLOs.
6. Comprehensive exam data indicate that the large majority of our candidates exceed or meet expectations for comprehensive exams.

#### Areas for improvement

1. We need to clarify how each assignment meets the designated SLO. For example, the 565 case study project as it was implemented in 07-08 met SLO 2 & 3 as designated but it also contained a literature review which meets SLO 7.
2. Using the data based on student grades provides us with limited information to make program improvement decisions. To gather more specific data on how candidates are performing on the benchmark assignments we need to create rubrics that include specific criteria.
3. To create a writing rubric and expectations for the quality of writing expected in program courses that are used consistently in all courses so that the expectations across the courses on this criteria are consistent. Although writing skills are not measured in all courses it will allow candidates to practice these skills in all courses and be more prepared for the courses for which it is measured and particularly for comprehensive exams.
4. Although we implement individual interventions as instructors, there is not a consistent model in the program and process that candidates need to follow when they are not meeting expectations. We will determine a process for implementing interventions for candidates.
5. We will meet to conduct reliability checks of student benchmark assignments using rubrics. This will be done on approximately 20% of the assignments from each course and for comprehensive exams.
6. Reexamine comprehensive exam design, including number of questions, type of questions. Reexamine how candidates are prepared for questions in the comprehensive exam seminar and core program courses.

6. How do these findings compare to past assessment findings regarding: a) candidate performance and, b) program effectiveness?

In the past we have examined both candidate performance data as well as program effectiveness data, but not as systematically as is currently the case. Candidate performance data was discussed in meetings where faculty would bring up issues or successes and then make decisions regarding course or assignment modifications. These discussions were usually based on anecdotal data, case examples, or generalizations about how candidates performed overall. In the past we did not have focused student learning outcomes or signature assignments to guide our data discussions.

Regarding program effectiveness, our program did keep both employer and candidate survey data but generally the program coordinator would examine this data but it was not necessarily shared with all faculty to facilitate program improvement.

7. What steps, if any, will be taken with regard to curriculum, programs, practices, assessment processes, etc. based on these findings in Questions 5 and 6? Please link proposed changes to data discussed in Q5 and prioritize the action items.

The program faculty regularly engage in ongoing discussions and consequent program improvements at our weekly faculty meetings e.g., revising our comprehensive exam grading rubrics to ensure clearer expectations for candidates and faculty and increased reliability amongst scorers, revisions to the Level 2 exit interview process, working more collaboratively with site-based support providers, etc.

We have not previously engaged in systematic discussions about candidate performance on signature assignments. We look forward to ongoing discussions around these data and to comparing student performance from year to year based on modifications made.

Based on the data reported and our analysis of these findings, program faculty have determined that the following program changes are warranted:

1. Faculty will track student performance data on benchmark assignments using rubrics to provide a more detailed analysis of areas where candidates are successful and where they struggle. In addition, we will track data by assignment and also by criteria on the assignments, in order to examine if there are particular criteria that candidates are struggling with or are exceeding in to make course and program level modifications. This will allow us to tailor our curriculum and instruction to better meet student needs.
2. Using rubrics we will conduct reliability checks on a percentage of each of the benchmark assignments.
3. Given that program faculty believe in mastery learning, we will track the student performance data for each signature assignment based on the student's first graded attempt at the assignment and also on their second attempt subsequent to instructor feedback and review.
4. Future data collection will involve disaggregating Level 2 and Master's candidates. Using this method we can determine if the groups of candidates are performing differently on the benchmark assignments and/or respond differently on other program effectiveness measures.
5. We will be making some changes to the requirements for the EDSP 565 Case Study project. For the current year we have removed the literature review as a benchmark assignment. This will ensure that the assignment is only measuring the designated SLOs. This will also hopefully address a concern we had regarding the differences in scores between the assignments on the case study project and the model demonstration project, the EDSP 563 benchmark assignment that assesses the same SLOs.
6. We will determine a specific process for implementing intervention for a candidate if they are not meeting expectations.
7. We will revisit our comprehensive exam questions to align with the program SLOs.
8. In refining our program SLOs, program faculty also had lengthy discussions about the currency and relevance of our program themes and goals. Subsequently, we will be working on revising our program themes in Spring 2009 to be implemented in Fall 2009
9. Given the increased demand for our Level II and Master's program and campus criteria for enrollment management, we will continue to closely monitor the size of our incoming Level II and Master's program cohorts to ensure a viable cohort size that allows candidates to take coursework and graduate in a timely fashion, while still ensuring that class sizes are not too large which could impact the quality of teaching and learning.

