

Academic Degree Programs Assessment



**Northern Illinois
University**

Submitted to the University Assessment Panel
AY 2022-2023

Part I: Assessment Plan
College Of Education
Department of Special and Early Education

Special Education
Masters of Science (MS)

September 26, 2022
Submitted to the University Assessment Panel by:
Greg Conderman, Assessment Coordinator
Lydia Gerzel-Short, Program Coordinator
Laura Hedin, Department Chair

Introduction

The Department of Special and Early Education (SEED) in the College of Education houses graduate and undergraduate programs in early childhood and special education. The focus of this report is the graduate-level program (M.S.Ed.) in special education. The M.S.Ed. in Special Education has seven separate and distinct emphases: Advanced Practices in Special Education, Assistive Technology Instructional Specialist (CATIS) for Persons with Vision Impairments, Behavior Analysis (BA), Learning-Behavior Specialist I (LBS I, special education licensure), Orientation and Mobility (O & M), Visual Impairments (educator licensure, TVI), and Vision Rehabilitation Therapy (VRT). Each program was developed in compliance with an accrediting organization and has full approval to prepare candidates in their respective professional fields. The vast majority of candidates who complete the M.S.Ed. enroll in the BA, LBS I, or vision programs. Most candidates in the AP emphasis already hold teacher licensure in special education and may be pursuing the Director of Special Education credential or other specialized training.

Two emphases in the M.S.Ed. in Special Education lead to Illinois educator licensure: the LBS and teacher of the visually impaired (TVI) emphasis. The LBS-1 emphasis prepares licensed special educators to teach grades kindergarten through age 22 in most disability areas. Second, Visual Impairments emphasis prepares licensed teachers of the visually impaired (TVI) for students in grades prekindergarten through age 22 who are blind or have low vision. Both programs adhere to standards for the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, formerly NCATE) standards, and the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards for initial teacher licensure. The TVI emphasis also aligns with standards from the Association for Education and Rehabilitation of Blind and Visually Impaired (AER). In the Advanced Practices emphasis in the degree program, candidates who already hold educator licensure complete specialized course sequences that lead to professional credentials. Similarly, emphases in BA, O&M, and VRT align with standards from their discipline-specific accreditation organizations as well as from CEC. The Association for Behavior Analysis International oversees accreditation of the BA program, approving our “verified course sequence” so that candidates are qualified to sit for the Board Certified Behavior Analyst examination. The state of Illinois and AER oversee approval and accreditation of the vision emphases (CATIS, O&M, TVI), and AER oversees accreditation of the CATIS and VRT programs. The Academy for Certification of Vision, Rehabilitation, and Education Professionals is the certifying organization for the Assistive Technology for Individuals with Visual Impairments specialization.

At the time of the 2016 assessment report, M.S.Ed. courses associated with educator licensure were aligned with Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS). This included the LBS and TVI licensure options and four optional course sequences/certificates of graduate studies associated with LBS II endorsements. Some students completed the LBS II certificates as part of the Advanced Practices option in the M.S.Ed. However, enrollment numbers were very low, and feedback from our program advisory committee (PAC) indicated a lack of demand for the LBS II. Consequently, the certificates were suspended, and the new emphasis in Behavior Analysis was developed (2018). Since its inception, the BA emphasis has been our most popular emphasis in the M.S.Ed. with a new cohort of approximately 30 graduate students beginning each fall semester.

In 2019-2020, faculty also updated many graduated courses to reflect CEC’s emphasis on high-leverage practices (HLPs). The HLPs consist of 22 evidenced-based methods or approaches identified by CEC as having significant positive impact on learners with disabilities. The HLPs

are divided into four broad subcategories: Assessment, Social-Emotional Learning, Instruction, and Collaboration. Coursework throughout the LBS and other emphases reflects CEC’s focus on HLPs. In 2021, CEC published new standards for both initial and advanced special education practices, prompting special education faculty to initiate revisions to courses as well as updates to assessments and rubrics to align with changes to the standards. This process began in 2021-2022 and will continue into the 2022-2023 academic school year. Recently, the Illinois State Board of Education announced a transition from the IPTS standards to the Illinois Culturally Responsive Teaching and Leading Standards (CRTLs). All courses in the programs will need to be aligned with the CRTLs by 2024; therefore, faculty are in the process of examining course content, syllabi, and assignments to assure that all CRTL standards are met in the program.

Based on these many changes in the field of special education and to our graduate degree program, the program faculty initiated a review of SLOs and assessments used to measure them in spring 2022. First, HLPs and CRTL standards were not present in the 2016 SLOs. Second, they found that previous SLOs had vague action words (e.g., recognize...in three SLOs) making assessment of the SLO difficult. Program faculty also found that several of the 2016 SLOs were identical to the undergraduate SLOs and were not pertinent to the graduate program. Finally, the 2016 SLOs primarily aligned with the LBS licensure emphasis and key assessments in that program area without consideration of non-licensure emphases. These SLOs were not relevant or appropriate for some of the new emphases in the M.S.Ed. For example, the 2016 SLO 2 focused on written lesson plans which are not a component of Advanced Practices, O & M, or the BA emphases. The revised SLOs more clearly reflect common expectations across the seven emphases. Table 1 shows the previously reported SLOs (2016) and the revised SLOs and the emphases in which they can be assessed.

Table 1. Comparison of previous and revised student learning outcomes for all seven emphases in the M.S.Ed. in Special Education.

2016 Student Learning Outcome	Revised Student Learning Outcome	Emphasis in which new SLO is assessed
Recognize historical, legal, and philosophical foundations of special education and write a well-developed personalized philosophy of special education based on historical, legal, civil rights, and research in the special education field. (recognition assessed on state test; personalized philosophy based on philosophy paper)	No corresponding revised SLO	N/A
Recognize components of and write lesson plans, unit plans, instructional plans, and transition plans for students with mild, moderate, and severe disabilities based on individual student needs and characteristics. (recognition assessed on the state test; writing the plan based on authentic artifacts)	Plan, implement, and evaluate interventions for individuals with disabilities using high-leverage practices (HLPs), culturally responsive teaching, and behavioral principles.	BA, CATIS, LBS, O&M, TVI, VRT
Correctly administer, score, and interpret scores from a standardized achievement test (skills assessed on state test and assessment project)	Analyze, accurately interpret, and evaluate data (screening, progress monitoring, formal, informal, criterion-referenced, and standardized) used for decision-making in a variety of special education settings.	AP, CATIS, LBS, O&M, TVI, VRT

Describe and demonstrate at least 3 assistive technologies to use with students with disabilities based on their unique needs and characteristics (describe based on written reflection; demonstrate based on performance assessment)	Synthesize research regarding special education curriculum to evaluate resources used in special education settings (e.g., curriculum, applications, assistive technology, online IEP programs).	AP, CATIS, LBS, O&M, TVI, VRT
Write a research paper/action research project on a timely topic or issue in special education with recent (since 2005) citations that also describes specific implications for practice (assessed through research paper and research proposal)	Design a research study grounded in an analysis of current research literature, to improve outcomes for individuals with disabilities in a professional setting (classroom, school, clinic) in which candidates work.	AP, CATIS, LBS, O&M, TVI, VRT
Display appropriate collaborative and professional behaviors/dispositions in NIU classes, early clinicals, and student teaching (assessed through dispositions checks and student teaching evaluation)	Evaluate collaborative practices in their school/professional setting and develop a plan to improve such practices grounded in the professional literature in special education.	AP, CATIS, LBS, O&M, TVI
	Display professionalism appropriate to the settings in which they work and learn.	AP, CATIS, LBS, O&M, TVI, VRT
Describe their own individual and NIU special education program strengths and areas for future improvement and receive at least 80% of “satisfactory” ratings regarding their knowledge and use of standards as noted by PAC committee members, employers, cooperating teachers, and student teaching supervisors (assessed through various surveys)	No corresponding updated SLO	N/A

Licensure and non-licensure emphases include many of the same types of assessments to evaluate student learning outcomes including:

- Student teaching or internship evaluations
- State/accreditation test scores
- Surveys of teacher candidates’ dispositions and professional behaviors
- Planning based on assessment of needs of students/participants, recommendations of high-leverage or evidence-based interventions
- Collaboration artifacts
- Research paper or grant proposal based on literature review
- Data collection, drawing conclusion/making decisions based on data

