Assessment:ProgramFourColumn

Program (ALP) - Educational Diagnostician MEd

College or Division: Education and Professional Studies
Department: Education
Assessment Coordinator: Scarlet Clouse (2014-2017) Lee Renfroe (2017-)
Statement of Purpose: The mission of the Sul Ross State University Educational Diagnostician Program is to:

1. Provide a superior, life-altering, and accessible education to diagnostician program students.

2. Equip students with a comprehensive knowledge base to be a multicultural diagnostician and leader.

3. Prepare students to positively cope with the rigors and demands of their role as an educational diagnostician.

4. Promote life-long learners with a passion to positively contribute to the field of education.

5. Produce future educational diagnosticians that will humbly, professionally serve the stakeholders in their communities.

Annual Updates

2017 - 2018

Evidence of Improvement from Previous Assessment Cycle: SLO 1 focuses on identification, placement, and support of students with disabilities, which correlates with the TExES Educational Diagnostician Domains I and III. The experiences related to these two domains are tied with practical experiences and are evaluated by mentor diagnosticians and the university supervisor. 1.a. The target was met this academic year as compared to not being met during 2016-17. 1.b. The target was met. As compared to last year when this target wasn't met. 94.4% of students taking the TExES 153 scored at least 240. Only one student (who has three attempts) has failed to pass the exam. When taking into consideration the three failed attempts our overall passing rate was 85%.

SLO 2 focuses on assessment, testing, and evaluation and correlates with TExES Educational Diagnostician Domain II. 2.a. During the 2017-18 academic year this target wasn't met. One student failed to pass the portfolio defense on the first attempt. However, improvement was made when compared to the 2016-17 academic year that had four students failing to pass the portfolio defense on the first attempt. This was an improvement of 75% as compared to 2016-17. 2.b. This target wasn't met during the 2017-18 academic year. However, improvement of 46% was made when compared to the 2016-17 academic year. This year 68% met or exceeded the goal and during the 2016-17 academic year 42% met or exceeded the goal.

SLO 3 focuses on professional and ethical roles of the educational diagnostician and correlates with the TExES Educational Diagnostician Domain IV. 3.a. During the 2017-18 academic year this target was met. This compares favorably to the 2016-17 academic year when the target was met. 3.b. During the 2017-18 academic year this target

wasn't met. However, there was improvement when compared to the 2016-17 academic year. This year, 68% of students met or exceeded this goal. During the 2016-17 academic year, 37.5% of students met or exceeded this goal. Therefore, during the 2017-18 academic year there was an improvement of 30.5%.

Review History: Reviewer #1 Name, Date, and Comments: Dr. Mark Saka, August 2, 2018
Review History: Reviewer #2 Name, Date, and Comments: Dr. Alicia Trotman, August 2, 2018
Review History: Reviewer #3 Name, Date, and Comments: Dr. Jimmy Case, August 2, 2018

2016 - 2017

Evidence of Improvement from Previous Assessment Cycle: SLO 1 focuses on identification, placement, and support of students with disabilities, which correlates with the TExES Educational Diagnostician Domains I and III. The experiences related to these two Domains are tied with practical experiences and are evaluated by mentor diagnosticians in the field. The Target was not met in the Supervisor Evaluation method of assessment within SLO 1. As in the previous cycle, there was only one student whose mentor assigned multiple Emerging ratings. The mentor relayed to the student that if there were a few more weeks in the semester, along with more opportunities to build on the skill being measured, then a rating of Average would have been obtained. In the second method of assessment for SLO 1, the Target criteria was not met in Standard I of the test takers. While the overall passing standard was met for the TExES exam, the Standard I overall percentage fell short of the required 80%, coming in at 78%. Although the target was not met for SLO 1, measure two, there was growth demonstrated from the previous assessment cycle.

