

**Master of Education in Special Education Degree Program**

<p><b>Learning Outcome</b></p> <p><i>What should a graduate in this major know, value, or be able to do at graduation and beyond?</i></p>	<p><b>Data Collection and Analysis</b></p> <p><i>What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be collected. Explain the procedure to analyze the data.</i></p>	<p><b>Results of Evaluation</b></p> <p><i>What were the findings of the analysis? List any specific recommendations</i></p>	<p><b>Use of Evaluation Results</b></p> <p><i>What changes in curriculum, courses, or procedures were made as a result of the program learning outcome assessment process?</i></p>
<p>Demonstrate mastery of the content of the M.Ed. degree program in special education, including, but not limited to history, philosophy, theories, legal and ethical practices, service delivery, curriculum and instruction</p>	<p>Data will be collected at the end of the program through an electronic folio which addresses all 10 standards of the <i>Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)</i>, the special education accrediting body. Data will also be collected on the results of the comprehensive exams at the end of the program. The curriculum committee will review trends in data.</p> <p>Content mastery will be also measured through the <i>PRAXIS Specialty Area: Education of Exceptional Student: Core Knowledge</i>.</p>	<p>Comprehensive exams given Summer II 2005 and Fall 2005 showed mixed results. While most candidates had overall strong performance, 3 out of 11 candidates did not pass. Weaknesses were in the area of content depth and quality of writing. Candidates taking spring 2006 comprehensive exams were the 3 candidates retaking the exams. This is a shift from a trend of a 100% passing rate for several years. We feel this is in part caused by a change in the preparation of our candidates before entering the program. In the past, most candidates had undergraduate degrees in education or a minor in special education in their undergraduate degrees. Now many candidates enter the program with no background in education.</p> <p>The electronic portfolio is being field tested; preliminary submissions suggested that the portfolio will allow faculty to better measure content depth and breadth. Initial results are inconclusive. Candidates were not required to complete the entire portfolio. The parts of each section completed showed a more detailed application of principles than were seen in previous versions of the portfolio.</p> <p>All candidates taking the <i>PRAXIS Specialty Area</i> test in special education passed.</p>	<p>Faculty members are developing a pre-comprehensive exam system to add a requirement to take and pass formative comprehensive examination exercises in targeted classes.</p>
<p>Demonstrate skills associated with the master's level in special education in planning</p>	<p>Data will be collected in methods classes (CSP 643, 686, 547, 647) in the form of</p>	<p>Methods instructors in the fall 2005 semester reported that while candidates demonstrated</p>	<p>Faculty members are reworking practicum and field experience components in CSP</p>

<p>and implementing instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs in a variety of classroom settings</p>	<p>lesson plans and observations. Each will be evaluated with a rubric. Methods instructors will evaluate trends in observations.</p>	<p>an ability to plan instruction, they were weak in sequencing and adapting instruction. They were also weak in the creative use of activities and materials to enhance instruction. The faculty members recognize a need to enhance the field experience and instructional planning components in CSP 643 and 686. The lesson plans in spring 2006 semester internships and practicum showed a lack of consistency in application. Again, this points to the lack of preparation of candidates coming into the program. In previous years, an assumption was made that candidates had at least a passing knowledge of lesson planning and classroom organization, and the coursework was designed to enhance this knowledge. It was also assumed that most, if not all, candidates were employed in classrooms. Increasingly, candidates do not have a background in education and are not employed in the classroom. This necessitates a shift in course content to the fundamentals of classroom instruction.</p>	<p>643, 686, 547 and 647 to build in more accountability, more varied experiences, and a better feedback loop.</p>
<p>Demonstrate skills associated with the master's level in special education in the measurement of student achievement and adjustment of instruction for maximum impact on student achievement</p>	<p>Data will be collected in CSP 545, <i>Curriculum Based Assessment</i>, and in field based methods classes (CSP 643, 686, 547, and 647). In each class, candidates are required to assess students; plan instruction based on the assessment; measure outcomes of instruction; and adjust instruction based on evaluation of outcomes. Data will be collected from lesson plans and reflections. Each will be evaluated with a rubric. Methods instructors will evaluate trends from submitted lesson plans and structured observations.</p>	<p>Methods instructors reported inconsistent application of assessment in lesson plans. Cooperating teachers in the field are less rigorous in daily assessment and do not monitor this as closely as they do other elements of teaching. The curriculum committee members are committed to the idea that novice teachers must assess daily to ensure outcomes. For several years, candidates have reported that field supervisors do not engage in daily assessment of specific skills, nor do they assess individual lesson plans.</p>	<p>Field supervisors are conferencing about how to best improve practice. The committee suggested that university supervisors monitor these practices carefully and give frequent feedback.</p>
<p>Demonstrate the candidate's commitment to the special education profession and to lifelong learning by documenting participation in professional development</p>	<p>Data will be collected in CSP 547 and CSP 647, each of which has professional development as a course requirement. In each course, candidates will be required to</p>	<p>Methods instructors reported an increase in the number and kinds of professional development activities students/candidates engaged in. The committee noted that this</p>	<p>Instructors continue to seek opportunities to provide a variety of professional experiences.</p>

activities	document the number of hours spent and types of experiences engaged in for professional development, reflecting upon experiences. Candidates are required to set professional goals and track progress toward these goals. Instructors will report to the curriculum committee on the variety and quality of professional development activities.	trend is a result of instructors proactively seeking opportunities and making these known to the candidates. In previous years, professional development activities tended to be limited to club meetings and professional development available on campus. This year, in addition to local options, professional development activities included a national conference and two special events in the disability community in Greenville.	
------------	---	---	--

\*The following titles are provided for referenced courses.

CSP 545 - Special Education Assessment

CSP 547 - Internship in Special Education

CSP 643 - Programming for Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs

CSP 647 - Practicum in Special Education

CSP 686 - Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs