College of Education Assessment, 2012-2013

Report assembled by Jon Margerum-Leys, Associate Dean for Students and Curriculum, College of Education

Introduction

Since 1954, the College of Education has been continuously accredited through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Our most recent visit, in 2010, resulted in a seven year re-accreditation, the longest re-accreditation that can be achieved. No areas of significant concern were noted by the reviewing team. The assessment plan that was developed for that visit is extremely thorough and the College of Education owes a debt of gratitude to Associate Dean Shawn Quilter for his leadership of the accreditation process.

We have continued to use the assessments developed at that time, consulting them for adjustments to programs and using the results to inform our decisions as well as our yearly reports to NCATE.

As mentioned, we have a seven-year accreditation, with our next visit scheduled in October of 2017. Recently, NCATE merged with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) to form a new organization, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). This academic year, the new organization announced its accreditation timeline and pathways to accreditation. The College of Education's accreditation pathway will be *Continuous Improvement*, which is similar to the pathway followed for the 2010 visit and is also in line with Eastern's institutional assessment culture. Teacher Preparation Institutions that use continuous improvement will file a comprehensive self-study report nine months prior to the visit—for us, that report will be filed in January of 2017. The report, in turn, focuses on three years of data collection, which will begin in January of 2014. The standards to be addressed were released in draft form in December of 2012 (see *CAEP Draft Standards* in the accompanying documentation) and will be finalized in the upcoming academic year. In addition, the new organization is likely to use a different

method of organizing program recognition, one that may or may not use Specialty Professional Associations (SPAs). As a result, in this academic year we were somewhat in limbo, using NCATE standards that we knew would be superseded by CAEP standards, but not knowing the details of what those standards would be.

The coming year will find assessment at the forefront. In the Fall of 2013, we will need to revisit all student assessments in light of the new accreditation standards and possibly reconfigured program recognition process.

Programs within the College of Education

The College of Education hosts 24 undergraduate and 49 graduate programs, distributed among the departments as follows:

- Leadership and Counseling, 15 graduate programs
- Special Education, 13 undergraduate and 15 graduate programs
- Teacher Education, 11 undergraduate and 19 graduate programs

Often, programs are grouped by field or by student population. For example, there are six 'flavors' of Master of Arts in Teaching programs, but they share a common core of courses. Each program or program group has a set of gateway assessments. In nearly all cases, these assessments are aligned with the standards of a Specialty Professional Association. The file *List of COE Programs* contains a catalog of all programs, their program coordinators, and the accompanying assessments.

Tracking student assessment data for this array of programs is a complicated undertaking, one to which the College of Education dedicates significant resources. We contract with LiveText, a leading provider of learning assessment systems. Students purchase individual five year accounts that, in addition to keeping assessment data, can serve as the basis for a professional portfolio. The College of Education also employs Smriti Panjabi, a PT 08, to manage the assessment system and support faculty, staff, and students in its use.

Assessment of Student Learning worksheet

In March, program coordinators were asked to complete an *Assessment of Student Learning* worksheet. This document was closely modeled on the College of Arts and Sciences document created by Dr. Doug Baker. For this year, the planning section of the document was to be completed. Coordinators were asked to list student learning outcomes and to choose one or more learning outcomes on which to focus in the upcoming academic year. Additionally, they were asked to list student activities or assignments related to the outcomes.

Fortunately, this is very much in line with the work that program coordinators do for program recognition and accreditation. Coordinators were able to choose outcomes that had already been identified, with assessments and activities that were also already connected with the relevant assessment. Unfortunately, some program coordinators did not turn in the worksheet by the close of the academic year. These programs will need to complete the worksheet at the start of the coming year. Completed worksheets can be found in Appendix A of this document.

Conclusion

The College of Education is, generally speaking, in a very strong position regarding assessments of student learning. Our long history of successful accreditation and program recognition have allowed us to build a strong foundation, with a robust assessment system and ample student data. In the current year, the college is in a middle ground between a very successful accreditation visit and forthcoming clarity regards standards to be met and avenues for demonstrating student success. In the coming year, we expect to make great strides in updating and adapting our existing infrastructure to meet these new challenges.

Appendix A: Assessment of Student Learning worksheets

Documents on the following pages are presented in alphabetic order by name of program. Electronic copies of the documents can be found in the folder labeled *COE Assessment Worksheets From Programs.*

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION Counseling Program

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Degree Program (Name and Banner code)	School Counseling SCS2; College Counseling CLCL; Clinical Mental Health Counseling CMHC
Department	Leadership & Counseling
Academic Year	2012-2013
Report Submitted by	Devika Dibya Choudhuri
Phone/email	734.487.2707 | dchoudhur@emich.edu
Date Submitted to Department Head or Department Assessment Committee	

For program review purposes, each of the colleges has been asked to update its assessment system. At the College of Education, we're fortunate in that most of our programs have ample student assessment connected with program recognition and/or accreditation. To keep our assessment system up to date, each program should have a list of student learning outcomes. For 2012-13, each

program should identify *at least two* specific outcomes (from the approved list). Ideally, data from these outcomes should already be being collected through LiveText or other means and should be being used for continuous improvement of programs. In the sections below, please indicate your program's current status regarding assessment of student learning.