SLO 2 focuses on assessment, testing, and evaluation and correlates with TExES Educational Diagnostician Domain II . Previous efforts from the 2015-2016 assessment cycle have proven effective in raising scores in Domain II; however, the target for the 2016-2017 cycle was not met. The following considerations could drive changes in the program to increase scores in Domain II: 1) further reduce the class size to allow for even greater individualization, 2) increased the amount of face-to-face instruction students receive while enrolled in this class,
3) require students to secure a mentor or assessment "guide" while completing this portfolio assignment, 4) create an additional course within the program that allows more assessment practice before compiling the portfolios.

SLO 3 focuses on professional and ethical roles of the educational diagnostician and correlates with the TExES Educational Diagnostician Domain IV. Based on results from assessment measures within SLO 3, a quiz will be added to the practicum (capstone) that focuses on ethical and professional practices, as they relate to the TExES exam. Results from this quiz will be included in the 2017-2018 assessment report to determine effectiveness.
Review History: Reviewer #1 Name, Date, and Comments: Barbara Tucker, June 14, 2017
Review History: Reviewer #2 Name, Date, and Comments: Maria Gear, June 14, 2017

2015 - 2016

Evidence of Improvement from Previous Assessment Cycle: SLO 1 focuses on identification, placement, and support of students with disabilities, which correlates with the TExES Educational Diagnostician Domains I and III. The experiences related to these two Domains are tied with practical experiences and are evaluated by mentor diagnosticians in the field. The Target was not met in the Supervisor Evaluation method of assessment within SLO 1. There was only one student whose mentor assigned multiple Emerging ratings. This could be due to a lack of understanding of the rubric, which may prompt clarification of scoring criteria and further mentor training needed. Otherwise, the Target would have likely been met. In the second method of assessment for SLO 1, the Target criteria was not met in Standard I of the test takers. While the overall passing standard was met for the TExES exam, the Standard I overall percentage fell short of the required 80%, coming in at 74.8%. This indicates that more foundational knowledge may be needed in special education. More students are enrolling in the program from non-special education backgrounds; therefore, foundational knowledge may be minimal.

SLO 2 focuses on assessment, testing, and evaluation and correlates with TExES Educational Diagnostician Domain II . Historically this has been one of the lowest scored Domains on the exam, even though overall pass rates in the class and on the TExES exam remain very high. The result of analyzing SLO 2 reveals the same outcome, as both of the assessment method Targets were not met. This has prompted immediate attention to overhauling two major testing courses within the program curriculum.

Lowering the course enrollment will also provide more time for individual student assistance.

SLO 3 focuses on professional and ethical roles of the educational diagnostician and correlates with the TExES Educational Diagnostician Domain IV. Both assessment methods indicate that the program Is successful in meeting the Target for SLO 3; however, modifications are still warranted. Instead of addressing professional and ethical competency once at the end of the program, site supervisors (mentors) will address these areas on the mid-semester evaluation form and the end-of-semester evaluation form. This will allow for earlier intervention and correction of issues that arise.
Review History: Reviewer #1 Name, Date, and Comments: Dr. Gina Stocks, August 9, 2016
Review History: Reviewer #2 Name, Date, and Comments: Dr. Mark Saka, August 9, 2016
Review History: Reviewer #3 Name, Date, and Comments: Dr. Kathy Stein, August 9, 2016
Review History: Reviewer #4 Name, Date, and Comments: Dr. Jeanne Qvarnstrom, December 5, 2016

2014 - 2015

Evidence of Improvement from Previous Assessment Cycle: Results indicate that students are successfully meeting the desired outcome for SLO 1, indicating that educational diagnostician candidates are successfully gaining methods to effectively collaborate with others during the placement process for special education. This is demonstrated not only through successful pass rates on the state exam, but also on final supervisor reports that are evaluated by parties unaffiliated with the program. SLO2 assessment methods indicate room for improvement regarding assessment practices. Although educational diagnostician candidates obtain an overall passing score on the state exam (program standards are higher than state standards in this case) and a passing score for the assessment portfolio, there is still room for improvement in this area specifically related to Domain II of the TExES exam. The SLO was not successfully met; therefore, greater emphasis will be placed on program improvement. No action is needed, other than continuous review, for SLO 3, because the target was met for one measure and exceed for the other.
Review History: Reviewer #1 Name, Date, and Comments: Dr. Jim Hector, September 12, 2015
Review History: Reviewer #2 Name, Date, and Comments: Dr. Christopher Estepp, September 15, 2015
Review History: Reviewer #3 Name, Date, and Comments: Dr. Sharon Hileman, September 25, 2015
Review History: Reviewer #4 Name, Date, and Comments: Dr. Jeanne Qvarnstrom, September 30, 2015

