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Provide summary of the last cycle’s use of results and changes implemented.
Graduate committee recommendation after thesis or professional paper defenses and Texas State mandated educator certification exam students’ performance data were shared with program faculty who agreed that it was important to refine their instructional efforts with respect to the overall exam. A closer inspection of the Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 TExES data revealed that greater attention needed to be given to Domain I of the TExES, since students’ average performance was 50% across two administrations of this exam. Faculty agreed to develop a plan to systematically incorporate these competencies into their courses and will begin implementing the revised courses in the Fall 2006 semester.

Provide summary of budget decisions and their impact on your program/division.
Funding was not requested.

Institutional Mission
Texas A&M International University, a Member of The Texas A&M University System, prepares students for leadership roles in their chosen profession in an increasingly complex, culturally diverse state, national, and global society … Through instruction, faculty and student research, and public service, Texas A&M International University embodies a strategic point of delivery for well-defined programs and services that improve the quality of life for citizens of the border region, the State of Texas, and national and international communities.

Academic Program/Administrative/Educational Support Unit Mission
The mission of the College of Education at Texas A&M International University is to provide a comprehensive and coherent professional development system for educators that link all aspects of the educational profession. Through educational experiences provided by the system, educators will be prepared to provide learner-centered instructional experiences that promote excellence and equity for students in the field.

Identify outcomes and relationship to Strategic Plan

Outcome 1
Students completing the special education masters program will demonstrate the ability to review and critique professional literature with the following rubric: Students will demonstrate ability to review with a written analysis of a peer reviewed article from journal in the field of special education and educational diagnosis. The following criteria are used to evaluate the written report. Is the written review of the article content clear and directed at the targeted audience (20%)? Is the written review consistently clear and logical with a convincing discussion of the topic (20%)? Is the sentence structure sophisticated, effective, and clear with readable syntax (20%)? Is the written review free of grammatical errors (20%)? and; Is the analysis thoughtful, insightful and relevant to the topic of the reviewed research (20%)?

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 1
Goal 2 Academic

Identify Strategic Plan Objective and Strategy related to Outcome 1 (Appendix A – Strategic Goals)
Provide quality instruction to prepare graduates for leadership roles in their chosen profession.

Methods of assessment
Graduate Committee Recommendation

Frequency of administration
Enter text here

Criteria/Benchmark
Students will demonstrate understanding of the current issues in the field with completion of thesis or professional paper as determined by the graduate committee. The evaluation criteria will be the unanimous decision of the graduate committee.

Outcome 2
Students completing the special education program will compare favorably statewide in assessment and evaluation.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 2
Goal 2 Academic

Identify Strategic Plan Objective and Strategy related to Outcome 2 (Appendix A – Strategic Goals)
To graduate students prepared to pass the TExAS and other professional licensing examinations

Methods of assessment
TExAS score reports

Frequency of administration
Enter text here
**Criteria/Benchmark**
The average score of students completing the special education masters program will be 240 on the Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) for Educational Diagnostician in Domain 2, Assessment and Evaluation.

---

**Outcome 3**
Students completing the special education masters program will demonstrate an understanding of current issues in their minor field.

**Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 3**
Goal 2 Academic

**Identify Strategic Plan Objective and Strategy related to Outcome 3 (Appendix A – Strategic Goals)**
Provide quality instruction to prepare graduates for leadership roles in their chosen profession.

**Methods of assessment**
Graduate committee recommendation after thesis or professional paper defence.

**Frequency of administration**
Enter text here

**Criteria/Benchmark**
Students will demonstrate understanding of the current issues in the field with completion of thesis or professional paper as determined by the graduate committee. The evaluation criteria will be the unanimous decision of the graduate committee.
Section II: Analysis of Results

When (term/date) was assessment conducted?
Outcome 1
Thesis and Professional Paper defenses were conducted at the end of each academic term (Fall, Spring and Summer) to all graduating students in the program.

Outcome 2
All TExAS exams were administered at state approved test administrations sites on the following dates: 10/2/04, 12/4/04, 4/2/05, 5/21/05 and 7/9/05.

Outcome 3
Thesis and Professional Paper defenses were conducted at the end of each academic term (Fall, Spring and Summer) to all graduating students in the program.

What were the results attained (raw data)?
Outcome 1
100% (N=2) of the graduate students successfully completed professional papers, and 100% (N=11) successfully completed a thesis.

Outcome 2
80% (N=10) of graduate students scored 240 or above overall on the TExAS for educational diagnosticians demonstrating a favorable comparison statewide (Mean=248.6, Median=249, Mode=260, Range=66 with Minimum=212 and Maximum=278). 50% (N=10) of graduate students scored 240 or above over all Domain I of the TExAS educational diagnosticians (Mean=231.1, Median=242, Mode=256. Range=111 with Minimum=162 and Maximum=273). 70% (N=10) of graduate students scored 240 or above over all Domain II of the TExAS educational diagnosticians (Mean=241.8, Median=248, Mode=245, Range=100 with Minimum=178 and Maximum=278). 100% (N=10) of graduate students scored 240 or above over all Domain III of the TExAS educational diagnosticians (Mean=269.6, Median=264, Mode=264, Range=35 with Minimum=256 and Maximum=291).

Outcome 3
100% (N=2) of the graduate students successfully completed professional papers, and 100% (N=11) successfully completed a thesis.

Who (specify names) conducted analysis of data?
Outcome 1
Randel D. Brown

Outcome 2
Randel D. Brown
Outcome 3
Randel D. Brown

When were the results and analysis shared? With whom (department chair, supervisor, staff, external stakeholders)? Minutes with data analysis submitted to assessment@tamiu.edu? (Please use Minutes Template located on the Project INTEGRATE web page.)
The results and analysis were shared with the College of Education Dean, Department of Special Population Chair, and all faculty teaching degree specific courses for the Master of Science in Generic Special Education

Has the assessment documentation (i.e., surveys, rubrics, course exams with embedded questions, etc.) been submitted to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning? Yes

Use of Results: Indicate what changes, if any, based on the data have been recommended?
Outcome 1
The results will be discussed with faculty in the Department of Special Populations to request feedback and/or recommendations.

Outcome 2
Faculty agreed to develop a plan to systematically incorporate TExAS competencies into their courses and will begin implementing the revised courses in the Fall 2006 semester.

Outcome 3
The results will be discussed with faculty in the Department of Special Populations to request feedback and/or recommendations.
Section III: Programmatic Review

What are the implications of the recommended changes?
Course content revisions

Will resources be affected by the recommended changes? □ Yes  ☒ No

If so, specify the anticipated effect(s) using the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ New resources required</td>
<td>□ New or reallocated space</td>
<td>□ Primarily faculty/staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Reallocation of current funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ University rule/procedure change only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Other: Enter text here</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative description and justification for request including related strategy
(Attach Budget Request ‘Form B’ and/or ‘Form C’)
Enter text here

If funding, physical or other resources were requested, what is the impact of the budget decisions on program/division?
Enter text here

In the box below, provide information on the outcomes for the next assessment cycle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes for Next Assessment Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuation of present outcome(s) - (Indicate reason for continuation):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes will remain the same because of their importance to educational diagnosticians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Outcome(s) – (List outcomes below):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter text here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for modification):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same outcomes, but some changes in wording for clarity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>