Program Level Student-Learning Outcomes Assessment
Special Education Programs
Report 2021-2022

Prepared by Heather Batchelder, Ph.D.
SPA: Council for Exceptional Children

Programs Overview

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) nationally recognized the special education programs at the University of Alaska Southeast (UAS) School of Education (SOE) in 2015.The recognition extends to 2025. The special education programs consist of four pathways: Master of Education (M.Ed.), Graduate Certificate (G.C.), Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.), and the Bachelor of Arts (BA). The M.Ed. and the G.C. (K-12) programs lead to the (PK) K-12 special education endorsement to those already holding an Alaska teaching certificate. The M.A.T. degree was initiated in 2012 to provide an alternative route to certification with the (PK) K-12 endorsement in special education to candidates who do not have a valid teaching certificate but who do have a baccalaureate degree. The BA. in special education, requested by Alaska's Department of Education and Early Learning (DEED) was initiated in 2012 and allows candidates to complete their baccalaureate degree, which includes coursework leading to certification with the (PK) K-12 endorsement in special education.

The special education programs are fully distance delivered and cater to non-traditional students. One full-time faculty member, one SOE instructor, and six adjunct instructors delivered the programs. Courses are "stacked" which means that all programs are typically represented in the course roster for each course offering in a given semester. Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP views the BA. and M.A.T. as initial certification programs. The M.Ed. and G.C. advanced programs house candidates who are certified general education teachers working in the field. The Council for Exceptional Children views all programs (M.Ed., G.C, BA., and M.A.T.) as initial certification programs unless the undergraduate degree is in special education, the program is considered advanced. This unique situation fosters opportunities for mentoring relationships among the candidates.

The special education program faculty support candidates who work in challenging situations in public schools. The program is committed to inclusive practice, cultural safety, curricular equity, and social justice. All of the required core courses emphasize the development and implementation of culturally sustainable special education services in all Alaska communities and in particular the rural and remote Alaska Native villages. Faculty are student-centered in course delivery and in a similar manner,

encourage candidates to develop culturally sustaining, strength-based, individualized and trauma informed classroom practices. The importance of collaboration with families and the community, reflection on practice, and knowledge of the theoretical foundation of practice and instruction are central components to the special education programs at UAS.

The state of Alaska has a critical need for special education teachers and the UAS programs are designed to meet those needs by supporting teachers in the field as they transition to special education, and by providing pathways for candidates who do not have a teaching certificate. The candidates enrolled in the BA. and M.Ed. programs constitute the largest enrolled group for the 2021/2022 academic year. The M.A.T. program candidates appears to be growing in numbers. Many of the G.C. program candidates are part of the General Education to Special Education Incentive Program sponsored by the Alaska school districts. The number of candidates who live and work in Alaska Native villages varies; however, there has been an increasing number of candidates from remote and rural locations. Many of the candidates in both the M.A.T. and BA. programs are employed as para-professionals in their districts. Many of our candidates are "place bound" and the current distance-learning format provides the flexibility that many require.

The number of enrolled majors has doubled since the report last year and the number of degrees earned has remained steady with one additional degree earned this year as compared to the previous report. (Tables 1 & 2 from the previous report have been combined as a single table in this report).

Please find the enrollment information for the special education programs for the 2021/2022 academic year below in Table 1.

Table 1

Degree	Total Enrollment	Newly Enrolled Only	Degrees Awarded
B.A.	73	10	3
M.A.T.	46	9	11
G.C.	33	4	10
M.Ed.	56	11	7
Total	**208**	**34**	**31**

Program Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Process

All special education programs are built on a foundation provided by the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards. When developing the program, thought was given to the content of the coursework and the specific skill competencies that provide a framework for each key assessment. By examining the data provided by each key assessment, faculty identified important competencies that demonstrate the candidate's ability to integrate content knowledge and skills (Table 2). These competencies are: problem identification, gathering of information from multiple sources of data

including an effective learning environment, interpretation of data, application of assessment data in the development of plans and instructional strategies, monitoring progress and determining the effectiveness of interventions, and the impact on student learning supported by data and not assumptions.