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results	Use of Results
SLO 1 - The educational diagnostician candidate effectively collaborates with all parties involved with the identification, placement, and ongoing support of students with disabilities through practical experiences gained while enrolled in semester-long practicum course. **Outcome Status:** Active	**Supervisor Evaluation -** a. Site Supervisor's Final Report-will evaluate students' identification, placement, and support skills **Target:** All educational diagnostician candidates (100%) enrolled in the educational diagnostician practicum course will obtain at least an Average/Good/Excellent rating, on all areas assessed, from site supervisor on "On-Site Supervisor's Final Report" form.	**Reporting Period:** 2017 - 2018 **Conclusion:** Target Met Each student enrolled in ED 7312 (Special Education Practicum) scored at least 80% on the evaluation conducted by the university supervisor. (06/01/2018)	**Use of Results:** Based on the results, the faculty plans to continue the virtual meetings at the beginning of the semester to explain the practicum experiences. Implement more virtual collaborative meetings between faculty and students to continually increase on-site observation scores. (06/01/2018)
		Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met Fall 2016-Thirteen (13) students enrolled in practicum, 100%, obtained all Average/Good/Excellent ratings from site supervisor on the final On-Site Supervisor's Report.	**Use of Results:** Although the overall target was not met, there was significant progress made from the previous reporting cycle.

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results	Use of Results
		According to the criteria, 100% of students did meet the Average/Good/Excellent rating for Fall 2017. Spring 2017-Fifteen (15) educational diagnostician candidates enrolled, 1 obtained rating designated as Emerging, 14 obtained all Average/Good/Excellent ratings from site supervisor on the final On-Site Supervisor's Report. According to the criteria, 100% of students (all 15) did not meet the Average/Good/Excellent rating for Spring 2017. Fall 2016: Excellent Rating-164 responses Good Rating-51 responses Average Rating-4 response Emerging Rating-0 response Poor Rating-0 responses Spring 2017: Excellent Rating-181 responses Good Rating-53 responses Average Rating-22 responses Emerging Rating-1 response Poor Rating-0 responses (05/30/2017)	Target was met for the Fall 2016 semester but fell short for the Spring 2017 semester. Only one criteria of "Emerging" was provided to the student intern in the final supervisor's report. Upon consultation with the student, I was advised that her mentor felt that if she had a couple more weeks in the semester, then she would have moved to the Average category and demonstrated mastery of that skill. (05/30/2017)
		Reporting Period: 2015 - 2016 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met Fall 2015-Six (6) students enrolled in practicum, 100% obtained all Average/Good/Excellent ratings from site supervisor on the first and final On-Site Supervisor's Report. Spring 2016-Seven (7) educational diagnostician candidates enrolled, 2 obtained ratings designated as Emerging, 5 obtained all Average/Good/Excellent ratings from site supervisor on the first and final On-Site Supervisor's Report. According to the criteria, 100% of students (all 7) did not meet the Average/Good/Excellent rating. Fall 2015: Excellent Rating-84 responses Good Rating-81 responses	**Use of Results:** An "Emerging" category was added during the close of the 2014-2015 reporting cycle to allow for site supervisors to more carefully analyze and categorize skills of the intern. After reviewing the first data set including the "Emerging" category, it is determined that for the 2016-2017 reporting cycle, the designation of "Emerging" will be acceptable, if it appears only on the first site supervisor's report. Students should not receive a rating of "Emerging" on the final

