I. PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

Program Learning Outcomes align with the Council for Exceptional Children standards (CEC, 2012), the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), the International Society for Technology in Education standards (ISTE), and the Ohio Preparation Requirements. Council for Exceptional Children Standards

Standard 1 Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences - Beginning special education professionals understand how exceptionalities may interact with development and learning and use this knowledge to provide meaningful and challenging learning experiences for individuals with exceptionalities. Standard 2 Learning Environments - Beginning special education professionals create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments so that individuals with exceptionalities become active and effective learners and develop emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and self-determination. Standard 3 Curricular Content Knowledge - Beginning special education professionals use knowledge of general and specialized curricula to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities. Standard 4 Assessment - Beginning special education professionals use multiple methods of assessment and data sources in making educational decisions. Standard 5 Instructional Planning and Strategies - Beginning special education professionals select, adapt, and use a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to advance learning of individuals with exceptionalities. Standard 6 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice - Beginning special education professionals use foundational knowledge of the field and their professional ethical principles and practice standards to inform special education practice, to engage in lifelong learning, and to advance the profession. Standard 7 Collaboration - Beginning special education professionals collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, individuals with exceptionalities, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways to address the needs of individuals with exceptionalities across a range of learning experiences.
II. PROCEDURES USED FOR ASSESSMENT

A. Direct Assessment

Key Assessment #1 OAE for Intervention Specialist – Prior to Student Teaching
Key Assessment #2 IS course grades/GPA – End of Program GPA
Key Assessment #3 Unit Plan – EDS 6610/4610
Key Assessment #4 Student Teaching Field Experience Form – EDS 6730/4730
Key Assessment #5 edTPA - EDS 6990/4990
Key Assessment #6 Transitions Assessment – EDS 6650/4650

B. Scoring of Student Work

Key Assessment #1 OAE for Intervention Specialist – Prior to Student Teaching – Externally Scored by Pearson
Key Assessment #2 IS course grades/GPA – End of Program GPA – WSU Calculation
Key Assessment #3 Unit Plan – EDS 6610/4610 – Rubric scored by course instructor
Key Assessment #4 Student Teaching Field Experience Form – EDS 6730/4730 – Rubric scored by University Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher
Key Assessment #5 edTPA - EDS 6990/4990 – Rubric scored externally by Pearson
Key Assessment #6 Transitions Assessment – EDS 6650/4650 – Rubric scored by course instructor

C. Indirect Assessment

Exit surveys, completer surveys, employer surveys

III. ASSESSMENT RESULTS/INFORMATION:

Key Assessment #1 OAE for Intervention Specialist – Prior to Student Teaching – Externally Scored by Pearson
Key Assessment #2 IS course grades/GPA – End of Program GPA – WSU Calculation
Key Assessment #3 Unit Plan – EDS 6610/4610 – Rubric scored by course instructor
Key Assessment #4 Student Teaching Field Experience Form – EDS 6730/4730 – Rubric scored by University Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher
Key Assessment #5 edTPA - EDS 6990/4990 – Rubric scored externally by Pearson
Key Assessment #6 Transitions Assessment – EDS 6650/4650 – Rubric scored by course instructor

Survey Data

Key Assessment #1 19/24 candidates passed – 79.2% pass rate. WSU was equal to or higher than state average in each of the 4 tested domains. Key Assessment #2 All candidates have met the GPA requirements. Key Assessment #3 All candidates met or exceeded the expectations of the learning outcomes. Key Assessment #4 Data from CPAST. In general, most candidates met or exceeded expectations on all criteria. Key Assessment #5 8/10 candidates passed. Overall average score decreased by 1.5 points (out of 75 points) from 2018-19. Key Assessment #6 All candidates met the
expectations related to the learning outcomes; no candidate exceeded the expectations. Only 3 respondents – no meaningful interpretation can be made.

Key Assessment #1 Improved in 9 of 10 competencies from 2018-19 year Decreased in competency score related to formal/informal assessments Key Assessment #2 Candidates are successful in program courses, all of which align to CEC standards. Key Assessment #3 Candidates are able to effectively plan a unit that aligns with the CEC standards and meet student needs Key Assessment #4 Strengths collaborating with others; responding to critical feedback; providing a safe environment; and professional dispositions. Key Assessment #4 Areas to Improve facilitating students ability to think critically; use of effective assessment techniques Key Assessment #5 Strengths candidates skills at deepening students learning and analyzing student language use/subject specific learning Key Assessment #5 Areas to Improve using knowledge of students to inform teaching/learning; analyzing teaching effectiveness; and analysis of student learning Key Assessment #6 Candidates are able to effectively develop a transition plan for adults with disabilities

IV. ACTIONS TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

This report is shared with the faculty (full-time and adjunct) who teach in the Intervention Specialist program. Additionally, the report is posted in the Intervention Specialist Pilot page. The IS program faculty and other college personnel meet monthly to discuss data and to make program decisions. Based on 2019-20 data, the program made adjustments to 3 key assessments. Additionally, a greater focus on writing Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs) was incorporated into coursework. The program faculty also re-examined the required coursework and made modifications to the Program of Study based on that. The program also added evidence of mathematical competency as part of the admission requirement in order to ensure graduates have the necessary content knowledge to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

V. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Additional documentation, when provided, is stored in the internal Academic Program Assessment of Student Learning SharePoint site.