PLANNING: SECTIONS I – IV

I. What are your program's Student Learning Outcomes?

Please list the program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

Based on our Specialized Program Accreditation, through the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) eight areas have been identified as the foundations for the professional preparation and development of counselors. Student learning outcomes are developing appropriate knowledge and skills in the areas of Professional Orientation and Ethical Practice, Social and Cultural Diversity, Human Growth and Development, Career Development, Helping Relationships, Group Work, Assessment, and Research and Program Evaluation. For more specific information see CACREP (2009) standards.

II. What Student Learning Outcomes will your program focus on for 2013-14?

(Select *at least two* outcomes from Section I.)

Students will be able to…

1. Develop appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions in conceptualizing, developing, and maintaining counseling relationships through stages, processes, and practices.
2. Develop a strong foundation in professional and ethical practice through field experiences that are structured and supervised by appropriately trained and supported supervisors.

3. Students must demonstrate a level of counseling competence commensurate with master's level practitioners. Skills involved in demonstrating such competence include:

1. *(a) An ability to establish a therapeutic alliance with clients.*

   (b) Mastery of basic and advanced counseling techniques.

   (c) An ability to conceptualize client problems.

   (d) An ability to establish a treatment plan with objectives and methods/techniques.

(e) An ability to utilize appropriate interventions.

(f) An ability to assess the degree to which client/counselor goals have been achieved.

2. *A clear understanding of a counselor's role in various settings*

3. *An ability to receive and appropriately utilize supervision.*

4. *An understanding of and adherence to professional and ethical standards of conduct.*

III. What student activities or assignments does the program use to assess each Student Learning Outcome listed in section II?

1. Helping relationships:

Students will be assessed on meeting the student learning outcome of developing helping relationships through a progressive program sequence of core courses. Using first triadic counseling microskills practice (COUN 505), then development and maintenance of a counseling relationship (COUN 580), and finally, supervised counseling practice with clients in the counseling clinic (COUN 686), students will learn to use the four interrelated dimensions of intervention and relationship skills; professional skills; conceptualization skills; and personalization skills. Assignments include counseling transcripts that demonstrate the use of appropriate intervention and relationship skills; case notes and case presentations that demonstrate conceptualization skills; self-reflection papers on counseling process and practice to enhance personalization skills; and professional counseling practice to demonstrate professionalization skills.

2. Professional Practice:

In the COUN 691 internship course, students must have their internship site approved by their faculty advisor in meeting conditions of appropriate counseling practice. Their site supervisor must complete a supervision contract with them and an online supervision training program that assists in the supervision process. During their 600 hour internship, students must attend an internship seminar with a faculty supervisor to build professional and ethical practice in addition to their site supervision which enhances their understanding of their specific professional track. Students must submit weekly log sheets of their internship activities, perform a case presentation, provide direct service to clients for a minimum of 240 hours, and satisfactorily demonstrate compliance with the counseling code of ethics.

IV. What methods will the program use for collecting and analyzing information about student achievement of the selected Student Learning Outcomes?

1. The course instructors for COUN 505, 580, and 686 will complete the <u>Evaluation of Counselor Development: Skills and Dispositions</u> for each student, so that every student is assessed at three points in their progress through the Counseling Core on a four point Likert

scale from 0= Unable to demonstrate; 1= Demonstrates unevenly or inconsistently; 2= Demonstrates congruent with skill development level; 3= Consistently demonstrates on an outstanding basis. These evaluations are shared with the student and then submitted on Livetext. If a student is unable to maintain at least a 1 on each of the four dimensions of intervention and relationship skills; professional skills; conceptualization skills; and personalization skills, they may not progress until there is a satisfactory plan to remediate.

2. Student professional and ethical practice is assessed by the faculty supervisor in a midterm and final evaluation, by a midterm and final evaluation by the site supervisor, as well as by an intern evaluation of site, site supervisor, and seminar. Achievement of SLOs will also be measured by evaluation of program preparation of students by site supervisors.

ANALYZING AND PLANNING: SECTIONS V – VII

To be completed by December 15, 2013

V. What are the results?

Describe the results of analyzing student performances on the selected learning outcomes.

VI. What do the results mean or suggest for the program (the 'so what')?

Describe what the results mean or suggest for the program in terms of student learning.

VII. What actions does the program plan for purposes of enhancing opportunities for student learning?

Based on findings of the above process, describe actions the program plans to implement.

Office of Academic Services Response and Support

The College of Education's Office of Academic Support will bring together the reports of the various programs into a College-wide report. Material from sections I-IV will be shared during Spring 2013. Materials from sections V-VII will be shared in January 2014.

NOTES

The main purposes for constructing programmatic assessments of student learning are the following:
- To enhance opportunities for students to learn
- To gather and share information that can help improve programs
- To contribute to EMU's efforts to retain accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission

All degree programs (undergraduate and graduate) must submit a report.

For the College of Education to effectively assess student learning, address program review requirements, and remain accredited, it is important that we continue to update our system of programmatic assessment of student learning on selected outcomes.

Programs with outside accreditation, (e.g., programs with specialized professional associations that coordinate with NCATE—soon to be CAEP) should use this template to present representative plans. The need for consistency among program review, program recognition, and accreditation works in the College of Education's favor. Please *do* use assessments created for program recognition and accreditation as the basis for material in this report.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION Educational Media and Technology (EDMT)

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Degree Program (Name and Banner code)	Educational Media and Technology (EDMT)
Department	Teacher Education
Academic Year	2012-2013
Report Submitted by	Michael McVey
Phone/email	(734) 645-1322/mmcvey@emich.edu
Date Submitted to Department Head or Department Assessment Committee	April 15, 2013

For program review purposes, each of the colleges has been asked to update its assessment system. At the College of Education, we're fortunate in that most of our programs have ample student assessment connected with program recognition and/or accreditation. To keep our assessment system up to date, each program should have a list of student learning outcomes. For 2012-13, each program should identify *at least two* specific outcomes (from the approved list). Ideally, data from these outcomes should already be being collected through LiveText or other means and should be being used for continuous improvement of programs. In the sections below, please indicate your program's current status regarding assessment of student learning.

I. What are your program's Student Learning Outcomes?

EDMT students will demonstrate these student learning outcomes:

1. Students will solve problems and make decisions in professional practice through
   a. research
   b. reflective inquiry
   c. knowledge of learning and development
   d. knowledge of diversity and cultural context
   e. knowledge of subject matter and/or professional knowledge

2. Students will demonstrate leadership by
   a. communicating effectively
   b. working collaboratively
   c. using technology effectively
   d. engaging in exemplary professional practice
   e. advocating for children and young adults
   f. engaging in continuous professional development

3. Students will demonstrate professional dispositions:
   a. adherence to professional ethics
   b. collaboration
   c. commitment to diversity
   d. leadership and initiative
   e. professional advocacy
   f. professional demeanor
   g. self-reflection
   h. student focus

4. Students will enhance their professional capacity in the area of Educational Media and Technology by:
   a. inspiring and participating in the development and implementation of a shared vision for the comprehensive integration of technology to promote excellence and support transformational change throughout the instructional environment.
   b. assisting teachers in using technology effectively for assessing student learning, differentiating instruction, and providing rigorous, relevant, and engaging learning experiences for all students.
   c. creating and supporting effective digital-age learning environments to maximize the

learning of all students.
  d. conducting needs assessments, developing technology-related professional learning programs, and evaluating the impact on instructional practice and student learning.
  e. modeling and promoting digital citizenship.
  f. demonstrating professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in content, pedagogical, and technological areas as well as adult learning and leadership and continuously deepening their knowledge and expertise.

II. What Student Learning Outcomes will your program focus on for 2013-14?

(Select *at least two* outcomes from Section I.)

Since the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) has changed our standards from the ones previously referred to as Technology Facilitator (TF) standards to Coaching (C) standards, our program will focus on Learning Outcome #4 (above) in an effort to ensure we are gathering the appropriate long-range data for a program review.

We will review all six Student Learning Outcomes and ensure that our existing courses align with them.

III. What student activities or assignments does the program use to assess each Student Learning Outcome listed in section II?

Describe the activity(s) or assignment(s) faculty in the program plan to use for purposes of determining how well students met the learning outcomes.

Our program retains records through LiveText of key indicators outlined for each of the Student Learning Outcomes.

IV. What methods will the program use for collecting and analyzing information about student achievement of the selected Student Learning Outcomes?

Describe how the program plans to collect and analyze student performance samples (e.g., essays, projects, other artifacts, etc.) for purposes of assessing each selected learning outcome. Also, consider how the program will distinguish levels of performance.

The EDMT Program will review scores as found in LiveText but as we approach the new

standards (NETS-C) we will be able to provide the COE Leadership Team with a much more refined approach to evaluating the results as we align our assessment tools to these new standards.

ANALYZING AND PLANNING: SECTIONS V – VII

To be completed by December 15, 2013

V. What are the results?

Describe the results of analyzing student performances on the selected learning outcomes.

VI. What do the results mean or suggest for the program (the 'so what')?

Describe what the results mean or suggest for the program in terms of student learning.

VII. What actions does the program plan for purposes of enhancing opportunities for student learning?

Based on findings of the above process, describe actions the program plans to implement.

Office of Academic Services Response and Support

The College of Education's Office of Academic Support will bring together the reports of the various programs into a College-wide report. Material from sections I-IV will be shared during Spring 2013. Materials from sections V-VII will be shared in January 2014.

NOTES

The main purposes for constructing programmatic assessments of student learning are the following:
- To enhance opportunities for students to learn
- To gather and share information that can help improve programs
- To contribute to EMU's efforts to retain accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission

All degree programs (undergraduate and graduate) must submit a report.

For the College of Education to effectively assess student learning, address program review requirements, and remain accredited, it is important that we continue to update our system of programmatic assessment of student learning on selected outcomes.