In all emphases, candidates complete a comprehensive exam in one of their final semesters. During this course, candidates conduct a review of literature on a topic related to their discipline-specific area and create a research or grant proposal based on that literature review. To complete their credentials in most emphases, candidates must also take and pass several assessments to enter the program, continue in the program, and successfully exit the program. For example, for program entry, candidates must have at least a 3.0/4.0 undergraduate or exiting grade point average (GPA), pass a safety tutorial test, have a negative TB test, pass a background check, and meet disposition assessments. To continue in the program, candidates must demonstrate mastery of specific state and national standards, maintain a 3.0 cumulative GPA, and earn scores of “satisfactory” for all items on a disposition assessment. To be recommended for licensure, candidates must pass the edTPA (the Education Teacher Performance Assessment),

pass program-specific state licensure tests, satisfactorily complete a student teaching or internship experience, and earn scores of “satisfactory” for all items on a disposition assessment (cooperating teacher and student teaching supervisor). Previously, candidates had to pass two state licensure tests—one related to general curriculum, and one related to licensure-specific content. In fall 2022, the state licensure tests were revised, and candidates will be the first to take one revised test (LBS or Vision). All state-mandated assessments are included in our overall comprehensive assessment plan for our accrediting organizations.

Additional factors contributing to decisions regarding preparation of candidates for professional careers and assess their knowledge, skills, and dispositions include competition from on-line universities, lower enrollments in graduate programs nation-wide, and declining state resources. Consequently, the special education faculty, special education clinical coordinator, department chair, and advisors hold monthly program meetings throughout the semester to plan and evaluate program initiatives, evaluate programmatic assessment activities, discuss issues related to clinical and advising practices, and review student concerns and the effectiveness of the dispositions process. These regular meetings provide a consistent forum to discuss available data related to the program (formative and summative) and make program changes, accordingly. In the past, these discussions resulted in the addition of the Behavior Analyst emphasis to the M.S.Ed., development of paid student teaching policies, and reorganization of the course sequence. Recent discussions have focused on moving the graduate LBS-1 program to a hybrid (or online) program, designing a Masters of Arts of Teaching (MAT) program option, and ways to embed field experiences into the graduate program. We also recently collaborated with faculty from the Department of Psychology and the Department of Leadership, Educational Psychology and Foundations to develop Doctoral-level options for those interested in pursuing a Doctoral program in Behavior Analysis and an Ed.S. for those pursuing a Director of Special Education credential. As noted earlier, an external Professional Advisory Board (PAC) meets annually with faculty to provide insights and guidance for program development. Members of this committee include special education teachers, principals, and special education administrators from the surrounding region, graduates from the program who are working in the field, adjunct faculty, and clinical and student teaching supervisors. Annual spring meetings of the PAC provide an opportunity for faculty to present and obtain feedback on new initiatives and learn about potential changes in district policies and practices. They also provide a forum for discussing program goals and objectives, program strengths, areas for improvement, and partnerships among the Special Education program, school districts, and cooperatives. Information gained from faculty meetings and PAC meetings is essential to the planning and assessment cycles of the program. As a result, faculty engage in critical thinking about program planning and future directions, course offerings and rotation of courses, changes to the field and student teaching.

The Special Education program provides a broad range of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions for candidates preparing to become exemplary special education teachers. Faculty have carefully designed and coordinated field experiences and course work based on policies, standards, and frameworks of the university, the College of Education, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), and our national organization, Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). Faculty collect and reflect upon data regularly and submit an annual comprehensive report to the Office of Teacher Licensure.

Goals of the undergraduate Special Education programs are based on:

Illinois Professional Teacher Standards (being replaced by Illinois Culturally Responsive Teaching and Leading Standards in 2025)

Illinois Core Language Arts Standards for All Teachers

Illinois Core Technology Standards for All Teachers

Illinois Content Standards in Specialization Areas (LBS I, Vision)

Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) Content Standards and Knowledge and Skill (Initial and Advanced Practice standards)

Sets Essential for All Special Educators at the initial preparation level

NCATE/CAEP Standards

NIU Conceptual Framework

Association for Education and Rehabilitation of Blind and Visually Impaired (AER)

2. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

List the degree program student learning outcomes in the space provided below. Do not include overall program goals (e.g., recruit more minority students, post-graduation employment, etc.).

