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External Review Team Members,

On behalf of the Department of Educational Psychology at Texas A&M University, I extend our sincere appreciation for your willingness to serve as an external reviewer for our Academic Program Review (APR). Your engagement is critical to the department's continuous improvement efforts as we seek to attract and maintain a diverse population of students while providing authentic educational experiences that create opportunities for advancement.

The following APR self-study report provides an overview of the department's history, summarizes faculty and student profiles, identifies key resources, and describes our degree program options at undergraduate ($n = 3$), master's ($n = 7$), and doctoral ($n = 6$) levels. This self-study also includes an assessment of progress since the department's last APR and a summary of our strategic priorities.

I look forward to introducing you to the faculty, staff, and students for whom I have the honor of serving as leader. They are eager to interact with your team and to welcome you to Aggieland. You can expect to hear “howdy” from many Aggies across the campus as it is the official greeting of Texas A&M University.

Thank you in advance for your time, thoughtful consideration, and valuable recommendations that will no doubt come from your collective participation. Please do not hesitate to contact me with requests for additional information or if you need any assistance in preparation for your trip.

Sincerely,

Shanna Hagan-Burke, Ph.D.

Professor, Head, and Douglas Palmer Endowed Chair of Educational Psychology
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External Review Team Charge

The Academic Program Review (APR) process at Texas A&M University provides the occasion for academic units to plan strategically, assess the quality and efficacy of their programs, and determine the best courses of action for ongoing improvement. APR is at the heart of our institutional commitment to excellence, and we sincerely thank you for assisting us. This letter provides you with the charge to the committee and a brief overview of the department.

Peer Review Team Charge

Please examine the department and its programs and make recommendations that will help in planning improvements. Your resources are a self-study report prepared by the department, copies of materials from the program's last review, information you gain through personal interactions while visiting Texas A&M University, copies of strategic plans and goal-setting documents at the department, college, and/or university level, and any additional information requested by you or by the department. Within the broad charge of recommending ways the department can continue to improve are some specific questions that we would like you to address:

- Based on the data/information provided in the self-study report or gathered by the review team, what are the department's overall strengths and weaknesses?
- How well do the department’s strategic goals align with those of its college and with those of Texas A&M University?
- How would you compare this department with its peers? Specifically, is the curriculum directly related and appropriate to the mission and goals of the institution?
- What improvements (including student learning and faculty development) has the department made since the previous program review?
- With only current resources or a modest infusion of new ones, what specific recommendations could improve the department’s performance, marginally or significantly?

We look forward to meeting with you during your time on campus. If you have any questions or require additional information prior to your visit, Ms. Bettyann Zito, APR Program Coordinator, at apr@tamu.edu.

Thank you,

Shanna Hagan-Burke, Ph.D.
Professor, Endowed Chair, & Head
Department of Educational Psychology
Executive Summary of the Self-Study Report

This Academic Program Review (APR) self-study report is a follow-up to the department's 2011-2012 APR and contains information to aid in the evaluation of the Department of Educational Psychology's (EPSY) Academic Programs. The report offers an overview of EPSY including its administrative structure, academic units (i.e., divisions) that house the faculty who administer its degree programs, and degree program requirements. Profiles of EPSY faculty, staff, and students are also included, along with relevant departmental data and a report of the progress made since the department's last APR.

Undergraduate Degrees and Concentration Programs

**B.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies:**
- Concentration program options:
  - Bilingual Education EC-6 (teacher certification program)
  - Special Education EC-12 (teacher certification program)

**B.S. in University Studies**
- Concentration program:
  - Child Professional Studies (non-certification program)

**Minor in Creative Studies**

Master's Degrees and Specialization Programs

**M.Ed./M.S. in Bilingual Education** *Online

**M.Ed./M.S. in Educational Psychology:**
- Creativity & Cognition (M.Ed.) *Online
- Developmental Sciences (M.Ed./M.S.)
- Research, Measurement, & Statistics (M.Ed./M.S.)
- School Counseling (M.Ed.) *Online

**M.Ed. in Educational Technology** *Online

**M.Ed./M.S. in Special Education** *Online

Doctoral Degrees and Specialization Programs

**Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology**

**Ph.D. in Educational Psychology:**
- Bilingual Education
- Developmental Sciences
- Learning Design & Technology
- Research, Measurement, & Statistics
- Special Education