Programs with outside accreditation, (e.g., programs with specialized professional associations that coordinate with NCATE—soon to be CAEP) should use this template to present representative plans. The need for consistency among program review, program recognition, and accreditation works in the College of Education's favor. Please *do* use assessments created for program recognition and accreditation as the basis for material in this report.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION Learning Disabilities (LD) report

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Degree Program (Name and Banner code)	Masters of Arts in Learning Disabilities LD/MA-ED
Department	Special Education
Academic Year	2012-2013
Report Submitted by	Loreena Parks
Phone/email	lparks1@emich.edu
Date Submitted to Associate Dean, Department Head or Department Assessment Committee	April 8th, 2013

For program review purposes, each of the colleges has been asked to update its assessment system. At the College of Education, we're fortunate in that most of our programs have ample student assessment connected with program recognition and/or accreditation. To keep our assessment system up to date, each program should have a list of student learning outcomes. For 2012-13, each program should identify *at least two* specific outcomes (from the approved list). Ideally, data from these outcomes should already be being collected through LiveText or other means and should be being used for continuous improvement of programs. In the sections below, please indicate your program's current status regarding assessment of student learning.

PLANNING: SECTIONS I – IV

Please complete by April 15, 2013

I. What are your program's Student Learning Outcomes?

Please list the program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).
- Demonstrated ability to carry out suitable procedures for the assessment of listening, thinking, speaking, reading, spelling, writing, mathematics or other areas of skill deficiency
- Demonstrated ability to specify in behavioral terms instructional objectives appropriate to the skill needs and entry-level characteristics of a K-12 student with LD
- Demonstrated ability to establish and maintain conditions and procedures of instruction suitable to the learning goals set for a K-12 student with LD
- Demonstrated ability to assess instructional outcomes in terms of individual student's behavior change and use these data in the formulation of an on-going instructional plan adjusted to changed student conditions
- Demonstrated ability to use appropriate techniques with the student to develop self-management skills required for constructive social participation and independent learning
- Demonstrated ability to function as a member of interdisciplinary teams and maintain effective liaison with families and others working with the student
- Passing status on the MTTC for LD

II. What Student Learning Outcomes will your program focus on for 2013-14?

(Select *at least two* outcomes from Section I.)

Students will be able to…
1. Demonstrated ability to carry out suitable procedures for the assessment of listening, thinking, speaking, reading, spelling, writing, mathematics or other areas of skill deficiency
2. Passing status on the MTTC for LD

III. What student activities or assignments does the program use to assess each Student Learning Outcome listed in section II?

Describe the activity(s) or assignment(s) faculty in the program plan to use for purposes of determining how well students met the learning outcomes.
1. The LD Program has the following components in its assessment system:
   - *Content knowledge: Assistive Technology/IEP Project* This assessment occurs in SPGN 481 *Assistive/Instructional Technology in SPED*
   - *Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions: Assessment Planning Project* This assessment occurs in SPLI 672 *Integrated Curriculum: Linguistics and Language Arts*
   - *Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions: Special Education Student Teaching* SPLI 693 *Practicum in Learning Disabilities*
   - *Effects on Student Learning: Behavior Change Plan* SPGN 461

Classroom Management and Intervention Strategies for Students with Disabilities

- *Additional Assessment: Curriculum-Based Test Project* SPGN 390 *Measurement/Diagnosis in SPED*

NOTE: **Track A students** (a program for candidates holding a teaching

certificate and seeking initial endorsement in learning disabilities)

do not need to take SPGN 390, SPGN 461 and SPGN 481.

Track B students (a program for candidates seeking an initial

endorsement in special education) will need to take SPGN 390,

SPGN 461 and SPGN 481.

2. The MTTC assessment is a summative evaluation of candidates' knowledge covering all as far as can be tested when students choose a response when using realistic scenarios. The test objectives on each MTTC assessment were prepared based on Michigan curriculum guides, textbooks, and teacher preparation and certification standards. The comprehensive content of the test objectives is divided into four subareas for the LD program area, which are then broken down into concepts or objectives covered on the test. The MTTC Assessment for Learning Disabilities includes the following subareas and alignment:
   - Subarea 1: *Understanding students with Learning Disabilities.*
   - Subarea 2: *Assessing students with learning disabilities and developing individualized programs.*
   - Subarea 3: *Teaching and modifying instruction and curricula for students with Learning Disabilities.*
   - Subarea 4: *Working in the professional world.*

IV. What methods will the program use for collecting and analyzing information about student achievement of the selected Student Learning Outcomes?

Describe how the program plans to collect and analyze student performance samples (e.g., essays, projects, other artifacts, etc.) for purposes of assessing each selected learning outcome. Also, consider how the program will distinguish levels of performance.

1. Candidates must earn an average rating of "acceptable" or better to pass each of the assessments listed in Section III number 1 above.   In addition to the assessments listed above, LD candidates are also required to submit professional dispositions as a part of SPLI 672 *Integrated Curriculum: Linguistics and Language Arts*, and SPLI 693 *Practicum in Learning Disabilities*. This data will be uploaded to LiveText.

2. All candidates seeking Initial Endorsement in Special Education in Michigan must pass an endorsement-specific MTTC exam, taken by students after

completing 90% of their program. This assessment is composed primarily of scenarios that students must read, then analyze and choose the most appropriate response from four choices. The endorsement-specific scenarios are realistic and include a range of disabilities and academic or social problems for students to analyze, although focused on the endorsement. The cutoff passing score is 220 out of 300 questions.

ANALYZING AND PLANNING: SECTIONS V – VII

To be completed by December 15, 2013

V. What are the results?

Describe the results of analyzing student performances on the selected learning outcomes.

VI. What do the results mean or suggest for the program (the 'so what')?

Describe what the results mean or suggest for the program in terms of student learning.

VII. What actions does the program plan for purposes of enhancing opportunities for student learning?

Based on findings of the above process, describe actions the program plans to implement.

Office of Academic Services Response and Support

The College of Education's Office of Academic Support will bring together the reports of the various programs into a College-wide report. Material from sections I-IV will be shared during Spring 2013. Materials from sections V-VII will be shared in January 2014.

NOTES

The main purposes for constructing programmatic assessments of student learning are the following:
- To enhance opportunities for students to learn
- To gather and share information that can help improve programs
- To contribute to EMU's efforts to retain accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission

All degree programs (undergraduate and graduate) must submit a report.

For the College of Education to effectively assess student learning, address program review requirements, and remain accredited, it is important that we continue to update our system of programmatic assessment of student learning on selected outcomes.

Programs with outside accreditation, (e.g., programs with specialized professional associations that coordinate with NCATE—soon to be CAEP) should use this template to present representative plans. The need for consistency among program review, program recognition, and accreditation works in the College of Education's favor. Please *do* use assessments created for program recognition and accreditation as the basis for material in this report.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION Social Foundations of Education

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Degree Program (Name and Banner code)	M.A. in the Social Foundations of Education (SFND)
Department	Teacher Education
Academic Year	2012-2013
Report Submitted by	Paul J. Ramsey
Phone/email	487-2774; pramsey1@emich.edu
Date Submitted to Department Head or Department Assessment Committee	March 19, 2013

For program review purposes, each of the colleges has been asked to update its assessment system. At the College of Education, we're fortunate in that most of our programs have ample student assessment connected with program recognition and/or accreditation. To keep our assessment system up to date, each program should have a list of student learning outcomes. For 2012-13, each program should identify *at least two* specific outcomes (from the approved list). Ideally, data from these outcomes should already be being collected through LiveText or other means and should be being used for continuous improvement of programs. In the sections below, please indicate your program's current status regarding assessment of student learning.

I. What are your program's Student Learning Outcomes?

Please list the program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).
   a) Examine the role of diversity in a democratic society.

   b) Use concepts and theories from the humanities and social sciences to interpret the meanings of education and schooling in diverse cultural contexts.

   c) Identify and evaluate the overarching intent or purposes of educational institutions.

   d) Identify and evaluate the contradictions and inconsistencies implicit in current social arrangements as these relate to schooling.

   e) Examine the ethical assumptions and value orientations underlying educational ideas, policies, and practices.

   f) Define relationships for participatory democracy as they are articulated in education for a pluralistic society.

   g) Demonstrate skills of critical inquiry.

   h) Communicate analytically.

   i) Demonstrate ability to use contextually appropriate grammar, sentence structure, and citation style to communicate meaning effectively.

II. What Student Learning Outcomes will your program focus on for 2013-14?

(Select *at least two* outcomes from Section I.)

Students will be able to...
   a) Identify and evaluate the overarching intent or purposes of educational institutions.

b) Define relationships for participatory democracy as they are articulated in education for a pluralistic society.
c) Communicate analytically.

III. What student activities or assignments does the program use to assess each Student Learning Outcome listed in section II?

Describe the activity(s) or assignment(s) faculty in the program plan to use for purposes of determining how well students met the learning outcomes.

In addition to the core SOFD courses that focus on specific outcomes, the Social Foundations of Education Master's Program developed a new course, SOFD 686: Thesis/Culminating Project Development, in order to assess a whole range of student learning outcomes. That is, students enrolled in SOFD 686 write a comprehensive essay in which they are expected to 1) demonstrate that they have met the SOFD student learning outcomes and 2) discuss they ways in which they will incorporate those skills and areas of knowledge into their theses and culminating projects.

Student Learning Outcomes	Formative Assessments	Summative Assessment
Identify and evaluate the overarching intent or purposes of educational institutions.	SOFD 550: Weekly Critical Response Papers; SOFD 572: Weekly Reading Summary/Reflection=	SOFD 686:Thesis/Culminating Project Development
Define relationships for participatory democracy as they are articulated in education for a pluralistic society.	SOFD 580: Democracy Assignment	SOFD 686:Thesis/Culminating Project Development
Communicate analytically.	SOFD 535: all assignments SOFD 550: all assignments SOFD 572: all assignments SOFD 580: all assignments	SOFD 686:Thesis/Culminating Project Development

IV. What methods will the program use for collecting and analyzing information about student achievement of the selected Student Learning Outcomes?