Revised Student Learning Outcome, fall 2022 <i>Candidates will...</i>	Emphasis in which new SLO is assessed
Plan, implement, and evaluate interventions for individuals with disabilities using high-leverage practices (HLPs), culturally responsive teaching, and behavioral principles.	BA, CATIS, LBS, O&M, TVI, VRT
Analyze, accurately interpret, and evaluate data (screening, progress monitoring, formal, informal, criterion-referenced, and standardized) used for decision-making in a variety of special education settings.	AP, CATIS, LBS, O&M, TVI, VRT
Synthesize research regarding special education curriculum to evaluate resources used in special education settings (e.g., curriculum, applications, assistive technology, online IEP programs).	AP, CATIS, LBS, O&M, TVI, VRT
Design a research study grounded in an analysis of current research literature, to improve outcomes for individuals with disabilities in a professional setting (classroom, school, clinic) in which candidates work.	AP, CATIS, LBS, O&M, TVI, VRT
Evaluate collaborative practices in their school/professional setting and develop a plan to improve such practices grounded in the professional literature in special education.	AP, CATIS, LBS, O&M, TVI
Display professionalism appropriate to the settings in which they work and learn.	AP, CATIS, LBS, O&M, TVI, VRT

3. Program-by-Baccalaureate Student Learning Outcomes Matrix Not applicable. This is a graduate program review.

This third section of the assessment plan is an alignment of the degree program student learning outcomes with the university baccalaureate student learning outcomes. **This applies only to undergraduate degree programs.**

4. Curriculum Map

The fourth section is a curriculum map. A curriculum map outlines the scope and sequence of courses students will take and aligns them with the degree program student learning outcomes. The curriculum map is an effective tool for not only sequencing the curriculum and instruction, but also for strategically identifying places for formative and summative assessments of student learning outcomes. For each course determine: (1) which outcomes are the *primary* focus of the course, and (2) the degree to which the course supports the outcome (i.e., at a beginning (B), developing (D), or proficient (P) level). Place a B, D, or P in the corresponding cell.

Courses	Student Learning Outcomes					
	1. Design, implement, evaluate interventions	2. Data-based decision making in varied special ed settings	3. Evaluate resources used in spec ed settings	4. Design a research study to improve student outcomes	5. Evaluate collaborative practices in their school/professional setting	6. Display professionalism
LBS I emphasis						
ETR 524 (assessment)		D				B
SESE 540 (LBS)	B		B		B	B
SESE 554 (LBS)		D	D			B
SESE 601 (LBS)	B		D			D
SESE 608 (LBS)	B	B			B	D
SESE 602 (LBS)	P		D	D		D
SESE 559 (LBS)			D	D		D
SESE 606 (BA and LBS)		D	D		D	D
SESE 603 (LBS)		P	P			P
SESE 552 (LBS and CATIS)	D	D	D	P		D
SESE 561 (LBS)	D	D	B	D		D
SESE 609/610 (LBS only, student teach)	P	P	P			P
SESE 692 (LBS) or 792 (BA), research course	D	D		P		P
SESE 605 (LBS)	D		P		P	P
SESE 511 (BA only)					D	D
SESE 515 (BA)		D	D			B
SESE 578 (BA only)			D		D	D

Courses	Student Learning Outcomes					
	1. Design, implement, evaluate interventions	2. Data-based decision making in varied special ed settings	3. Evaluate resources used in spec ed settings	4. Design a research study to improve student outcomes	5. Evaluate collaborative practices in their school/professional setting	6. Display professionalism
SESE 592 (AP and BA only)	D		D			
SESE 708 (BA only)						
SESE 709 (BA only)						
SESE 710 (BA only)						
Student Learning Outcomes						
Vision Emphases (CATIS, TVI, O&M)						
SEVI 500 (CATIS and TVI only)	D		B		B	B
SEVI 510			B	B	B	B
SEVI 520	B		B	B		D
SEVI 521	D		D	D		D
SEVI 530	D	D	D			D
SEVI 540 (CATIS and TVI only)	B	B	B		D	D
SEVI 541	D	D	D	D		D
SEVI 543 (VRT only)	D		D			D
SEVI 545 (VRT only)	D		D			D
SEVI 550	B		B			D
SEVI 551	D	D	D	D		D
SEVI 552	D			P	P	P
SEVI 570 (O & M only)	D		D			D
SEVI 571 (O & M only)	P		P			P
SEVI 581/582 (student teach, TVI only)	P	P	P			P

Courses	Student Learning Outcomes					
	1. Design, implement, evaluate interventions	2. Data-based decision making in varied special ed settings	3. Evaluate resources used in spec ed settings	4. Design a research study to improve student outcomes	5. Evaluate collaborative practices in their school/professional setting	6. Display professionalism
SEVI 585 (internship, O & M, TVI, VRT)	P	P	P			P
SEVI 586 (TVI only)			P		P	P
SEVI 596 (CATIS only)			P		P	P
Research course (all emphases)	D	D		P		D

Note. Data for key assessments are collected from all candidates during courses shown in **bold**. The CATIS emphasis includes SESE 552, Assistive Technology/Multiple Disabilities.

