Degree/Certificate: BAE Special Education

Major/Option: Special Education
Submitted by: Marion Moore and Jan-Olov Johansson
Date: December 17, 2014

Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2013-14

Part I – for the 2013-14 academic year: Because Deans have been asked to create College-Level Summary Reports annually, the template has been slightly modified for a) clarity for Chairs and Directors, and b) a closer fit with what the Deans and Associate Deans are being asked to report.

1. **Student Learning Outcome**: The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.

   Special Education (SPED) Students Learning Outcomes:

   - Students will demonstrate special education content knowledge competencies by passing the WEST-E Exam.

   - Students will apply special education knowledge and skills by passing special education field experience.

2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** Indicate whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.
       _____*SLO is met after changes resulting from ongoing assessments, referencing*
              assessment results from the previous year to highlight revisions;
       _____*SLO is met, but with changes forthcoming;*
       __*X*___*SLO met without change required*

3. **Strategies and methods:** Description of assessment method and choices, why they were used and how they were implemented.

   WEST-E State Test for Special Education is an end-of-program content test for teacher certification in Special Education. This test is designed to measure a teacher candidate's knowledge of special education content and is aligned with teacher endorsement competencies. There are approximately 110 multiple-choice questions, covering four content domain areas (below):
   - 25 percent related to "understanding students with disabilities" (Domain 1),
   - 25 percent related to "assessment and program development" (Domain 2),
   - 25 percent related to "promoting development and learning" (Domain 3), and
   - 25 percent related to "foundations and professional practice" (Domain 4).

A score of 240 is required to pass the test (range 100-300), and the candidates have approximately 135 min to complete the test. The performance indices used for each domain are described in Table 1 below.

Table 2: Special Education WEST-E Domain Performance Indices

	Multiple Choice Questions
4	Most or all of the questions were answered correctly.
3	Many of the questions were answered correctly.
2	Some of the questions were answered correctly.
1	Few or none of the questions were answered correctly.

4. **Observations gathered from data**: Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.

   a. Findings: Eighteen special education teacher candidates completed the Special Education WEST-E in 2013-2014. All 18 (100%) special education teacher candidates passed the test; two teacher candidates completed retakes.

   The average total scale score for this group was 260.1, range 244-278 with a standard deviation of 12.1 points. In comparison, the average total scale score for WA State was 263 with a 94.2% pass rate.

   Average domain scores ranged from 3.11 to 3.39; Domain 1 had the lowest average, Domains 2 & 4 had the highest averages, and Domain 3 had an average score of 3.17. The distributions of domain score results for each domain are presented in Table 2 below. A quick overview revealed that the majority of scores were 3s and 4s which accounted for 77% to 94% of the domain scores. Fewer 3s and 4s were found for Domain 1 (77%), and most 3s and 4s were found for Domain 4 (94 percent). However, with only 18 teacher candidates completing the test, these percentages are fairly similar because one candidate represents 6%. In comparison, WA State average domain scores ranged from 3.3 to 3.5; Domain 1 and 2 had the lowest averages, Domain 4 had the highest average, and Domain 3 had an average score of 3.4.

Table 2: Special Education WEST-E Domain Scores

Domain 1				Domain 2		
Row Labels ▼	Count	%		Row La ▼	Count	%
2	4	22%		2	3	17%
3	8	44%		3	5	28%
4	6	33%		4	10	56%
Grand Total	**18**	**100%**		**Grand Tot**	**18**	**100%**
Domain 3				**Domain 4**		
Row Labels ▼	Count	%		Row La ▼	Count	%
2	3	17%		2	1	6%
3	9	50%		3	9	50%
4	6	33%		4	8	44%
Grand Total	**18**	**100%**		**Grand Tot**	**18**	**100%**

b. Analysis of findings:

First, we recognized that all special education candidates passed their WEST-E test. Second, our analysis revealed that 5 out of 18 teacher candidates' scores were just above the 240 point cut score. This group accounted for 9 out of 11 Domain scores noted as a 2. Third, we had 5 teacher candidates with total scores between 240 and 249, 3 teacher candidates with total scores between 250 and 259, and 10 teacher candidates with scores above 260. Even if all teacher candidates passed the test, there were clear differences in domain scores between the lower scoring group of students versus the higher scoring group.

Table 4: Domain Average Scores Comparison

Domain	Low scoring group (240-249; n=5)	High scoring group (260+; n=10)
1	2.4	3.6
2	3.2	3.7
3	2.4	3.5
4	2.8	3.6

This finding suggests that teacher candidates who scored between 240 and 249 were less successful than teacher candidates who scored 260 or higher on multiple-choice items "mostly" related to Domains 1, 3, and 4. That is, content specific questions related to "understanding students with disabilities," "promoting development and learning," and "foundations and professional practice."

5. **What program changes will be made based on the assessment results?**

    a) Describe plans to improve student learning based on assessment findings (e.g., course content, course sequencing, curriculum revision, learning environment or student advising).

    We will discuss and identify all courses that target WEST-E objectives related to "understanding students with disabilities," "promoting development and learning," and "foundations and professional practice." We will identify strengths and weaknesses in students' work in these courses and make revisions and changes as needed.

    b) Provide a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year.

    We will start the process and discussion during Winter 2015 Quarter and then create a plan to be implemented during Spring 2015 Quarter.

6. Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed and an evaluation of the assessment plan/process itself.

    No change to the assessment process or plan is needed at this time.

Definitions:

1. **Student Learning Outcome**: The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.

2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** This checklist informs the reader whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.

3. **Strategies and methods used to gather student performance data,** including assessment instruments used, and a description of how and when the assessments were conducted. Examples of strategies/methods: embedded test questions in a course or courses, portfolios, in-class activities, standardized test scores, case studies, analysis of written projects, etc. Additional information could describe the use of rubrics, etc. as part of the assessment process.

4. **Observations gathered from data**: This section includes findings and analyses based on the above strategies and methods, and provides data to substantiate the distinction made in #2. For that reason this section has been divided into parts (a) and (b) to provide space for both the findings and the analysis of findings.

5. **Program changes based on the assessment results:** This section is where the program lists plans to improve student learning, based on assessment findings, and provides a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year. Programs often find assessment is part of an ongoing process of continual improvement.

6. **Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed.** Evaluation of the assessment plan and process itself: what worked in the assessment planning and process, what did not, and why.