Describe how the program plans to collect and analyze student performance samples (e.g., essays, projects, other artifacts, etc.) for purposes of assessing each selected learning outcome. Also, consider how the program will distinguish levels of performance.

As noted above, SOFD had developed a new course (SOFD 686) to assess student leaning outcomes. Students comprehensive essays, which demonstrate that they have met the outcomes, are evaluated with a uniform rubric. Thus, the graduate coordinator for the SOFD program aggregates all of the outcomes data collected from the essay rubrics.

SOFD 686: Essay Rubric

Criteria Number	Score		
	6-5	**4-3**	**2-0**
1. Issue definition relative to democracy and diversity	Meaningful and substantive definition of an issue relevant to a diverse and democratic society is provided.	Issue clearly defined, lacks depth and/or clear discussion of relevancy and connection to divers and democratic society.	Issue not clearly defined in terms of the purpose of the essay.
2. Demonstration of disciplinary knowledge	Includes a literature review that demonstrates a critical comprehension of research/scholarship within at least one field relevant to the Social Foundations of Education	Literature review is relevant but lacks depth and or breadth and or critical analysis.	Literature review is neither relevant nor comprehensive.
3. Purposes of Education	Includes a strong vision of the purposes of education as well as a critical analysis of the purposes of schooling in the current context.	Vision of education is present but lacks depth and or the analysis of the purposes of schooling in the current context is present but limited.	Neither the vision of education nor the critical analysis of the current context is clear or coherent.
4. Analysis	Critical appraisal of the related elements within the issue demonstrated	Attempts are made to explicate claims, but lacks clarity and/or	Related elements are not well explicated or supported.

	by clear explication supported where appropriate by relevant literature/research.	more support is needed.	
5. Organization and coherence of ideas	Essay is logically organized with coherent supporting ideas. Organization is reinforced with an informative introduction, fully developed paragraphs, effective transitions, and a compelling conclusion.	Coherence of supporting ideas needs improvement. Lacks some of the following elements: informative introduction, fully developed paragraphs, effective transitions, and a compelling conclusion.	Essay is not coherent and lacks effective organization.
5. Conventions of grammar, sentence structure, and citation style	Essay uses contextually appropriate grammar, sentence structure, and citation style (APA) to communicate meaning effectively.	Essay grammar and sentence structure usage minimally interferes with effective communication of meaning.	Grammar and sentence structure usage significantly interferes with effective communication of meaning.

Reviewer: _____   Date:_____

ANALYZING AND PLANNING: SECTIONS V – VII

To be completed by December 15, 2013

V. What are the results?

Describe the results of analyzing student performances on the selected learning outcomes.

VI. What do the results mean or suggest for the program (the 'so what')?

Describe what the results mean or suggest for the program in terms of student learning.

VII. What actions does the program plan for purposes of enhancing opportunities for student learning?

Based on findings of the above process, describe actions the program plans to implement.

Office of Academic Services Response and Support

The College of Education's Office of Academic Support will bring together the reports of the various programs into a College-wide report. Material from sections I-IV will be shared during Spring 2013. Materials from sections V-VII will be shared in January 2014.

NOTES

The main purposes for constructing programmatic assessments of student learning are the following:
- To enhance opportunities for students to learn
- To gather and share information that can help improve programs
- To contribute to EMU's efforts to retain accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission

All degree programs (undergraduate and graduate) must submit a report.

For the College of Education to effectively assess student learning, address program review requirements, and remain accredited, it is important that we continue to update our system of programmatic assessment of student learning on selected outcomes.

Programs with outside accreditation, (e.g., programs with specialized professional associations that coordinate with NCATE—soon to be CAEP) should use this template to present representative plans. The need for consistency among program review, program recognition, and accreditation works in the College of Education's favor. Please *do* use assessments created for program recognition and accreditation as the basis for material in this report.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION Speech Language Pathology

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Degree Program (Name and Banner code)	Speech-Language Pathology Graduate Program (SPLP)
Department	Special Education
Academic Year	2012-2013
Report Submitted by	Sarah M. Ginsberg
Phone/email	487-2722/sginsberg@emich.edu
Date Submitted to Associate Dean, Department Head or Department Assessment Committee	4-9-13

For program review purposes, each of the colleges has been asked to update its assessment system. At the College of Education, we're fortunate in that most of our programs have ample student assessment connected with program recognition and/or accreditation. To keep our assessment system up to date, each program should have a list of student learning outcomes. For 2012-13, each program should identify *at least two* specific outcomes (from the approved list). Ideally, data from these outcomes should already be being collected through LiveText or other means and should be being used for continuous improvement of programs. In the sections below, please indicate your program's current status regarding assessment of student learning.

PLANNING: SECTIONS I – IV

I. What are your program's Student Learning Outcomes?

Please list the program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).
1. Students will demonstrate cooperation with fellow professionals and supervisors in clinical settings.
2. Students will demonstrate socially appropriate communication and interactions during clinical interactions with supervisors and clients.

II. What Student Learning Outcomes will your program focus on for 2013-14?

(Select *at least two* outcomes from Section I.)