Table 2

CEC Standards	Competencies	IEP Project	Case Study	Transition Plan	Lang. & Lit. Intervention Project	Clinical Obs. form	Portfolio
Foci for the CEC Initial Preparation Standards							
CEC: Learner & Learning							
Learner Development	Use of data from multiple sources	X	X		X	X	X
& Individual Learning Differences	Develop plans & instr. strategies	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Monitor progress	X	X	X	X	X	X
Learning Environments	Evaluation of the learning environment		X		X		
CEC: Content Knowledge & Professional Foundations							
Curricular Content Knowledge	Application of content knowledge & skills	X	X	X	X	X	X
CEC: Instructional Pedagogy							

Assessment; Instructional Planning & Strategies	Application (interpretation) of data	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Identify key instructional issues (problem identification)	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Determine effectiveness of intervention	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Evaluate candidate impact on student learning	X	X		X	X	X
CEC: Professionalism & Collaboration							

Professional Learning & Practices; Collaboration	Application & knowledge of policies and Sp. Ed. Regulations	X	X	X		X	X

Data are collected from the Professional Characteristics Assessment (PCA) and the Student Teacher Observation Tool (STOT) across the UAS SOE. Please see Tables 10 and 11.

How the data are collected on the Program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) (rubrics, portfolios, etc.)

Small class sizes allow faculty to develop meaningful relationships with their teacher candidates in order to facilitate candidate success in the key competencies. Program faculty use a model of assessment often referred to as "mastery learning." Typically, candidates who struggle are provided individualized support in identifying the areas that need attention and reconsideration. In this way, the candidates' learning is supported throughout many of the courses in the program, providing faculty with more information relating to the candidates' abilities to perform well as special educators, and to support students with exceptional learning needs. Every rubric for each key assessment is aligned with the competencies for the program, which makes it possible to quickly identify areas where candidates need additional support.

The data collected on the Program SLOs during the previous academic year.

AY 2021/2022 (Summer 2021, Fall 2021, Spring 2022).
The data that follow are identified by the following designations: BA., M.A.T, and G.C. and M.Ed. for each key assessment.

IEP Project Data Tables CEC Analysis of Data for IEP Project Low Incidence Disabilities. Note: 27 candidates were assessed. N=5 B.A., N=4 M.A.T., N=9 G.C., N=9 M.Ed

Table 3

Criteria / Domain of Practice	Target		Met		Not Met		N/A
DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT: Description of learning issues and domains of development	5	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.	
	3	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	6	G.C.	3	G.C.		G.C.	
	6	M.Ed	3	M.Ed		M.Ed	
DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT: Identification of Educational issues including language and communication	5	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.	
	3	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	6	G.C.	2	G.C.	1	G.C.	
	5	M.Ed	4	M.Ed		M.Ed	
DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT: Identification of variables in the learning environment that impact student learning	3	B.A.	2	B.A.		B.A.	
	3	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	6	G.C.	2	G.C.	1	G.C.	
	5	M.Ed	4	M.Ed		M.Ed	
DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT: Identification of family and cultural dynamics	3	B.A.	2	B.A.		B.A.	
	1	M.A.T.	3	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	

	3	G.C.	6	G.C.		G.C.	
	4	M.Ed	5	M.Ed		M.Ed	
INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES: Identification and use of evidence based practices	3	B.A.	2	B.A.		B.A.	
	1	M.A.T.	3	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	2	G.C.	7	G.C.		G.C.	
	4	M.Ed	5	M.Ed		M.Ed	
INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES: Identifies strategies that facilitate integration into various settings	4	B.A.	1	B.A.		B.A.	
	2	M.A.T.	2	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	2	G.C.	7	G.C.		G.C.	
	1	M.Ed	8	M.Ed		M.Ed	
INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES: Integration and alignment of Instructional Strategies with IEP plan	3	B.A.	2	B.A.		B.A.	
	3	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	3	G.C.	6	G.C.		G.C.	
	4	M.Ed	5	M.Ed		M.Ed	
INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLAN: Statement of Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP)	4	B.A.	1	B.A.		B.A.	
	3	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	3	G.C.	6	G.C.		G.C.	
	4	M.Ed	5	M.Ed		M.Ed	
INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLAN: Goals and Objectives	4	B.A.	1	B.A.		B.A.	
	3	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.	2	G.C.	2	G.C.	
	2	M.Ed	7	M.Ed		M.Ed	

SUMMARY: Assessment of Goals and Progress						
	5	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	3	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	5	G.C.	3	G.C.	1	G.C.
	4	M.Ed	5	M.Ed		M.Ed

Case Study Data Table

Data for Practicum are only collected in the fall and spring semesters. Note: 21 candidates were assessed. N=2 B.A., N=8 M.A.T., N=8 G.C., N=3 M.Ed