APPENDIX A
Education Specialist Level II and Master's Degree
Data Analysis Meeting
October 30, 2008

Attendees:  Cara Richards, Sue Leonard-Giesen, Rebecca Canges, Gary Greene, Shireen Pavri

1.  Student Learning

Overall we are satisfied with student performance. Faculty discussed that it is the expectation that students earn As and Bs at the graduate level and this is how the majority of our students perform. We discussed what we do for students who are not performing at the level we expect. Dr. Greene mentioned that most often these students meet with the instructor to discuss ways to get them at the level we expect. We then discussed the different ways we provide intervention to students not meeting expectations:

1.      Review drafts
2.      Individual support/advising from instructor or program coordinator
3.      Tutorials: APA, punctuation
4.      PD workshops
5.      Writing center
6.      546C writing workshops
7.      Individual appointments

In looking at the benchmark assignment data two assignments stuck out because there was more of a distribution across scores: EDSP 565 Case study and EDSP 546C Reflective practice project. For all other assignments the majority of students tended to exceed expectations. We discussed possible reasons for this. One is that for both of these assignments students complete a research paper that includes a literature review. For 546C the literature review ties directly to the SLO but for 565 it does not. Also, 565 meets the same SLOs as 563 and the benchmark assignment for 563 the students performed higher. This discrepancy is problematic if the assignments are supposed to target the same SLO. Also, with regard to the assignments with literature reviews we wondered if students in the masters degree performed higher than student in the Level II only program. Unfortunately we cannot determine this from the data we collected. In future data collection we will be able to disaggregate this data.

2.  Instrument Utility

The instruments that we used last year varied by course and the data for our signature assignments we overall scores on the assignments. This data did not give us the level of information that we needed for program improvement. Also because we were developing SLOs last year our signature assignments were not as aligned with the SLOs as we would have wanted. This was most apparent with case study from EDSP 565. We have since created a rubric that measures the specific SLOs that need to be met in the case study assignment.
Since then we have created rubrics and will be using them this semester. All benchmark assignment rubrics are broken into individual criteria that can be analyzed.

3. Programs, Courses, Practices

We discussed several actions that we would take to improve student learning:
1. Faculty will track student performance data on benchmark assignments using rubrics to provide a more detailed analysis of areas where candidates are successful and where they struggle.
2. We will conduct reliability checks on a percentage of each of the benchmark assignments.
3. We will track the student performance data for each signature assignment based on the student's first graded attempt at the assignment and also on their second attempt subsequent to instructor feedback and review.
4. Future data collection will involve disaggregating Level 2 and Master's candidates. Using this method we can determine if the groups of candidates are performing differently on the benchmark assignments and/or respond differently on other program effectiveness measures.
5. We will be making some changes to the requirements for the EDSP 565 Case Study project.
6. We will determine a specific process for implementing intervention for a candidate if they are not meeting expectations.

**California State University, Long Beach**
**Education Specialist Level II Moderate/Severe Disabilities Credential Program**

Teacher's name: _____

Rater's name and position: _____

Directions for Rating: Rate the teacher on a scale of 1 – 4
    1 = competency not demonstrated,
    2 = competency demonstrated at a minimum level,
    3 = competency demonstrated at a sufficient level,
    4 = competency demonstrated at an advanced level,
    NA = No information to make rating.

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**DATA-BASED DECISION MAKING**     1  2  3  4  NA
Each candidate demonstrates the ability to continually analyze assessment & performance data to determine whether to maintain, modify or change specific instructional strategies, curricular content or adaptations, behavioral supports &/or daily schedules to facilitate skill acquisition & successful participation for each student.