Students will be able to…

I believe that as these SLO's are consistent with our ASHA Accreditation standards and we use them as a "red flag" mechanism to alert us to professional disposition concerns, we will continue using the existing (above) outcomes.

III. What student activities or assignments does the program use to assess each Student Learning Outcome listed in section II?

Describe the activity(s) or assignment(s) faculty in the program plan to use for purposes of determining how well students met the learning outcomes.

Clinical supervisor uses a 3.0 rating scale to assess students they have supervised in a clinical setting on the above items. Results are discussed with students in evaluation/debrief process.

IV. What methods will the program use for collecting and analyzing information about student achievement of the selected Student Learning Outcomes?

Describe how the program plans to collect and analyze student performance samples (e.g., essays, projects, other artifacts, etc.) for purposes of assessing each selected learning outcome. Also, consider how the program will distinguish levels of performance.

We plan to continue collecting this data in SPSI 528, 538, 568, 687, 688, 689.

ANALYZING AND PLANNING: SECTIONS V – VII

To be completed by December 15, 2013

V. What are the results?

Describe the results of analyzing student performances on the selected learning outcomes.

The average score of the students from previous data is in the acceptable range (2-3).

VI. What do the results mean or suggest for the program (the 'so what')?

Describe what the results mean or suggest for the program in terms of student learning.

If students score below a 2 on any professional disposition item, it triggers discussion with the clinical supervisor, the students' advisor, and may initiate a remediation plan to address areas of concern.

VII. What actions does the program plan for purposes of enhancing opportunities for student learning?

Based on findings of the above process, describe actions the program plans to implement.

No changes currently planned as it appears to be successful at this time.

Office of Academic Services Response and Support

The College of Education's Office of Academic Support will bring together the reports of the various programs into a College-wide report. Material from sections I-IV will be shared during Spring 2013. Materials from sections V-VII will be shared in January 2014.

NOTES

The main purposes for constructing programmatic assessments of student learning are the following:
- To enhance opportunities for students to learn
- To gather and share information that can help improve programs
- To contribute to EMU's efforts to retain accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission

All degree programs (undergraduate and graduate) must submit a report.

For the College of Education to effectively assess student learning, address program review requirements, and remain accredited, it is important that we continue to update our system of programmatic assessment of student learning on selected outcomes.

Programs with outside accreditation, (e.g., programs with specialized professional associations that coordinate with NCATE—soon to be CAEP) should use this template to present representative plans. The need for consistency among program review, program recognition, and accreditation works in the College of Education's favor. Please *do* use assessments created for program recognition and accreditation as the basis for material in this report.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION Visual Impairment (VI)

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Degree Program (Name and Banner code)	Elementary/Secondary Teacher Certification and Endorsement in Visual Impairment
Department	Special Education
Academic Year	2013-14
Report Submitted by	Tsai-Ping "Alicia" Li, Ed. D.
Phone/email	734-487-3300 tli@emich.edu
Date Submitted to Associate Dean, Department Head or Department Assessment Committee	4/7/2013 Submitted to Dr. Jon Margerum-Leys

For program review purposes, each of the colleges has been asked to update its assessment system. At the College of Education, we're fortunate in that most of our programs have ample student assessment connected with program recognition and/or accreditation. To keep our assessment system up to date, each program should have a list of student learning outcomes. For 2012-13, each program should identify *at least two* specific outcomes (from the approved list). Ideally, data from these outcomes should already be being collected through LiveText or other means and should be being used for continuous improvement of programs. In the sections below, please indicate your program's current status regarding assessment of student learning.

PLANNING: SECTIONS I – IV

I. What are your program's Student Learning Outcomes?

Please list the program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

The ten SLOs listed below are required competencies for a teacher of students with visual impairments (VI) specified by the Michigan Department of Education Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education and/or the Council of Exceptional Children:

1. Demonstrate mastery of beginning and advanced braille.
2. Demonstrate an understanding and mastery in the use of technology designed for the visually impaired.
3. Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the impact of visual impairment on learning and the ability to work effectively as a member of a multidisciplinary team including professionals in the fields of education, medicine, technology, and agency support.
4. Demonstrate the ability to develop, implement, facilitate, and evaluate appropriate educational programs for students with visual impairments ages 0-26, including those who are totally blind, partially sighted, and/or have additional disabilities.
5. Demonstrate the techniques necessary to develop and teach orientation and mobility skills appropriate to the student's needs including community transportation.
6. Understand and explain the structure and function of the eyes, and various eye disorders as a result of deficits to the structure and function of the eyes.
7. Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of curriculum across various settings for students with visual impairments (including human sexuality, family, community living, career selection, self-help skills, recreation and leisure).
8. Demonstrate knowledge of local, state, and national resources for the blind and partially sighted.
9. Demonstrate the ability to work effectively with parents of students with visual impairments, and serve as a liaison between the family, school, and community.
10. Demonstrate knowledge of the Professional Ethics as outlined by the Council of Exceptional Children.

II. What Student Learning Outcomes will your program focus on for 2013-14?

(Select *at least two* outcomes from Section I.)

