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Planning Instructions:

Identify at least three student learning outcomes and complete the following portions of this plan. Student learning outcomes are defined in terms of what students will know, or be able to do, or believe as a result of instruction. The completed plan is e-mailed to Oaplan@acad.usf.edu.

Reporting Instructions:

At the end of the assessment period, the assessment report is prepared and e-mailed to: Oareports@acad.usf.edu. The report contains a summary of assessment findings identified. In addition, the report describes what changes (if any) were made as a result of a review of assessment findings. The discussion on use of results should, at the very least, indicate that faculty members reviewed the assessment findings.
Outcomes Assessment Plan/Report

Student Learning Outcome #1

What will students know or be able to do or believe? Be specific.

Students completing their doctoral program in special education will demonstrate knowledge of the specialized content in their field.

ASSESSMENT PLAN - The completed assessment plan is e-mailed to Oaplans@acad.usf.edu at the beginning of the assessment period.

It is recommended that two means of assessment be prepared for each student learning outcome. One means of assessment may be sufficient.

Means of Assessment #1: Within three months of completing their program, and after attaining a professional position, all Ph.D. graduates will be asked to rate series of items concerning their level of preparedness in their specialized field.

Criteria for Success: Ninety percent or more of the Ph.D. students completing the program will assign an overall rating of 4 or above (on a 5 point scale) to a series of items concerning their level of preparedness in their specialized field.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Means of Assessment #2: At the end of course work, doctoral students choose either to write an article length publishable paper to reflect an integration of course content or to complete a three day comprehensive exam.

Criteria for Success: Assessment on the choice outlined above will be determined by the doctoral candidate’s committee, following the guidelines established for the exam or paper by the doctoral program.

ASSESSMENT REPORT - These items are completed after assessment activities, at the end of the assessment period. Completed assessment reports are e-mailed to: Oareports@acad.usf.edu

Findings: What findings resulted from assessment activities?

Use of Results: What changes, if any, were made in response to the findings? This section should indicate that faculty members reviewed the assessment findings.
Student Learning Outcome #2

What will students know or be able to do or believe? Be specific.

During the first year of their program, students will demonstrate their ability to critique scholarly works in writing using critical analysis, analyzing & synthesizing the literature cited, drawing appropriate conclusions based on evidence. They will also develop a position paper addressing a current issue in the field and supporting it with the research literature. Student writing will be clear, organized and free from grammatical or syntactical errors.

ASSESSMENT PLAN - The completed assessment plan is e-mailed to Oaplans@acad.usf.edu at the beginning of the assessment period.

It is recommended that two means of assessment be prepared for each student learning outcome. One means of assessment may be sufficient.

Means of Assessment #1: One writing assignment from courses in the first semester that incorporates the qualities described in action item 1 will be submitted by each student for review by a panel of faculty. Faculty will evaluate each submitted writing piece using an appropriate evaluation rubric.

Criteria for Success: 100% of students will receive an average rating of 4 (out of 5) by a panel of faculty using an appropriate evaluation rubric.

Means of Assessment #2: Students will submit one writing assignment from courses in their second year that incorporates the qualities described above for a review of a panel of faculty. Faculty will evaluated each submitted writing selection using an appropriate evaluation rubric. Students will write a grant proposal for either the OSEP Student Initiated Project Competition or a comparable funding competition. Class members and the instructor will review the proposal and score it. Students will contribute to writing sections of a research or teacher preparation grant proposal with a faculty member.

Criteria for Success: 1) 100% of students will receive an average rating of 4 (out of 5) by a panel of faculty using an appropriate evaluation rubric. 2) Students’ research proposals will be scored no less than 80 (out of 100) ponts by the professor using the OSEP evaluation protocol. 3) Students will participate in writing a training grant proposal.
ASSESSMENT REPORT - These items are completed after assessment activities, at the end of the assessment period. Completed assessment reports are e-mailed to: Oareports@acad.usf.edu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings:</th>
<th>What findings resulted from assessment activities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Results:</td>
<td>What changes, if any, were made in response to the findings? This section should indicate that faculty members reviewed the assessment findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Learning Outcome #3

What will students know or be able to do or believe? Be specific.

Students will develop a teaching portfolio that illustrates their knowledge of the standard special education teacher education curriculum and their skill in delivering that curriculum.

ASSESSMENT PLAN - The completed assessment plan is e-mailed to Oaplans@acad.usf.edu at the beginning of the assessment period.

It is recommended that two means of assessment be prepared for each student learning outcome. One means of assessment may be sufficient.

Means of Assessment #1: A rubric similar to the Teaching Rubric used during the USF Tenure and Promotion process will be used to evaluate portfolios. At least two faculty members will review each portfolio.

Criteria for Success: Students are expected to have successfully taught in several different settings that involved a variety of instructional approaches, for example, the delivery of lectures, leading discussions, orchestrating and facilitating case discussions and role plays as well as directing service learning projects, action research projects, and portfolio construction. Students also are expected to have worked in an advisory capacity with undergraduate or MAT students in their field assignments.

Means of Assessment #2: The attached rubric, adapted from the USF Personnel Committee’s rubric for promotion and tenure, will be used by at least two faculty to evaluate students’ teaching portfolios.

Criteria for Success: Students will achieve an average rating above 3.0 on teaching rubric.

ASSESSMENT REPORT - These items are completed after assessment activities, at the end of the assessment period. Completed assessment reports are e-mailed to: Oareports@acad.usf.edu

Findings: What findings resulted from assessment activities?