**Ph.D. in School Psychology**

EPSY is one of four departments currently housed within the College of Education & Human Development (CEHD) at Texas A&M University. The department is home to a variety of interrelated disciplines and degree options focused on human development and well-being in educational and community contexts. Its undergraduate programs prepare students to work with children and youth in a variety of community and school environments. The department also offers a range of master's degrees geared towards professionals in schools, communities, and the corporate world. At the doctoral level, EPSY offers Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degrees in Counseling Psychology, Educational Psychology, and School Psychology. The following table summarizes the number of tenure-track and
professional track faculty within the department's six academic units along with student enrollment for fall 2018 in EPSY degree programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC UNIT</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>STUDENT ENROLLMENT BY PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TENURED &amp; TENURE-TRACK</td>
<td>ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>5 (3 full &amp; 2 associate)</td>
<td>1 (clinical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>5 (3 full &amp; 2 associate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Sciences</td>
<td>6 (1 full &amp; 2 associate, 3 assistant)</td>
<td>3 (2 clinical &amp; 1 instructional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Measurement, &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>5 (1 full, 2 associate, &amp; 2 assistant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>5 (1 full, 2 associate, &amp; 2 assistant)</td>
<td>2 (clinical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>8 (3 full, 2 associate, &amp; 3 assistant)</td>
<td>3 (clinical)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EPSY began the 2018 academic year with 44 full-time faculty, the majority of whom are tenured ($n = 24$) or tenure-track ($n = 11$). The department also has 9 professional track faculty with workloads that are predominantly (80% - 90%) teaching. Biographical summaries for all faculty are included in Appendices A and B.

The department administers three undergraduate degree programs, seven master's degree specialization programs, and five doctoral degree specialization programs. Over the past five years, EPSY has experienced growth in enrollments and subsequent graduation rates, with much of the change attributed to increased participation in master's degree programming. As of fall 2018, the department's student enrollment is 714 students (309 undergraduate & 405 graduate).

The department's strategic priorities align with the university's strategic vision and plans while reflecting the College of Education and Human Development's vision of transforming lives through leadership and innovation in education and human development. These efforts are enhanced by robust extramural research and outreach activities that create opportunities for meaningful student engagement while expanding our capacity to help meet the needs of the community and state of Texas. EPSY faculty averaged $10.1$ million annually in new grant awards between 2015-2017; In 2018 EPSY faculty received $7.4$ million in new external awards. EPSY's multiple innovative research and teaching labs and clinics, a university-designated center on Dual-Language and Literacy Acquisition, and a federally designated center on Disability and Development are additional assets that enrich students' experiences.
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Texas A&M University

RANKINGS

#1

- in Texas and #7 nationally, **Best Colleges You Can Actually Get Into**, *Money Magazine*
- **most affordable college** in Texas, *Business Insider*
- among public universities and #4 overall, nationally, **Best Universities in the Country**, *Washington Monthly*
- in Texas and #4 nationally, **Best Value (public universities)**, *U.S. News & World Report*
- in Texas and top 25 nationally in **highest-earning graduates**, *Forbes*
- in Texas in **6-year student graduation rates** — both overall and for minorities, *Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board*
- nationally (tied with the University of Michigan) for **most graduates serving as CEOs of Fortune 500 companies**, *Fortune*

#2

- nationally, **Best Schools in the Nation**, *Schools.com*

#3

- nationally (tie), in **student engagement**, *Wall Street Journal*

---

Top 20 Nationally

- **Best Colleges for Big Paychecks**, *Money Magazine*
- **Top Undergraduate Schools for Entrepreneurship Studies (#21 among graduate schools)**, *Princeton Review*
- **Overall rankings among public colleges and universities**, *Wall Street Journal*
- **Best College Towns in America (College Station)**, *MSN.com*

Want more? Go to accountability.tamu.edu
Questions? Contact Ann Kellett at akellett@tamu.edu
Texas A&M is the state's first public institution of higher education. With a student body of more than 64,000 and more than 5,700 acres on the College Station campus, Texas A&M is also among the nation's largest universities. Our origins, however, are much humbler: we owe our existence to the Morrill Act, approved by the United States Congress on July 2, 1862. This act provided for donation of public land to the states for the purpose of funding higher education whose "leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanic arts."

The State of Texas agreed to create a college under the terms of the Morrill Act in November 1866, but actual formation didn't come until the establishment of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas by the Texas state legislature on April 17, 1871. A commission created to locate the institution accepted the offer of 2,416 acres of land from the citizens of Brazos County in 1871, and instruction began in 1876. Admission was limited to white males, and, as required by the Morrill Act, all students were required to participate in military training.