Students will be able to…

Based on the VI courses offered for the 2013-14 academic year, the two SLOs chosen to be focused on are as follows:

SLO 1: Students will demonstrate mastery of beginning and advanced braille.
The two braille courses offered, SPVI 365 Braille I and SPVI 465 Braille II: Nemeth Code for Mathematics and Science Notation, enable VI major students to develop proficiency in reading and writing error-free braille. They also develop proficiency in reading and writing Nemeth Braille Code for mathematics and science. The VI majors gain knowledge and experience in applying the learned braille symbols, rules, and formats to school related materials such as flash cards, worksheets, calendars, textbooks, etc.

SLO 2: Students will demonstrate an understanding and mastery in the use of technology designed for the visually impaired.

In the use of technology, as students in all program areas of special education, VI majors are required to take SPGN 481 Assistive Technology in Special Education to learn the access to the curriculum, classrooms and daily activities through assistive technology, which encompasses both high and low-tech options. They are further prepared in SPVI 469 Technology for Persons with Visual Impairments, where they expand their learning in access technology for individuals with visual impairments through speech, large print and braille systems. VI majors are introduced to a wide variety of software programs and devices available for use by individuals with visual impairments. They learn how to conduct a technology evaluation and to determine appropriate software or devices for the students with visual impairments. The step-by-step ability to operate VI related devices and software programs is required of every student. Furthermore, they are assigned to work with students with visual impairments at the elementary or secondary level in public school settings in the use of technology as part of the course requirements.

III. What student activities or assignments does the program use to assess each Student Learning Outcome listed in section II?

Describe the activity(s) or assignment(s) faculty in the program plan to use for purposes of determining how well students met the learning outcomes.

During the course of the 2013-14 academic year, the following courses and assignments/activities are used to address the two SLOs listed in question II:

SLO 1: Students will demonstrate mastery of beginning and advanced braille.

SPVI 365 Braille I (Literary Braille): Weekly assignments (drills and exercises for braille writing) and quizzes for each lesson (convert print to braille for braille writing and braille to print for braille reading); braille flash cards, calendars, and worksheets; final exam.

SPVI 465 Braille II (Nemeth Code for Math and Science): Weekly assignments and quizzes; braille worksheets; braille math textbooks; midterm and final exam.

SLO 2: Students will demonstrate an understanding and mastery in the use of technology designed for the visually impaired.

SPVI 469 Technology for Persons with Visual Impairments: Course projects (e.g., creating a manual on the use of the iPad and Braille Pen, designing a map by using IVEO—a touch and speak device for the blind), content tests for major software programs and devices for the blind (e.g., Duxbury, JAWS, Scientific Notebook, Braille Note); field experience (e.g., working with children in public schools on the iPad and Braille Pen).

IV. What methods will the program use for collecting and analyzing information about student achievement of the selected Student Learning Outcomes?

Describe how the program plans to collect and analyze student performance samples (e.g., essays, projects, other artifacts, etc.) for purposes of assessing each selected learning outcome. Also, consider how the program will distinguish levels of performance.

SLO 1 Braille: SPVI 365 & 465

All of the braille reading and writing assignments, quizzes, and exams will be graded and satisfactory performance is granted when students complete them with 80 percent accuracy. This applies to all of the work required for the two classes, including worksheets, calendars,

exercises, math textbooks, quizzes, and exams.

SLO 2 VI Technology: <u>SPVI 469</u>
        Content tests on the major software programs and devices for the blind: Satisfactory performance is only granted when the students pass them with 80 percent accuracy.
        Course projects: Accuracy, organization, clarity, and application will be evaluated for three levels: unacceptable, acceptable and target. Only the latter two are counted as "satisfactory."
        Field experience: "Satisfactory performance" is only considered when the children the VI majors work with acquire 80 percent of the skills set out to achieve.

ANALYZING AND PLANNING: SECTIONS V – VII

To be completed by December 15, 2013

V. What are the results?

Describe the results of analyzing student performances on the selected learning outcomes.

VI. What do the results mean or suggest for the program (the 'so what')?

Describe what the results mean or suggest for the program in terms of student learning.

VII. What actions does the program plan for purposes of enhancing opportunities for student learning?

Based on findings of the above process, describe actions the program plans to implement.

Office of Academic Services Response and Support

The College of Education's Office of Academic Support will bring together the reports of the various programs into a College-wide report. Material from sections I-IV will be shared during Spring 2013. Materials from sections V-VII will be shared in January 2014.

NOTES

The main purposes for constructing programmatic assessments of student learning are the following:
- To enhance opportunities for students to learn
- To gather and share information that can help improve programs
- To contribute to EMU's efforts to retain accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission

All degree programs (undergraduate and graduate) must submit a report.

For the College of Education to effectively assess student learning, address program review requirements, and remain accredited, it is important that we continue to update our system of programmatic assessment of student learning on selected outcomes.

Programs with outside accreditation, (e.g., programs with specialized professional associations that coordinate with NCATE—soon to be CAEP) should use this template to present representative plans. The need for consistency among program review, program recognition, and accreditation works in the College of Education's favor. Please *do* use assessments created for program recognition and accreditation as the basis for material in this report.