5. Assessment Methods

This final section of the assessment plan describes the assessment methods the degree program will be using to measure how well students are meeting program student learning outcomes. See the [UAP Academic Program Assessment Plan and Status Report Rubric-Checklist](#) for a description of characteristics seen in well-functioning assessment methods.

EXPLANATION OF ASSESSMENT METHODS TABLE

The first part of the assessment methods section is an explanation of each assessment method that will be used to measure student learning outcomes.

Assessment Method	Explanation					
	Description	Student-Level Achievement ^a	Program-Level Target ^b	When Data Will be Collected	Person Responsible	SLOs Covered
Case Study or Instructional Program (SEVI 543, 560, 570; SESE 601, 602, 554, 552, 559, 561, SESE 708, 709)	<p>In a variety of courses, candidates are assigned one student or a small group for whom they collect data, teach a specific academic skill, strategy, or social behavior based on data collected on students' present level of performance.</p> <p>Candidates provide the baseline data, a rationale for teaching a specific skill, a lesson objective, one or more lesson plan with evidence of use of high-leverage practices, and a plan for assessing the learning objective.</p> <p>Candidates reflect on the effectiveness of the instruction and plan next steps in instruction.</p>	<p>Given a rubric for the case study assignment, students will earn a score of "meets standards" or better on 80% of rubric items related to planning and implementing interventions (lessons) and no scores of "does not meet".</p> <p>Score corresponds to a B or better.</p>	80% of all students will meet the student-level target on the case study assignment.	Before finals week during every semester in which the course is offered	Course Instructor	1, 3
Behavior Change Project (2016 and updated, SESE 515, 554)	<p>Candidates develop an individualized behavior plan for a student who has challenging behavior or significant developmental disability. Gather observational data, develop and implement a behavior plan, and assess the effectiveness of that plan.</p>	<p>Given a rubric for the case study assignment, students will earn a score of "meets standards" or better on 80% of rubric items and no scores of "does not meet".</p> <p>Score corresponds to a B or better.</p>	80% of all students will meet the student-level target on the aligned assignment(s).	Before finals week during every semester in which the course is offered	Course Instructor	2, 3

Assessment Method	Explanation					
	Description	Student-Level Achievement ^a	Program-Level Target ^b	When Data Will be Collected	Person Responsible	SLOs Covered
Assessment Project (2016 and revised, ETR 524, BA and LBSI; SESE 709— Vineland assignment)	Candidates administer a formal, standardized test to an elementary student, score the test, and write an assessment report with interpretations for programming. They analyze the qualities of their norm-referenced test and make data-based decisions based on their student data information.	Given a rubric for the assessment project assignment, students will earn a score of “meets standards” or better on 80% of rubric items and no scores of “does not meet”. Score corresponds to a B or better.	80% of all students will meet the student-level target on the aligned assignment(s).	Before finals week during every semester in which the course is offered	Course Instructor	2
Evaluate an instructional resource such as assistive technology, curriculum, or application (LBS, CATIS, TVI; SESE 552, SEVI 550, SEVI 551)	Students research an app, program, assistive technology, or curriculum used in special education, develop a handout or power point based on specific questions and prompts and present their information to the class.	Given a rubric for the technology assignment, students will earn a score of “meets standards” or better on 80% of rubric items and no scores of “does not meet”. Score corresponds to a B or better.	80% of all students will meet the student-level target on the aligned assignment(s).	Before finals week during every semester in which the course is offered	Course Instructor	3
Collaboration Project/Paper (SEVI 552, SESE 605; CATIS, LBS, TVI)	Candidates reflect upon the collaborative practices in their professional setting, research best practices, and develop a plan to improve collaborative practices in their school. They write a paper and make a presentation in class.	Given a rubric for the collaboration research paper assignment, students will earn a score of “meets standards” or better on 80% of rubric items and no scores of “does not meet”. Score corresponds to a B or better.	80% of all students will meet the student-level target on the aligned assignment(s).	Before finals week during every semester in which the course is offered	Course Instructor	4, 5
Research paper or capstone project (SESE 578, 592, 692, SEVI 586, 596)	Candidates write a research proposal in the capstone special education research class. They synthesize relevant research literature and write a research proposal with opportunities for faculty feedback prior to final submission.	Given a rubric for the methods paper/capstone assignment, students will earn a score of “meets standards” or better on 80% of rubric items and no scores of “does not meet”. Score corresponds to a B or better.	80% of all students will meet the student-level target on the aligned assignment(s).	Before finals week during every semester in which the course is offered	Course Instructor	4