Table 4

Criteria / Domain of Practice	Exceeds		Met	Not Met	N/A
Description of Presenting issues and Context (CEC 5)	2	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	8	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	8	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	3	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
Collection and summary of data (CEC 5)	2	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	8	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	8	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	3	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
Analysis of Data (CEC 4)	2	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	8	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	8	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	3	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
Collaboration and Communication with Family (CEC 7)	2	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	8	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	8	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	3	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
Collaboration and Communication with Student (CEC 7)	2	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	8	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	8	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	3	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
Development of Instructional Strategies and Interventions (CEC 5)	2	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	8	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	8	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	3	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
Summary Statement (CEC 6)	2	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	8	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	

	8	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	3	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
Statement of Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (CEC 1.4)	2	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	8	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	8	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	3	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	

Transition Plan

Note: 21 candidates were assessed. N=5 B.A., N=5 M.A.T., N=5 G.C., N=6 M.Ed

Table 5

Criteria / CEC Standards	Target		Met	Not Met	N/A
DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT: Description of Student Strengths and Possible Barriers	5	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	6	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT: Description of Impact of ELN on Student Learning & Functional Performance	5	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	6	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
DEVELOPMENT OF A PERSONAL PLAN: Person-Centered Planning Summary (CEC 2,6,7)	5	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	6	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
DEVELOPMENT OF A PERSONAL PLAN: Discussion of Transition Issues: Self-Determination and Self-Advocacy (CEC 2,6,7)	5	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	6	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
IDENTIFYING RESOURCES AND IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN: Identifying Resources (CEC 2,6,7)	5	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	6	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
IDENTIFYING RESOURCES AND IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN: Systems of Support (Family and Community) (CEC 2,6,7)	5	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	6	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
IDENTIFYING RESOURCES AND IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN: Summary of Sustainability (Barriers and Accessibility) (CEC 2,6,7)	5	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.	G.C.	G.C.	
	6	M.Ed	M.Ed	M.Ed	
THE TRANSITION PLAN: Summary of Present Level of Academic	5	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	M.A.T.	

Criteria / CEC Standards		Target		Met		Not Met	N/A
Achievement and Functional Performance (CEC 2,6,7)	5	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.	
	6	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
THE TRANSITION PLAN: IEP/Transition Goals (CEC 2,6,7)	5	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.	
	6	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
THE TRANSITION PLAN: Written Transition Plan (CEC 2,6,7)	5	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.	
	6	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	

Language and Literacy: Assessment & Intervention Plan

Note: 22 candidates were assessed. N=6 B.A., N=7 M.A.T., N=7 G.C., N=2 M.Ed

Table 6

Criteria / CEC Standards		Target		Met		Not Met	N/A
Part 1: OVERVIEW & DESCRIPTION OF PRESENTING ISSUES: Contextual Factors (CEC 4)	6	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.	
	7	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.	2	G.C.		G.C.	
	2	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
Part 1: OVERVIEW & DESCRIPTION OF PRESENTING ISSUES: Summary of Observational Data from individual academic and non-academic sessions (CEC 4)	4	B.A.	2	B.A.		B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.	2	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.	2	G.C.		G.C.	
	2	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
Part 1: OVERVIEW & DESCRIPTION OF PRESENTING ISSUES: Description and Review of the Learning Environment (CEC 2)	3	B.A.	3	B.A.		B.A.	
	7	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	6	G.C.	1	G.C.		G.C.	
	2	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
Part 1: OVERVIEW & DESCRIPTION OF PRESENTING ISSUES: Statement of Present Level of Academic Achievement & Functional Performance (CEC 1.4)	4	B.A.	2	B.A.		B.A.	
	6	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.	2	G.C.		G.C.	
	2	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
Part 1: OVERVIEW & DESCRIPTION OF PRESENTING ISSUES: Profile Summary & Analysis of Data (ECE 4,5)	3	B.A.	3	B.A.		B.A.	
	6	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	6	G.C.	1	G.C.		G.C.	
	2	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
Part 2: INTERVENTION PLAN: Intervention Plan Learning Goals (CEC 5)	5	B.A.	1	B.A.		B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.	2	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	7	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.	

