

ASSESSMENT WEBSITE INFORMATION

College: Education

Degree Program: Special Ed- Instructional Specialist P-4 MSE

Chair/Director: Annette Hux

2012 Report

DATA SAY:

During 2010, the P-4 PRAXIS II pass rate for Special Education candidates had for three test administrations been below the 80% required NCATE pass rate.

SO WHAT:

Faculty discussed the problem and determined that lack of course content alignment with state core competencies at both the ASU curriculum and the State of Arkansas levels were responsible for the identified problem with PRAXIS II pass rates.

HOW WE CHANGED:

Faculty responsible for the Master's Degree in P-4 Special Education made significant changes in the course, ELSE 6023 Characteristics of Individuals with Disabilities, to enhance the degree's alignment with the CEC Standards and core knowledge addressed in the Praxis exams. Meanwhile, the Arkansas Department of Education changed the Praxis II exam for special education candidates to Core Knowledge and Application test number 354, which better aligns with state and CEC requirements than did the previously required PRAXIS II exam.

WHAT WE GOT:

Results show 100% of the candidates taking the new PRAXIS test during the 2011-2012 testing period passed, (N = 84).



ASSESSMENT WEBSITE INFORMATION

College: Education

Degree Program: MSE Special Ed- Instructional Specialist P-4

Chair/Director: Annette Hux

2013 Report

DATA SAY:

Data were collected on the students writing a Present Level of Performance, Annual Goals and Objectives while writing of an IEP.

During the fall 2012 semester the students' scores were:

Present Level of Performance Standard 8

Exemplary 79%

Acceptable 15%

Unacceptable 5%

Annual Goals Standard 7

Exemplary 53%

Acceptable 9%

Unacceptable 38%

Objectives Standard 7

Exemplary 74%

Acceptable 10%

Unacceptable 16%

SO WHAT:

What we found is that our students are scoring average and below in determining what information is required to be written in a Present Level of Performance regarding the students. And the information that comes from the PLOP is what helps determine what the students weaknesses are and what area he/she needs to have goals and objectives for. Students are having difficulty determining how to write the goals and objectives including each component required.

HOW WE CHANGED:

Special Education faculty met and decided to change the way the IEP Module was to provide the students more practice in the courses before they wrote the IEP for their target student in this LAB module. Instructions were reworded, all special education faculty were involved in teaching the lab courses so we would be more involved and know how to answer the students the questions the same way from each professor, and a template was provided on what the IEP should look like.



ASSESSMENT WEBSITE INFORMATION

College: Education **Degree Program:** MSE Special Ed- Instructional Specialist P-4

Chair/Director: Annette Hux **2013 Report**

WHAT WE GOT:

During the spring 2013 semester the IEP sections of Present Level of Performance, Annual Goals and Objectives were assessed. Results came back as follows:

Present Levels of Performance Standard 8 CC8S5

Exemplary 65%

Acceptable 20%

Unacceptable 15%

Annual Goals Standard 7 CC7K3 (national, state or provincial, and local curricula standards)

Exemplary 60%

Acceptable 10%

Unacceptable 30%

Objectives CEC Standard 7 IGC7S3

Exemplary 75%

Acceptable 0%

Unacceptable 25%