Use of Results: 1) Students will be given feedback on their teaching portfolios and on their performance in teaching roles. The student’s major professor and the professor responsible for the teacher education seminar will also be provided a copy of the evaluation at the end of
Outcomes Assessment Plan/Report

the semester. 2) These data will be used to evaluate the teacher education component of the doctoral program. Adjustments in the program will be made to ensure that all students have sufficient and successful (ratings above a 3) supervised teaching experiences prior to their graduation.

Duplicate this sheet to assess additional student learning outcomes.
### Part II: Primary Domains for Successful Teaching Proficiency

#### Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Dimensions</th>
<th>Outstanding 5</th>
<th>Strong 4</th>
<th>Satisfactory 3</th>
<th>Weak 2</th>
<th>Unacceptable 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous improvement in teaching over time (reflective)</strong></td>
<td>Narrative in teaching portfolio reflects thoughtful, respectful, thorough consideration of feedback about teaching and consistent reflection about ways of improving or maintaining a high standard of teaching. Furthermore, when indicated, changes in behavior are evident. There is a clearly expressed alignment between the stated philosophy and teaching approach.</td>
<td>Narrative in teaching portfolio reflects consideration of feedback about teaching and reflection about ways of improving teaching. When indicated, changes in behavior are evident. A correspondence between stated philosophy and teaching approach is evident.</td>
<td>Narrative in teaching portfolio reflects efforts to self-evaluate and <em>attend</em> to helpful feedback, but a corresponding change in teaching behavior is limited. Correspondence between the stated philosophy and teaching approaches is implied.</td>
<td>Narrative in teaching portfolio reflects limited consideration of feedback about teaching and efforts to improve teaching are limited. Little correspondence is noted between the stated philosophy and teaching approaches.</td>
<td>Narrative in teaching portfolio does not consider feedback about teaching, nor are efforts to improve teaching evident. No correspondence is noted between the stated philosophy and teaching approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content knowledge and expertise</strong></td>
<td>Syllabi and faculty evaluations of instruction indicate course content is current. Syllabi contain and peer evaluations of instruction describe content that will prepare students to master the knowledge and skills identified by relevant learned societies or that reflect conscientious dissent from these standards.</td>
<td>Syllabi and faculty evaluations of instruction indicate course content contains many of the current issues in the field. Syllabi contain and peer evaluations of instruction describe content that will prepare students to master the knowledge and skills identified by relevant learned societies.</td>
<td>Syllabi and faculty evaluations of instruction indicate the course content is somewhat dated and not all learned society standards are adequately incorporated.</td>
<td>Syllabi are not complete and reflective of learned society standards. Faculty evaluations are missing or they indicate instructional practice is out of date, shallow and inaccurate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course delivery</strong></td>
<td>Syllabi reflect a logical, thoughtfully sequenced course. Expectations are stated explicitly and assignments explained in detail. Student evaluations</td>
<td>Syllabi are organized and class activities appear to be logically sequenced. Assignments are clearly explained. Student</td>
<td>Syllabi suggest that the course format was adequately organized, and student evaluations for the most part report that the instructor</td>
<td>Student evaluations report that instruction was not clearly organized and the instructor was not well prepared.</td>
<td>Student evaluations indicate delivery of instruction was consistently inadequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Assessment Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction was delivered effectively. Instructor was very prepared, explained concepts clearly, and effectively used a variety of instructional strategies to deliver content.</td>
<td>Evaluations indicate that the instructor was prepared, explained concepts well, and used effective teaching strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was usually prepared, and explained concepts in comprehensible ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Teaching (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Dimensions Continued:</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student learning and achievement</strong></td>
<td>Student products reflect outstanding achievement and/or substantial learning/progress over time.</td>
<td>Student products are of good quality and clearly reflect considerable learning/progress over time.</td>
<td>Student products are of acceptable quality and reflect adequate learning/progress over time.</td>
<td>Student products reflect little learning or progress over time.</td>
<td>Student products are not of acceptable quality or are not provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of instructional techniques</strong></td>
<td>Teaching materials, handouts, course format, instructional approaches are clearly aligned with the course objectives and are creative/innovative, reflecting a variety of instructional approaches.</td>
<td>Teaching materials, handouts, course format, instructional approaches are aligned with the course objectives and reflect a variety of instructional approaches.</td>
<td>Teaching materials, handouts, course format, instructional approaches are aligned with the course objectives and reflect some variation in approach.</td>
<td>Teaching materials, handouts, course format, instructional approaches show limited variety and are only somewhat aligned with the course objectives.</td>
<td>Teaching materials, handouts, course format, instructional approaches are neither aligned with the course objectives nor varied in approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill in responding to individual students’ needs/interests</strong></td>
<td>Teaching narrative, instructional materials, student evaluations, and observations of teaching indicate a high level of skill in involving and motivating all students. Individual students’ needs and perspectives are clearly respected and valued.</td>
<td>Teaching narrative, instructional materials, student evaluations, and observations of teaching report a commitment to and general success in involving and motivating all students.</td>
<td>Teaching narrative, instructional materials, student evaluations, and observations of teaching reflect efforts to involve and motivate all students, but student feedback and teaching observations across multiple semesters indicate that some students’ needs and perspectives are not being successfully addressed.</td>
<td>Teaching narrative, instructional materials, student evaluations, and observations of teaching report limited efforts to involve and motivate students with special needs. Further, little sensitivity to individual differences among students is evident.</td>
<td>Teaching narrative, instructional materials, student evaluations, and observations of teaching report do not reflect efforts to involve and motivate students with special needs, nor do they reflect a sensitivity to individual differences among students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes Assessment Plan/Report

Form C