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results	Use of Results
		Average Rating-7 response Emerging Rating-0 response Poor Rating-0 responses Spring 2016: Excellent Rating-37 responses Good Rating-35 responses Average Rating-3 responses Emerging Rating-16 responses (10 on first site supervisor's report and 6 on the final site supervisor's report) Poor Rating-0 responses (06/16/2016)	site supervisor's report. (06/28/2016)
		Reporting Period: 2014 - 2015 **Conclusion:** Target Met Fall 2014-Thirteen (13) students enrolled in practicum, 100% obtained all Average/Good/Excellent ratings from site supervisor. Spring 2015-Thirteen (13) educational diagnostician candidates enrolled, 100% obtained all Average/Good/Excellent ratings from site supervisor. Fall 2014: Excellent Rating-179 responses Good Rating-22 responses Average Rating-7 response Poor Rating-0 responses Spring 2015: Excellent Rating-37 responses Good Rating-35 responses Average Rating-3 responses Poor Rating-0 responses (03/30/2016)	**Use of Results:** Faculty plan to revise the Site Supervisor Evaluation instrument considered to reflect a more quantitative result. Faculty will review the areas rated Average and consider additional emphasis in instruction those areas. Additionally, there is need for revision to the site-supervisor’s evaluation to allow for greater analysis. (03/30/2016)
	Certification Exam - b. Standardized examination results on state certification exam (TExES-Educational Diagnostician 153) **Target:** 80% of students will score at least a passing score of 240 on the state certification exam and 80% of students will score 80% or higher on each of the test standards	**Reporting Period:** 2017 - 2018 **Conclusion:** Target Met All but one student passed the TExES 153 certification exam. The one student has taken the exam three times. (06/01/2018)	**Use of Results:** Based on the results, the faculty plans to: Beginning Fall 2018, more virtual study times will be utilized along with faculty-developed workshops. (The student that hasn't passed was enrolled in the practicum during Fall 2017. The

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results	Use of Results
	addressing identification, placement, and support		university was actively seeking a faculty member for the program. There was a faculty member hired on 5 January.) (06/01/2018)
		Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met Fall 2016 & Spring 2017-91.6% of eligible test takers (n=24) scored higher than 240 (µ=258) Domain I-µ=78% Domain III-µ=80.75% 94% 89% 67% 78% 89% 82% 89% 89% 83% 94% 83% 65% 83% 88% 78% 65% 89% 71% 61% 73% 78% 71% 65% 81% 83% 82% 71% 81% 76% 94% 78% 89% 72% 82% 72% 94% 67% 89% 78% 59% 82% 75% 67% 65% 78% 89% 89% 83% (05/30/2017)	**Use of Results:** The overall pass rates for the TExES Educational Diagnostician remain well over the minimum of 240. The target was not met because the average on Domains I and II should have been above 80%. Domain I fell to 78%. This is not alarming to me, again, as students continue to join the program from non-special education backgrounds this is to be expected. Although this dip in scores have not significantly affected overall pass rates, it would be advisable to follow scores from Domain I over the next reporting period. If scores continue to decline, then possibly leveling courses for non-sped teachers could be mandated. (05/30/2017)
		Reporting Period: 2015 - 2016 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met Fall 2015 & Spring 2016-100% of eligible test takers (n=10)	**Use of Results:** As more and more students enter the program from non-special education fields, there

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results	Use of Results
		scored higher than 240 (μ=259) Domain I-74.8% Domain III-81% (06/27/2016)	needs to be more attention to basic, foundational knowledge before proceeding with more specific courses. ED 5312 and ED 5321, both that focus on the basics of special education and law in the public schools will be revised to include a more comprehensive look at special education. First-time test taker status will be examined. There were two students that did not score the minimum passing score on the first attempt, but were successful on the second attempt. Efforts will increase to prepare students to pass the exam on the first attempt. (06/27/2016)
		Reporting Period: 2014 - 2015 **Conclusion:** Target Met Fall 2014 & Spring 2015-100% of eligible test takers (n=16) scored higher than 240 (μ=262) Standard III-92% Standard IV-97% Standard V-89% (03/30/2016)	**Use of Results:** ED 5306 will be offered twice per academic year (instead of once per year every fall) in each long semester to reduce class size. This will allow greater individualized assistance and supervision of educational diagnostician candidates while administering and interpreting assessments. (03/30/2016)
SLO 2 - The educational diagnostician candidate demonstrates the ability to critically evaluate assessments and understand the implications of chosen assessments. **Outcome Status:** Active	**Portfolio Review -** a. Rubric Applied to Portfolio Faculty evaluates a student-created semester long testing portfolio using a four-part rubric. The rubric assesses (1) Inclusion of Required Items, (2) Assessment Information, (3) Report Information, and (4)	**Reporting Period:** 2017 - 2018 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met One student did not pass the portfolio defense on the first attempt. (06/01/2018)	**Use of Results:** Based on the results, the faculty plans to implement more collaborative meetings between practicum students and faculty. (The one student that didn't pass on the first attempt was enrolled during Fall 2017. The university was

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results	Use of Results
	Timelines. **Target:** All (100%) educational diagnostician candidates will receive a grade of at least 90% on the testing portfolio.		without an Educational Diagnostician Program Coordinator.) The student successfully passed the portfolio defense on the second attempt. Faculty members and the Department Chair held two collaborative meetings with the student to model successful portfolio defense. Beginning Fall 2018, students enrolled in the practicum will hold a "mock" portfolio defense with the program coordinator. (06/01/2018)
		Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met Breakdown of portfolio grades for Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 of educational diagnostician candidates enrolled in ED 5306 Fall 2016 (n=15): 6: 99-90% 3: 89-80% 4: 79-70% 2: 69-60% 0: <60% Spring 2017 (n=15): 3: 99-90% 4: 89-80% 6: 79-70% 2: 69-60% 0: <60% (05/30/2017)	**Use of Results:** As stated in the 2016-2016 cycle, it is recommended that the criteria be lowered to 80% for this measure. This portfolio assignment is very rigorous and spans the course of the semester. The following considerations could be made to further raise the overall scores on the portfolios: 1) further reduce the class size to allow for even greater individualization 2) increased the amount of face-to-face instruction students receive while enrolled in this class 3) require students to secure a mentor or assessment "guide" while completing this portfolio assignment 4) create an additional course within the program that allows

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results	Use of Results
			more assessment practice before compiling the portfolios (05/30/2017)
		Reporting Period: 2015 - 2016 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met Breakdown of portfolio grades for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 of educational diagnostician candidates enrolled in ED 5306 (n=16) 6: 90-99% 6: 89-80% 3: 79-70% 1: <60% (06/29/2016)	**Use of Results:** The target of 90% for final grade on portfolio has not been met for two consecutive reporting periods. The criteria should be moved to 80% to allow for success while still working to increase overall scores on portfolio. Upon consultation with the instructor of ED 5306, it was determined that there is too much content to be covered in the class. When examining ED 5323 it was noticed that it is very low on content and the determination was made to move much of the non-essential assessment requirements to ED 5323 and use that course as a pre-requisite for ED 5306. In doing this, it will allow for greater time to cover material in-depth and work individually with students to ensure that they are producing quality work and thoroughly comprehend the assessment processes, as evidenced through their final assessment portfolios. (06/29/2016)
		Reporting Period: 2014 - 2015 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met 50% of educational diagnostician candidates enrolled in ED 5306 (n=20) scored 90% of higher on portfolio (μ=87%) (03/30/2016)	**Use of Results:** ED 5306 will be offered twice per academic year (instead of once per year every fall) in each long semester to reduce class size. This will allow