**BEHAVIORAL, EMOTIONAL, & ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORTS**     1  2  3  4  NA
Each candidate demonstrates advanced knowledge & ability to implement systems that assess, plan, & provide academic & social skill instruction to support students with complex behavioral & emotional needs. Each candidate works with educational, mental health, & other community resources in the ongoing process of designing, implementing, evaluating, & modifying identified supports to ensure a positive learning environment.

**CURRENT & EMERGING RESEARCH & PRACTICES**     1  2  3  4  NA
Candidates demonstrate that they read, apply, & disseminate current & emerging research on best practices as well as maintain currency on educational policies & laws that affect their professional practice.

**TRANSITION & TRANSITION PLANNING**     1  2  3  4  NA
Candidates demonstrate the knowledge & ability to implement factors associated with successful planning & implementation of transitional life experiences; each candidate collaborates with personnel from other educational

& community agencies to plan for successful transitions for students.

**ADVANCED COMMUNICATION SKILLS**                              1   2   3   4   NA
Each candidate demonstrates effective communication skills in the areas of
respectful collaboration, managing conflicts, supervising staff such as
paraprofessionals, & networking & negotiating, including family members

**LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT**                                    1   2   3   4   NA
Each candidate demonstrates leadership & management skills to coordinate &
facilitate educational programs, including constructing & following efficient
schedules that meet individual student needs & maximize available resources.
The candidate demonstrates the ability to work effectively within integrated
service delivery models & actively participates in school restructuring & reform
efforts to impact systems change.

**California State University, Long Beach**
**Education Specialist Level II Credential and Master of Science in Special Education Program**

**Student Exit Survey**

**Name** (Optional):                                              **Date**:

**Credential area**:        Mild/Moderate ___    Moderate/Severe ___    Dual  M/M/S ___

**Place a check here if you are a student in the Master of Science degree program.** _____

What semester and year did you begin the Level II/Masters program, not including prerequisite courses?

What semester and year did you complete your final Level II/Masters course?

We would like you to take a few minutes to share with us your impressions of the Education Specialist Level II Credential and Master of Science in Special Education Degree Program as you are now finishing those stages of the program.  We thank you in advance as student feedback is a valuable source of program evaluation information for us.

Please rate the program in terms of how well we prepared you to be an effective teacher.   Using the 1-4 scale provided, rate the level of preparation as exceptional (4), adequate (3), less than adequate (2), and not acceptable (1).   Circle N/A if the item is not applicable.

**PROGRAM GOALS**

**How would you rate the quality of preparation in relation to our program goals?**

**Exceptional ------------ Unacceptable**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.  Effective and caring teachers | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
| 2.  Partners with parents and others in the development of high quality educational programs | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
| 3.  Lifelong learners engaged in program development reflective of best practices | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |

Comments and suggestions:

**Next, tell us about the quality of preparation in the following Level II/Master of Science areas:**

<div align="center">

**Exceptional ------------ Unacceptable**

</div>

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Emerging issues in special education | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
| 5. Reflective practice/action research | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
| 6. Advanced special education methods | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
| 7. Assistive and augmentative technology | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
| 8. Transition planning | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
| 9. Communication and collaboration with other professionals and families | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
| 10. Research methods in education | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |

Comments and suggestions:

**Level II only students:** *If you completed nonuniversity activities instead of coursework for Level II requirements, please describe how well those nonuniversity activities prepared you in the contracted areas.*

**11. How would you rate the support provided by your support provider?**

<div align="center">

**Exceptional ------------ Unacceptable**

4     3     2     1     N/A

</div>

**Overall, rate the quality of the preparation in the following areas:**

<div align="center">

**Exceptional ------------ Unacceptable**

</div>

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12. Critical thinking | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
| 13. Effective writing | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
| 14. Analysis and synthesis of the current literature in special education | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | N/A |

Comments and suggestions:

**In the following space, please provide us with what you would describe as the top 3 areas in need of improvement in the Level II and/or Master of Science in Special Education preparation program.**

**In the following space, please provide us with what you would describe as the top 3 strengths of your Level II and/or Master of Science in Special Education preparation program.**

**Thanks again for providing us with the requested information.  Rest assured that these results are carefully examined and used to refine our program.**