

# Academic Program Assessment Report

**Assessment** is a term commonly used to encompass the process of gathering and using evidence to guide improvements.

SACSCOC requires that an institution "identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results".

## Be sure to **SAVE** your progress as you work!

**Academic Program**  
Special Education, B.S.

**Submission Year**  
2024-2025

**Assessment Coordinator Name**  
Carol Hoyle

**Enter Assessment Coordinator Email**  
choyle1@lander.edu

## Program Goal

### Goal

#### Goal 1

**Program Goals** are broad and overarching statements about the skills, knowledge, and dispositions students are expected to gain by the end of their course of study (big picture). They support the Institution's Mission/Goals.

#### Program Goal

Graduates in the Special Education program of the Department of Teacher Education will demonstrate specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions in accordance to the South Carolina Teaching Standards and Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards.

#### Pillar of Success Supported

High-Demand, Market-Driven Programs

## Outcomes

### Outcome 1

**Outcomes** are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

**Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.**

**What type of Outcome would you like to add?**

## Student Learning Outcome

### Enter Outcome

Results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS)

### Timeframe for this Outcome

Academic Year 2023-2024

### Performance Target for "Met"

The average score for Lander's Department of Teacher Education Special Education Teacher Candidates on all 30 components of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is 2.75 or higher.

### Performance Target for "Partially Met"

The average score for Lander's Department of Teacher Education Special Education Teacher Candidates on 20/30 components of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is 2.75 or higher.

### Performance Target for "Not Met"

The average score for Lander's Department of Teacher Education Special Education Teacher Candidates on less than 20 components of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is 2.75 or higher.

### Assessment Measure Used

Teacher Work Sample (TWS)

### Frequency of Assessment

Once, during final semester of the special education professional program (student-teaching).

### Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

The average score on 22/30 components was 2.75 or higher. 2

### Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

### Comments/Narrative

The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) assessment is designed to allow teacher candidates to demonstrate their performance during student teaching. Successful completion of this assessment demonstrates that teacher candidates are prepared to enter the classroom as entry-level teachers.

The TWS assessment was developed by the Lander Department of Teacher Education and is aligned with InTASC standards and the South Carolina Teaching Standards.

The TWS is professional demonstration of educator competencies through a performance-based assessment tool that provides direct evidence of a teacher candidate's ability to design and implement standards-based instruction, assess student learning and reflect on the teaching and learning practice. This was completed during the student teaching semester after consultation with the cooperating teacher regarding choice of appropriate topic to be taught in a particular subject area(s) as determined by each program. Candidates planned a unit based on the requirements of our program. The teacher candidates planned for, taught, assessed, analyzed assessment results, and reflected upon this unit of study that they created. Prior to designing instruction, the teacher candidate considered the contextual factors of the community, school, and students as well as the classroom environment, management techniques to be used, and procedures to be followed that would ensure student success.

Analysis of the results from the 2023-2024 school year demonstrates that the average score for education student teachers on 22/30 of the components was 2.75 or higher with 16 of them being 3.0 or higher.

Analysis of component average scores indicate that these candidates showed strengths in the area of Learning Goals (3.86) as they designed their unit goals and in using Pre-Assessment Results as they

designed their lesson objectives. They also showed strength in making informative decisions based on their instruction as seen in the scores for Whole Class Decision-Making (3.57) and Small-Group/Individual Decision-Making (3.45). A final strength was found in their using the implications of their teaching to design their own professional learning goals (Implications for Professional Learning Goals (3.57)).

Three areas of weakness were found where the average score fell below 2.60: Knowledge of Theoretical Framework for Student Learning (2.57), Student Engagement Supported by Goals (2.57), and Student Self-Reflection & Record of Growth (2.28). These results suggest that candidates had difficulty connecting the strategies used in their lessons to educational learning theories. They need to review lessons to ensure activities fully engage the students and that they have the student reflect on their own learning and growth. This self-reflection in turn will help students become more engaged in their own progress and class activities.

#### **Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results**

\$0.00

#### **Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used**

No additional resources needed

## **Outcome 2**

**Outcomes** are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

**Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.**

#### **What type of Outcome would you like to add?**

Student Learning Outcome

#### **Enter Outcome**

Results of the EDUC 461 Final SC 4.0 Evaluation of Lesson Observations

#### **Timeframe for this Outcome**

Academic Year 2023-2024

#### **Performance Target for "Met"**

The average score for Lander's Department of Teacher Education Special Education Teacher Candidates on all 29 components of the EDUC 461 Final SC 4.0 Evaluation of Lesson Observations is 3.0 or higher

#### **Performance Target for "Partially Met"**

The average score for Lander's Department of Teacher Education Special Education Teacher Candidates on 20/29 components of the EDUC 461 Final SC 4.0 Evaluation of Lesson Observations is 3.0 or higher

#### **Performance Target for "Not Met"**

The average score for Lander's Department of Teacher Education Special Education Teacher Candidates on less than 20/29 components of the EDUC 461 Final SC 4.0 Evaluation of Lesson Observations is 3.0 or higher

**Assessment Measure Used**

EDUC 461 Final SC 4.0 Evaluation of Lesson Observations

**Frequency of Assessment**

Once, during final semester of the special education professional program (student-teaching).

**Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)**

The average score on 25/29 components was 3.0 or higher.

**Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)**

2

**Comments/Narrative**

Special Education Teacher Candidates taught a total of 10 lessons (4 the University Supervisor observed and 3 the Cooperating Teacher observed). Each was scored using the South Carolina 4.0 Rubric. A final meeting was held at the end of the clinical. In this meeting, the university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and candidate met to review all lessons and determine a final score for each component of SC 4.0 Rubric. This is the same rubric used by districts in South Carolina to evaluate their teachers. The rubric assesses the students on planning, instruction, classroom environment, and professionalism while in their final clinical setting (student teaching).

Analysis of the average scores for spring candidates found the following:

The candidates showed strength again this year across all the components in Classroom Environment indicating strengths in classroom management as all scores were 3.29 or higher. They also showed that they understand how to get to know their students as they excelled in Teacher Knowledge of Student (3.71).

Areas of need continue to be seen in lower scores for Student Work (2.86) and Assessment (2.86). Each of these is in the Planning section of the rubric. Students continue to need work on planning appropriate assessments for their lessons. A third area with a lower score (2.86) was Lesson Structure and Pacing in which teachers must ensure their lesson is structured well and the pace ensures students are engaged throughout the lesson. The final area that fell short of the expected 3.0 score was Standards & Objectives (2.86)

**Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results**

none

**Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used**

n/a

## Goal Summary

**Goal Summary/Comments**

Lander University Special Education Teacher Candidates demonstrated their mastery of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions for the South Carolina Teaching Standards and Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards as seen in their meeting the majority of the performance outcomes for the TWS and the EDUC 461 Final SC 4.0 Evaluation of Lesson Observations. These two assessments evaluate how the teacher candidates plan, teach, and manage the classroom in their final clinical setting (student teaching).

Students showed strengths their knowledge of their students in both assessments. This is seen in their use of their knowledge of the students in planning learning goals and objectives and making instructional

decisions during instruction.

While students were able to plan the assessments for the TWS unit, they had more difficulty planning student work and assessment in lessons planned and observed. They also had more difficulty structuring their lessons and ensuring the pacing of each lesson.

### **Changes Made/Proposed Related to Goal**

Emphasis for the 2024-2025 year will be placed on teaching candidates to ensure that the assessment for each lesson includes appropriate student work that will show student mastery of the lesson objective. As students develop lesson plans for the two clinical settings prior to student teaching: SPED 329 and SPED 429, instructors will work to help candidates more fully match lesson assessment with their lesson objectives and instruction. They will also assist candidates with effective pacing of their lessons. These adjustments should help students connect more to these standards and objectives as they teach their lessons.

### **Upload Rubrics/Other Files**

## **Goal 2**

**Program Goals** are broad and overarching statements about the skills, knowledge, and dispositions students are expected to gain by the end of their course of study (big picture). They support the Institution's Mission/Goals.

### **Program Goal**

To comply with Program Productivity standards as defined by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education.

### **Pillar of Success Supported**

High-Demand, Market-Driven Programs

## **Outcomes**

### **Outcome 1**

**Outcomes** are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

**Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.**

### **What type of Outcome would you like to add?**

Operational Outcome

### **Enter Outcome**

Major Enrollment

### **Timeframe for this Outcome**

Academic Year 2023-2024

**Performance Target for "Met"**

Using a five-year rolling average, the number of students enrolled in the major (special education) for Baccalaureate programs is greater than or equal to 12.5.

**Performance Target for "Partially Met"**

Not applicable

**Performance Target for "Not Met"**

Using a five-year rolling average, the number of students enrolled in the major (special education) for Baccalaureate programs is less than 12.5.

**Assessment Measure Used**

Enrollment and Graduation data extracted from Banner

**Frequency of Assessment**

Annually

**Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)**

38

**Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)**

3

**Comments/Narrative**

Special Education faculty attended Lander Open Houses or provided information for faculty attending to enhance recruitment of special education majors. Special education faculty encouraged new education majors to consider the special education major.

**Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results**

\$0.00

**Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used**

No additional resources needed to sustain the results.