Criteria							
	2	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
Part 2: INTERVENTION PLAN: Assistive, Alternative, & Augmentative Communication Strategies (CEC 4,5)	4	B.A.	1	B.A.	1	B.A.	
	2	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.	4	M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.	1	G.C.	1	G.C.	
	1	M.Ed		M.Ed	1	M.Ed	
Part 2: INTERVENTION PLAN: Evaluation of Intervention Plan: Assessment Strategies (CEC 4)	5	B.A.	1	B.A.		B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.	
	6	G.C.	1	G.C.		G.C.	
	1	M.Ed	1	M.Ed		M.Ed	
Part 3: SUMMARY & META-ANALYSIS: Summary and Analysis of Interventions and Assessment Data (CEC 5)	6	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.	
	6	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	7	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.	
	2	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
Part 3: SUMMARY & META-ANALYSIS: Modifications and Accommodations (Impact on Student Learning) (CEC 5)	6	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.	
	7	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.	
	1	M.Ed	1	M.Ed		M.Ed	
Part 3: SUMMARY & META-ANALYSIS: Evaluation of Alternative, Assistive and Augmentative Strategies (CEC 5)	5	B.A.	1	B.A.		B.A.	
	5	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	2	M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.		G.C.	2	G.C.	
	2	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
Part 3: SUMMARY & META-ANALYSIS: Plan for Sharing Information with Stakeholders (CEC 4)	6	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.	
	6	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	7	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.	
	2	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
Analysis of Student Learning: The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.	2	B.A.	4	B.A.		B.A.	
	4	M.A.T.	3	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	5	G.C.	2	G.C.		G.C.	
	2	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	

Analysis of Student learning

The following data table is focused on the <u>analysis of student learning</u> aligned through the Teacher Work Sample across the EPP and represents a small segment of the overall CEC assessment described in the narrative. The Analysis of Student Learning is part of the data collection for CAEP. Note: 22 candidates were assessed. N=6 B.A., N=7 M.A.T., N=7 G.C., N=2 M.Ed

Table 7

Criteria	Not Met		Met		Target		N/A
Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation	B.A.	4	B.A.	2	B.A.		
	M.A.T.	1	M.A.T.	6	M.A.T.		
	G.C.	2	G.C.	5	G.C.		
	M.Ed	1	M.Ed	1	M.Ed		

Alignment with Learning Goals		B.A.	4	B.A.	2	B.A.	
		M.A.T.	4	M.A.T.	3	M.A.T.	
		G.C.	2	G.C.	5	G.C.	
		M.Ed	1	M.Ed	1	M.Ed	
Interpretation of Data		B.A.	4	B.A.	2	B.A.	
	1	M.A.T.	2	M.A.T.	4	M.A.T.	
		G.C.	2	G.C.	5	G.C.	
		M.Ed		M.Ed	2	M.Ed	
Evidence of Impact on Student Learning		B.A.	4	B.A.	2	B.A.	
	1	M.A.T.	2	M.A.T.	4	M.A.T.	
		G.C.	2	G.C.	5	G.C.	
		M.Ed		M.Ed	2	M.Ed	

Clinical Practice Observation

Table Data for Practicum are only collected in the fall and spring semesters. Note: 20 candidates were assessed. N=2 B.A., N=7 M.A.T., N=8 G.C., N=3 M.Ed

Table 8

CEC Standard / Domain of Practice	Exceeds		Met		Not Met		N/A
Instructional Planning (CEC 5)		B.A.	2	B.A.		B.A.	
	1	M.A.T.	6	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	7	G.C.	1	G.C.		G.C.	
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
Instructional Strategies (CEC 5)		B.A.	2	B.A.		B.A.	
	2	M.A.T.	5	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.	
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
Assessment: Evaluation of Student Learning (CEC 4)		B.A.	2	B.A.		B.A.	
	1	M.A.T.	6	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	7	G.C.	1	G.C.		G.C.	
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
Learning Environments & Social Interactions (CEC 2)		B.A.	2	B.A.		B.A.	
	4	M.A.T.	3	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.	
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed	
Language & Communication (CEC 1,5)		B.A.	2	B.A.		B.A.	
	2	M.A.T.	5	M.A.T.		M.A.T.	