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results	Use of Results
			greater individualized assistance and supervision of educational diagnostician candidates while administering and interpreting assessments. (03/30/2016)
	Exam/Quiz - Standardized - b. Standardized examination results on state certification exam (TExES-Educational Diagnostician 153)*Specific analysis of Domain II-Assessment and Evaluation **Target:** All (100%) educational diagnostician candidates will obtain at least an 80 % on Domain II items on TExES 153.	**Reporting Period:** 2017 - 2018 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met 38% of the students that took the TExES 153 Certification Exam did not answer at least 80% of the Domain II questions correctly. (68% of them did answer at least 80% of Domain II questions correctly.) (06/01/2018)	**Use of Results:** Based on the results, the faculty plans to implement a more hands-on approach to administering assessments. Students will be required to work more closely with their on-site supervisor to have more assessment opportunities. Also, during the practicum students will have two assessment projects integrated with their practical experiences. (06/01/2018)
		Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met 45.83% of eligible test takers (n=24) scored higher than 80% on competencies within Domain II of the TExES 153 (μ=78.08%) Individual scores on TExES 153, Domain II: 81% 73% 81% 85% 85% 85% 74% 74% 85% 85% 81% 62% 78% 77%	**Use of Results:** There was an overall increase in the average of Domain II scores from the 2015-2016 assessment cycle; however, the target for 2016-2017 assessment cycle was not met. The changes instituted in the 2015-2016 cycle have proven to be effective and it is advisable to wait for the next cycle of assessment results are reported in anticipation that Domain II scores will continue to rise. (05/30/2017)

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results	Use of Results
		89% 92% 63% 78% 73% 74% 85% 67% 81% 81% (05/30/2017)	
		Reporting Period: 2015 - 2016 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met 42% of eligible test takers (n=12) scored higher than 80% on competencies within Domain II of the TExES 153 (µ=77%) Individual scores on TExES 153, Domain II: 85% 88% 81% 88% 93% 77% 64% 77% 61% 62% 67% 77% (06/28/2016)	**Use of Results:** The scores on Domain II decreased from the previous reporting cycle even though overall pass rates on the TExES 153 remained high (100%). In an effort to continually improve specific Domain II competencies, the course addressing those competencies will continue to be offered twice a year. The instructor reports that she is able to spend much more time with students individually than a class offered once per year with a high enrollment. The testing course that primarily prepares students for competencies within Domain II (ED 5306) has a maximum enrollment of 10 students per semester. In addition, it was decided that the content in ED 5306 would be reevaluated and redistributed to another testing course (ED 5323). This will allow even more time for critical elements to be addressed in hopes of raising scores on

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results	Use of Results
			specific competencies within Domain II. (06/28/2016)
		Reporting Period: 2014 - 2015 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met 75% of eligible test takers (n=16) scored higher than 80% on competencies within Domain II of the TExES 153 (μ=85.4) (03/30/2016)	**Use of Results:** Embed, review, and assess competencies (003, 004, 005) from Domain II in additional courses within the program instead of just ED 5306. (03/30/2016)
SLO 3 - The educational diagnostician candidate is able to analyze the ethical and professional responsibility to the field of special education. **Outcome Status:** Active	**Supervisor Evaluation -** a. Site Supervisor Evaluations Final report will evaluate students' understanding of ethical and professional responsibility. **Target:** All educational diagnostician candidates (100%) enrolled in the educational diagnostician practicum course will obtain at least an Average/Good/Excellent rating, on all areas assessed in the ethical and professional responsibility section, from site supervisor on "On-Site Supervisor's Final Report" form.	**Reporting Period:** 2017 - 2018 **Conclusion:** Target Met All students enrolled in the practicum scored at least an "average" rating on this section of the on-site supervisor evaluation. (06/01/2018)	**Use of Results:** Based on the results, the faculty plans to continue the practice of collaborative meetings between faculty and students. Continually encourage students to conduct themselves in an ethical/professional manner through partnerships with local school districts and on-site supervisors. (06/01/2018)
		Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017 **Conclusion:** Target Met Fall 2016-Thirteen (13) educational diagnostician candidates enrolled in practicum, 100% obtained all Average/Good/Excellent ratings from site supervisor. Spring 2017-Fifteen (15) educational diagnostician enrolled, 100% obtained all Average/Good/Excellent ratings from site supervisor. (05/30/2017)	**Use of Results:** Since the target was met the evaluation report will remain unchanged and will continue to measure competence in ethical and professional responsibilities. (05/30/2017)
		Reporting Period: 2015 - 2016 **Conclusion:** Target Met Fall 2015-Eleven (11) educational diagnostician candidates enrolled in practicum, 100% obtained all Average/Good/Excellent ratings from site supervisor. Spring 2016-Eight (8) educational diagnostician enrolled, 100% obtained all Average/Good/Excellent ratings from site	**Use of Results:** The site supervisor's evaluation needs to be completed twice a semester for each intern, once in the middle of the semester and once at the end. From now on, the site supervisor's mid-semester

