



3211 Providence Drive  
Anchorage, AK 99508-4614  
907.786.1050

## REPORT ON AY2022-2023 ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT

**Submission date:** 11/15/2023

**Assessment Plan covered in the report:** Special Education GC/MEd

**College:** School of Education

**Campuses where the program(s) is delivered:**  Anchorage  KOD  KPC  MSC  PWSC

**Submitted by:** Krista James, Ph.D., Special Education-Program Lead, kpjames@alaska.edu

*After responding to the questions below, the program should email this form to the dean, with a copy to the appropriate community campus director(s) if the program is delivered on a community campus.*

- 1. Please list and number the Program Student Learning Outcomes your program assessed in AY23. For each outcome, indicate one of the following: Exceeded faculty expectations, Met faculty expectations, or Did not meet faculty expectations.**

***Example: 1. Communicate effectively in a variety of contexts and formats – Exceeded faculty expectations; 2. Adopt critical perspectives for understanding the forces of globalization and diversity – Met faculty expectations.***

- 1.Utilize a variety of assessments to identify specific areas of student strengths and weaknesses and use the results to guide instruction.-Met Expectations
- 2.Individualize instruction to meet the specific needs of students with disabilities in inclusive settings.-Exceeded Expectations
- 3.Support and promote inclusiveness and equity for students with diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds.-Exceeded Expectations
- 4.Apply the legal and ethical principles associated with special education.-Exceeded Expectations
- 5.Promote a positive social environment for all students, particularly those with significant emotional and/or behavioral disorders.-Exceeded Expectations
- 6.Develop and maintain an atmosphere of collaboration with teachers, parents, administrators, and paraprofessionals.-Met Expectations
- 7.Critically analyze and apply principles of research.-Exceeded Expectations
- 8.Demonstrate literacy regarding theoretical perspectives associated with human development and

learning.-Exceeded Expectations

**2. Describe your assessment process in AY23 for these Program Student Learning Outcomes, including the collection of data, analysis of data, and faculty (and other, e.g., advisory board) conversations around the findings. (1000 words or less)**

The program utilizes seven key assessments that are embedded into coursework throughout the program to measure student performance on CEC Standards, Student Learning Outcomes, and CAEP Standards. Students submit the assessments to Watermark where program faculty score individual assessments. Yearly, faculty uses Watermark to run reports to determine how students are performing on each standard. This data is reviewed by the program's advisory board and they create goals and action steps for moving forward into the next academic year.

**3. What are the findings and what do they tell the faculty about student learning in your program? (1000 words or less)**

A total of 8 candidates were assessed across six assessments. Scores demonstrated that 80% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations on all indicators with one exception. Candidate performance on CEC KE 4.4 Engage individuals with exceptionalities to work toward quality learning and performance indicates a need to analyze data and bring to the program advisory board for review and discussion.

Scoring scale: 3–Exceeds Expectation, 2.5–Partially Exceeds Expectation; 2–Meets Expectation, 1.5–Partially Meets Expectation, 1–Approaches Expectation.

**4. Based on the findings, did the faculty make any recommendations for changes to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Yes**

- i. **Please describe the recommended action(s), what improvements in student learning the program hopes to see, the proposed timeline, and how the program will know if the change(s) has worked. If no recommendations for changes were made, please explain that decision. (1000 words or less)**

Yes, the faculty proposed to bring the assessment scores, instruments, and rubrics which are aligned with CEC Standards 4.4 to the program advisory committee meeting in Fall 2023 where the committee will review the information and make recommendations for how the program can improve our instruction in the area of quality learning.

**5. In the past academic year, how did your program use the results of previous assessment cycles to make changes intended to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Please check all that apply.**

Course curriculum changes

- Course prerequisite changes
- Changes in teaching methods
- Changes in advising
- Degree requirement changes
- Degree course sequencing
- Course enrollment changes (e.g., course capacity, grading structure [pass/fail, A-F])
- Changes in program policies/procedures
- Changes to Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)
- College-wide initiatives (e.g., High-Impact Practices)
- Faculty, staff, student development
- Other
- No changes were implemented in AY23. *(If no options above were selected)*

**If you checked “Other” above, please describe. (100 words or less)**

Changes to program assessments

**6. Do you have any information about how well these or other past improvements are working? Are they achieving their intended goals? Please include any data or assessment results that help you demonstrate this. (1000 words or less)**

Data is being collected this academic year to determine the effectiveness of the program assessment changes and will be reviewed in Spring 2023. Curriculum changes will go into effect in Fall 2024 and data will be reviewed in Spring 2025.

---

### **DEAN SECTION (Due to the program on January 15)**

*After completing the Dean Section and signing it, the dean should email this form to the program, and copy [uaa\\_oaa@alaska.edu](mailto:uaa_oaa@alaska.edu) for posting. If the program is delivered on one or more community campus, the dean should consult with the appropriate community campus director(s) on the response and copy the appropriate community campus director(s) when emailing the response to the program.*

**1. Based on the program’s responses above, what guidance and support do you have for the program moving forward? (200 words or less)**

The Special Education faculty are encouraged to explore why only 80% of candidates are successful on the key indicators and why Indicate 4.4 on engaging with individuals with exceptionalities. The planned advisory committee review should consider if the misalignment is in the content presented, field experience expectations, and/or assessment measures. Any or all of these components might need to be modified and implemented in the 24-25 academic year.

- 2. Discuss what the program is doing particularly well in terms of its processes for the assessment and improvement of student learning, for example, the use of a common rubric or prompt, a signature assignment, etc. (200 words or less)**

The systematic approach used by EDSE to collect and analyze learner data stems from the expectations of CAEP and ensures a high-quality approach to assessment and continuous improvement. The faculty are to be commended for continuing to engage the advisory committee to adjust and refine program assessments in response to learner performance.

**Dean's signature:**

DocuSigned by:  
*Tonia A. Dousay*  
845105C7D9E64AA...

**Date:** 1/12/24