Criteria	Target		Met		Not Met	
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Collaboration (CEC 7)	1	B.A.	1	B.A.		B.A.
	2	M.A.T.	5	M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Post Observation Conference Foundations (CEC 6)	1	B.A.	1	B.A.		B.A.
	3	M.A.T.	4	M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Post Observation Conference Professional & Ethical Practice (CEC 6)	1	B.A.	1	B.A.		B.A.
	5	M.A.T.	2	M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed

Portfolio

Data Tables and analysis CEC Update Analysis of Data for the portfolio are only collected in the fall and spring semesters. Note: 24 candidates were assessed. N=3 B.A., N=10 M.A.T., N=8 G.C., N=3 M.Ed

Table 9

Criteria	Target		Met		Not Met	
CEC Standard 1: Learner Development & Individual Learning Differences						
Understanding of Concepts and Content	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Application of Content of CEC Standard to Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Reflection on Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
CEC Standard 2: Learning Environment						
Understanding of Concepts and Content	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.

	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Application of Content of CEC Standard to Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Reflection on Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed

CEC Standard 3: Curricular Content Knowledge

Understanding of Concepts and Content	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Application of Content of CEC Standard to Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Reflection on Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed

CEC Standard 4: Assessment

Understanding of Concepts and Content	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Application of Content of CEC Standard to Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Reflection on Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed

CEC Standard 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies

Understanding of Concepts and Content	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Application of Content of CEC Standard to Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Reflection on Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
CEC Standard 6: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice						
Understanding of Concepts and Content	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Application of Content of CEC Standard to Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Reflection on Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
CEC Standard 7: Collaboration						
Understanding of Concepts and Content	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Application of Content of CEC Standard to Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.
	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed
Reflection on Practice	3	B.A.		B.A.		B.A.
	10	M.A.T.		M.A.T.		M.A.T.

	8	G.C.		G.C.		G.C.
	3	M.Ed		M.Ed		M.Ed

Professional Characteristics Assessment (PCA)

The Professional Characteristics Assessment is part of the data collection for CAEP. Note: 12 candidates were assessed. N=3 B.A., N=9 M.A.T. No BA students enrolled in student teaching in the Fall 2021 semester.

Table 10

Criteria	Level	Expectations Unmet	In Progress (partially met)	Expectations Met	Expectations Exceeded
1a. Motivated to become an effective practitioner & committed to their decision to teach.	BA				3
	MAT				9
2. Respectful of & committed to meeting the needs of individuals from diverse backgrounds.	BA			1	2
	MAT				9
3. Works collaboratively with all members of the school community.	BA				3
	MAT			1	8
4. Demonstrates intellectual curiosity.	BA			1	2
	MAT			2	7
5. Flexible in their thinking & creative in their ideas.	BA			1	2
	MAT			1	8
6. Professional & ethical in their behavior.	BA				3
	MAT			1	8
7. Demonstrate observable behaviors that reflect the importance of helping students develop the skills & strategies needed for healthy interpersonal relationships.	BA				3
	MAT				9

Student Teacher Observation Tool (STOT)

The Student Teacher Observation Tool is part of the data collection for CAEP. The BA and MAT candidates participate in Student Teaching. Note: 12 candidates were assessed. N=3 B.A., N=9 M.A. No BA students enrolled in student teaching in the Fall 2021 semester.

Table 11

Criteria	Distinguished		Proficient +		Proficient		Emerging +		Emerging		Underdeveloped +		Underdeveloped		N/A
Standard #1: Learner Development															
Supports student learning through developmentally appropriate instruction	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA	
	9	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT	
Accounts for differences in students' prior knowledge	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA	
	8	MAT	1	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT	
Standard #2: Learning Differences															
Uses knowledge of students' socioeconomic, cultural & ethnic differences to meet learning needs	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA	
	9	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT	
Exhibits fairness & belief that all students can learn	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA	
	9	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT	
Standard #3: Learning Environments															
Creates a safe & respectful environment for learners	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA	
	9	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT	
Structures a classroom environment that promotes student engagement	1	BA	2	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA	
	6	MAT	2	MAT	1	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT	
Clearly communicates	2	BA	1	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA	

Descriptor																
expectations for appropriate student behavior	7	MAT	2	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Responds appropriately to student behavior	2	BA	1	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	7	MAT	2	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Guides learners in using technologies in appropriate, safe and effective ways		BA	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	4	MAT	4	MAT	1	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT

Standard #4: Content Knowledge

Descriptor																
Effectively teaches subject matter		BA	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	9	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Guides mastery of content through meaningful learning experiences	1	BA	2	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	7	MAT	2	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Integrates culturally relevant content to build on learners' background knowledge	2	BA	1	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	7	MAT	1	MAT	1	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT

Standard #5: Applications of Content

Descriptor																
Connects core content to relevant, real-life experiences and learning tasks	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	9	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Designs activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives		BA	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	2	MAT	6	MAT	1	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Accesses content resources to guild global		BA	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	2	MA	6	MA		MA		MA		MA		MA		MA		MA 1

Indicator	Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
awareness	T								
Uses relevant content to engage learners in innovative thinging & collaborative problem solving	BA		3						
	MAT	1	7						1

Standard #6: Assessment

Indicator	Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Uses multiple methods of assessment	BA	2	1						
	MAT	6	2	1					
Provides students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning	BA	1	2						
	MAT	6	2	1					
Uses appropriate data sources to identify student learning needs	BA	2	1						
	MAT	7	1	1					
Engages students in self-assessment strategies	BA		3						
	MAT	4	4	1					

Standard #7: Planning for Instruction

Indicator	Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Connects lesson goals with school curriculum and state standards	BA	2	1						
	MAT	9							
Uses assessment data to inform planning for instruction	BA	2	1						
	MAT	8		1					
Adjusts instructionnal plans to meet students' needs	BA	2	1						
	MAT	9							
Collaboratively designs instruction	BA	3							
	M	9							

		AT		AT		AT		AT		AT		AT		AT
Standard #8: Instuctional Strategies														
Varies instructional strategies to engage learners	1	BA	2	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	8	MAT	1	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Uses technology appropriately to enhance instruction		BA	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	6	MAT	2	MAT	1	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Differentiates instruction for a variety of leaerning needs	2	BA	1	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	8	MAT	1	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Instructional practices reflect effective communication skills	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	8	MAT	1	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice														
Uses feedback to improve teaching effectiveness	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	9	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Uses self-reflection to improve teaching effectiveness	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	9	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Upholds legal respoinsibilities as a professional educator	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	9	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Demonstrates commitment to the profession	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	9	MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT		MAT
Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration														
Collaborates with colleagues to improve student performance	3	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA
	9	MA		MA		MA		MA		MA		MA		MA

		T		T		T		T		T		T		T	
Collaborates with parent/guardian/ advocate to improve student performance	3	B A T		B A T		B A T		B A T		B A T		B A T		B A T	
	8	M A T		M A T	1	M A T		M A T		M A T		M A T		M A T	

An evaluation of the data collected on the Program SLOs during the previous academic year

The charts present summary data for candidates who are enrolled in each of the programs in a given annual year. Evaluation scores are based on criteria listed in the descriptive rubrics for each key assessment. Faculty review candidate progress on each key assessment following the completion of each course in order to make informed program changes where necessary. In preparation for the Council for Exceptional Children Report and for Council for the Accreditation for Educator Preparation (CAEP) Report the special education faculty completed interrater reliability evaluations of key assessments.

All candidates receive specific instruction prior to, and after the key assessment is administered in specific courses. Typically, candidates who have not met the criteria listed in each assessment rubric have the opportunity to resubmit assessments after receiving extensive feedback. For this reason, the data charts submitted for some key assessments show that the majority of candidates have reached either the "met" or "exceeded" level for criteria in each key assessment. The data tables for assessments administered in 2021/2022 have some variations due to accommodations made in response to the reaction of COVID 19.

The Language and Literacy Assessment was assessed by a new adjunct and the data may indicate an assessor difference and/or it may indicate that the students need more instruction in the area of augmentative/assistive technology, intervention implementation, and data interpretation. Faculty will investigate further. The Analysis of Student Learning is embedded in the Language and Literacy Assessment, this section will be included in the investigation to determine how to facilitate candidates' learning in language and literacy assessment.

The two who candidates who scored in the 'unmet "range on the IEP Project declined to revise the assignment.

Future plans to improve student learning

Based on analysis of candidate data, the special education faculty will discuss the PCA results in greater depth. The use of the InTASC standards for disposition assessment is under consideration as a tool to measure disposition to teach. The CLASS Tool is a valid and reliable tool to capture the interactions between students, teachers, peers, and other adults in the classroom during practica and this could replace the STOT and the PCA.

The number of enrolled majors has doubled since last year at this time. Overall, candidates in the

special education programs are demonstrating progress. Degrees awarded remained steady. Some suggestions for improvement were noted. Student and interested party feedback revealed that the faculty should review the thesis and seminar courses for relevancy. In light of candidate feedback regarding program structure, special education faculty are looking forward to discussing the possibilities of creating 7.5 week courses that allow candidates to take two courses a semester that are not simultaneous, with potentially two new faculty members.