Assessment Method	Explanation					
	Description	Student-Level Achievement ^a	Program-Level Target ^b	When Data Will be Collected	Person Responsible	SLOs Covered
Student Teaching Evaluation (SESE 609, 610; SEVI 581, 582) or Internship (SEVI 585)	Candidates complete a student teaching “internship” in which they assume the roles and responsibilities of a special education teacher under supervision from a cooperating teacher. Subcategories include	On the final weekly evaluation, students will earn a mean score of “three” (satisfactory; 5-point scale) or better in each subcategory of the student teaching or internship evaluation form (scores range from one to four), with no scores of unsatisfactory (1). Subcategories reported as they align with SLO.	80% of all students will meet student-level target of three or better in each subcategory with no scores of unsatisfactory.	Before finals week during every semester in which the course is offered	Student Teaching Supervisor, Student Teaching Coordinator, Program Coordinator, Assessment Coordinator	1, 2, 3, 5
State Licensure Test (not course specific)	Candidates take the state test that includes subtests on relevant areas such as: Assessing, Foundations, Managing the Environment, Planning, Professional Conduct, and Collaborating.	A student will earn a passing standard score (240) on every subtest and a passing standard score on the whole test (240).	80% of all students will pass the state test with a score of 240 or better [this is the criteria set by our accreditation bodies].	Every semester	Assessment Coordinator	1, 2, 3, 5
Dispositions Survey (all coursework but university level survey done during final internship or student teaching)	Cooperating teachers and NIU supervisors complete a university-wide survey evaluating students’ professionalism during their student teaching/internship semester. The survey consists of 11 items scored using a 4-point Likert scale.	Given the dispositions survey, students will earn a score of “meets standards” or better on 80% of rubric items with no scores of unsatisfactory.	80% of all students will meet the student-level target on the dispositions survey.	Final internship or student teaching	Cooperating teacher and student teaching supervisor	6
<i>Note.</i> ^a Student-level target is the score or performance an individual student must demonstrate to say the student met the student learning outcome. ^b Program-level target is the percent of all students that must demonstrate they meet the student learning outcome.						

ASSESSMENT METHODS-BY-OUTCOMES MATRIX

The assessment methods section concludes with an assessment methods-by-outcomes matrix that maps which assessments will measure a given student learning outcome. Use the curriculum map to identify key places in the curriculum where existing assessment data might be used as a measure of program student learning outcomes (e.g., major projects/performances, capstone experiences, etc.). Outcomes are listed in the first row, and each assessment method is listed in the first column. It is useful if assessments are listed in chronological order, from the first students will see, to the last. For each assessment method determine: (1) which outcome(s) it **primarily and intentionally** measures, (2) if it is being used for formative (F) or summative (S) purposes, and (3) whether it is an indirect (I) or direct (D) measure of the student learning outcome.

Formative assessments occur earlier in the curriculum and are used to see if students are on track and progressing sufficiently; **summative assessments** occur at or near the end of the curriculum and are used to see if students have successfully met the program student learning outcomes.

Direct assessments are those that compellingly and clearly measure student performance (e.g., exam score, performance assessment, direct observation). **Indirect assessments** are rough estimates and proxies of student performance (e.g., self-reports of learning, alumni perceptions, etc.).

Assessment Method	1. Design, implement, evaluate interventions	2. Data-based decision making in varied special ed settings	3. Evaluate resources used in special settings	4. Design a research study to improve student outcomes	5. Evaluate collaborative practices in their school or professional setting	6. Display professionalism
Case Study, including lesson plans	S, D	F, I	F, I			
Behavior Change Project	F, I	S, D				F, I
Assessment Project	F, I	S, D				
Evaluate assistive technology, applications, or curriculum			S, D	S, I		
Collaboration Project				F, I	S, D	F, I
Research Paper, Capstone Project		F, I		S, D	S, I	
Student Teaching Evaluation	S, D	S, D			S, I	S, D
State test	S, I	S, I	S, I	S, I	S, I	S, I
Dispositions Survey						S, D