**Outcome 2**

**Outcomes** are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

**Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.**

**What type of Outcome would you like to add?**

Operational Outcome

**Enter Outcome**

Completions (Degrees Awarded)

**Timeframe for this Outcome**

Academic Year 2023-2024

**Performance Target for "Met"**

Using a five-year rolling average, the number of degrees awarded (special education) for Baccalaureate programs is greater than or equal to 8.

**Performance Target for "Partially Met"**

Not applicable

**Performance Target for "Not Met"**

Using a five-year rolling average, the number of degrees awarded (special education) for Baccalaureate programs is less than 8.

**Assessment Measure Used**

Enrollment and Graduation data extracted from Banner

**Frequency of Assessment**

Annually

**Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)**

8.2

**Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)**

3

**Comments/Narrative**

The Early Alert system was used for students having academic difficulties and additional stresses they may have faced. Special education advisors met frequently with advisees virtually and/or in person to answer questions, review program requirements, and provide support. Advisors reviewed Praxis scores and sent reminders to students about Praxis requirements and timelines for Lander. All students were provided with suggested study materials. The EDUC 205: Teacher Education and Praxis Preparation course was offered to assist students struggling with passing the required Praxis exams.

**Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results**

\$0.00

**Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used**

No additional resources are needed to sustain the results.

## Goal Summary

**Goal Summary/Comments**

The Special Education Program met expected outcomes for this goal.

**Changes Made/Proposed Related to Goal**

The faculty will continue to provide supports needed for students to help them be successful and complete their programs. Special Education majors are being asked to attend open houses to help recruit special education majors.

**Upload Rubrics/Other Files**

### Goal 3

**Program Goals** are broad and overarching statements about the skills, knowledge, and dispositions students are expected to gain by the end of their course of study (big picture). They support the Institution's Mission/Goals.

**Program Goal**

All Special Education Majors will attain a score of 165 on the Praxis II required for their teaching certification in the state of South Carolina (Passing Score is 158)

**Pillar of Success Supported**

## Outcomes

### Outcome 1

**Outcomes** are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

**Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.**

**What type of Outcome would you like to add?**

Student Learning Outcome

**Enter Outcome**

Praxis II-Test #5543

**Timeframe for this Outcome**

Academic Year 2023-2024

**Performance Target for "Met"**

Praxis II Test #5543- score of 165 or higher

**Performance Target for "Partially Met"**

Praxis II Test #5543- score of 158-164

**Performance Target for "Not Met"**

Praxis II Test #5543- score of less than 158

**Assessment Measure Used**

Praxis II-Test #5543

**Frequency of Assessment**

Yearly (prior to student teaching)

**Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)**

6/6 teacher candidates who took the exam scored 165 or higher

**Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)**

3

**Comments/Narrative**

Students are encouraged to pass their professional Praxis II exam prior to enrollment in EDUC 461 (student teaching).

Dr. Hoyle conducted an analysis of the scores for the 6 teacher candidates who took the exam for this academic year. One graduate did not attempt the exam as did not plan to pursue state certification. All 6 passed the exam required score of 158 and scored 165 or higher on the exam. Candidates' mean score was 170.8. The range of scores was 165-180 with a median score of 169.5.

Candidate scores for each of the six categories on the exam were reviewed by looking at whether candidates' scores fell within the average range, below the average range, or above the average range



as noted in individual score reports. Two areas of strength this year were found in Planning and Instruction. This supports the strengths found in planning in the TWS assessment in Goal 1.

An area of continued weakness was seen in Assessment. This is the same area showing as a weakness in the assessments analyzed in Goal 1.

During this past year, the following supports were provided for candidates to help them meet this objective. Praxis II study plans were required in SPED 329. Special education courses were aligned with clinical experiences to ensure opportunities to apply course content and concepts.

**Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results**

\$0.00

**Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used**

No additional resources are needed to sustain results.

## Goal Summary

**Goal Summary/Comments**

100% of the students who took the exam passed the exam again this academic year and met the expected score of 165.

**Changes Made/Proposed Related to Goal**

Additional emphasis will continue to be placed on assessment in the two assessment courses: SPED 423 and SPED 321. Emphasis will be placed on connecting the lesson objectives, assessments, and instruction as students plan and teach lessons and units in their clinical courses.

A new Praxis II exam is replacing the current one for our program. Practice questions have been incorporated into the SPED 329 seminars to help prepare students for this new exam.

Dr. Hoyle will analyze student reports again this coming year to determine if there are any specific areas that need to be emphasized as the students begin to take this new exam version.

**Upload Rubrics/Other Files**

**Dean's Email Address**

shuntbarron@lander.edu

**Approved by Dean?**

Yes

**Signature of Dean**

Sarah Hunt-Barron

**Comments from Dean's Review**

I appreciated the connections between goals and the use of data to inform changes to your program!

**Thank you for reviewing and approving this report. The approval and a copy of the report will be emailed to you and the Assessment Coordinator.**