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results	Use of Results
		supervisor. (06/28/2016)	evaluation and final evaluation will require input relating to ethical and professional responsibilities. This will allow for earlier identification and address of issues of concern. (06/29/2016)
		Reporting Period: 2014 - 2015 **Conclusion:** Target Met Fall 2014-Thirteen (13) educational diagnostician candidates enrolled in practicum, 100% obtained all Average/Good/Excellent ratings from site supervisor. Spring 2015-Thirteen (13) educational diagnostician enrolled, 100% obtained all Average/Good/Excellent ratings from site supervisor. (03/30/2016)	**Use of Results:** Considering that not all students received an excellent rating, faculty has decided to introduce more practical application towards scenarios focusing on ethical and professional responsibilities. In addition, the site supervisor's evaluation will be reconstructed to identify very specific areas related to ethical and professional practices. (03/30/2016)
	Exam/Quiz - Standardized - b. Standardized examination results on state certification exam (TExES-Educational Diagnostician 153)-focus on ethics and professionalism **Target:** 80% of educational diagnostician candidates will score at least a passing score of 240 or higher on the state certification examination focusing on Standard II, addressing ethical and professional practices, roles, and responsibilities.	**Reporting Period:** 2017 - 2018 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met 38% of the students that took the TExES 153 Certification Exam did not answer correctly at least 85% of the Domain IV questions. (68% of them did answer at least 80% of the Domain IV questions correctly.) (06/01/2018)	**Use of Results:** Based on the results, the faculty plans to implement a more collaborative effort between the program coordinator, on-site supervisor, and the practicum student to offer more opportunities to experience practical situations requiring ethical decision-making. During the practicum, students will be required to successfully complete two projects (scenarios requiring application of Domain IV knowledge). (06/01/2018)
		Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017 **Conclusion:** Target Not Met 37.5% of eligible test takers (n=24) scored higher than 80% on competencies within Domain IV of the TExES 153	**Use of Results:** While there was improvement from the last assessment cycle, this SLO still fell short of the target. Specific standards within Domain IV will

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results	Use of Results
		Individual scores on TExES 153, Domain IV (μ=77.54): 83% 78% 72% 78% 83% 78% 56% 100% 83% 83% 67% 76% 89% 76% 72% 72% 78% 83% 78% 67% 81% 61% 89% 78% (05/30/2017)	be addressed within the practicum course and students will be required to complete a quiz reflecting their knowledge and competence within this domain specifically. (05/30/2017)
		Reporting Period: 2015 - 2016 **Conclusion:** Target Met 25% of eligible test takers (n=12) scored higher than 80% on competencies within Domain IV of the TExES 153 (μ=76%) Individual scores on TExES 153, Domain IV: 71% 83% 81% 78% 95% 76% 78% 67%	**Use of Results:** While the Target was met in this outcome, competencies related to Domain IV will be embedded throughout more of the coursework and emphasized in the practicum in an effort to raise the individual scores to above 75%. (06/29/2016)

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results	Use of Results
		67% 86% 78% (06/28/2016)	
		Reporting Period: 2014 - 2015 **Conclusion:** Target Met Fall 2014 & Spring 2015-100% of eligible test takers (n=16) scored higher than 240 (μ=262), score on Standard II-85% (03/30/2016)	**Use of Results:** Faculty will analyze areas of lower scores and consider expanding curriculum and practical experience to provide greater support for student success. (03/30/2016)