Texas A&M underwent many changes in the 1960s under the presidency of Gen. James Earl Rudder. Under his tenure the college diversified, opening its doors to African-Americans and formally admitting women. Participation in the Corps of Cadets was also made voluntary. In 1963, the Texas state legislature officially renamed the school to Texas A&M University, with the "A" and "M" being a symbolic link to the school's past but no longer officially standing for "Agricultural and Mechanical."

Since that time, Texas A&M has flourished to become one of the nation's premier research universities. Along with the University of Texas and Rice, Texas A&M is one of only three Tier 1 universities in the state. In 1971 and 1989, respectively, Texas A&M was designated as a sea-grant and a space-grant institution, making it among the first four universities to hold the triple distinction of land-grant, sea-grant, and space-grant designations.

While membership in the Corps of Cadets became voluntary in 1965, the Corps has nonetheless continued to play a key role in the university. The Corps is often referred to as the "Keepers of the Spirit" and "Guardians of Tradition." Texas A&M remains one of only six senior military colleges, and the Corps of Cadets is the largest uniformed body outside the national service academies. As such, it has historically produced more officers than any other institution in the nation other than the academies.

The George Bush Presidential Library and Museum opened in 1997 on west campus, making Texas A&M one of only a few universities to host a presidential library on their campus. President Bush maintained an active role in the university, hosting and participating in special events organized through the library up until his death in December 2018.

Currently, Texas A&M is one of the largest single campus universities in size, with over 64,000 students as of Fall 2018, is a member of the Association of American Universities, is one of the largest annual external funding, and is known for its rich traditions and remarkable history. No other university in the U.S. has had a greater change in the last four decades; from a 6,000 member military school to major Tier I research institution. It is one the first four designated Land, Sea, and Space Grant institutions. A bit more is at [http://www.tamu.edu/about/facts/history.html](http://www.tamu.edu/about/facts/history.html). (Institutional Profile is provided in Appendix C).
History of the College of Education and Human Development

The College of Education and Human Development originated in 1969 and first opened its doors to students on Sept. 1 of that year. The college will celebrate its 50th anniversary in 2019. Between fall of 2010 and fall 2018, student enrollment increased from 4,070 to 5,218 undergraduates and from 1,323 to 1,601 graduate students.

During that same period the college’s faculty grew from 107 to 117 tenured and tenure track faculty to 117, and from 80 to 102 professional track (i.e., clinical and instructional) faculty. Despite this growth, the current number of tenured and tenure-track faculty remains below that of 2009 (when there were 120), indicating the lingering effects of budget cuts that were put in place the following year.

Six deans have led the college since its establishment in 1969.

The college leadership transitioned from Dean Jane Conoley (who left to assume deanship at the University of California- Santa Barbara in 2005) to Dr. Douglas J. Palmer, who became Dean in May 2006 after serving as interim dean and as former executive associate dean. During his tenure, Palmer worked to expand the leadership role of the college and broaden student centered initiatives and international learning opportunities.

In June of 2015, Dr. Joyce Alexander became the sixth dean to lead the college. Prior to this appointment, she was the Executive Associate Dean in the School of Education at Indiana University Bloomington where she had been a member of the faculty since 2005 and Chair of the Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology for six years.

The College has maintained the four-department structure adopted in 2000. The College-level leadership includes four associate deans, six assistant deans, and 70 staff members who work...
to provide college-level services and supports in instructional technology, marketing and communications, finance and administration, research services, academic affairs, faculty affairs, and organization development and diversity initiatives. The college’s department heads, deans and office leaders, and representatives of various College constituencies comprise a Dean’s Council that meets monthly and serves as the primary mechanism to formally propose and approve procedures for the college.

The college's standing committees include the Graduate Instruction Committee, Faculty Advisory Council, Clinical Faculty Advisory Committee, Council on Teacher Education, Council of Principal Investigators, Tenure & Promotion Advisory Committee, Staff Advisory Council, Lecturer & Instructional Professor Advisory Council, Technology Council, and Sustainability Campaign Committee.

US News and World Report in 2018 ranked the college 37th on its graduate programs list of Best Education Schools. In 2018, faculty were engaged in externally funded projects, resulting in $30.2 million annual research budget. New research funding awards totaled $39.5 million for the College in 2018. Funding agencies include NSF, NIH, US Department of Education, numerous state agencies and private foundations. The College also is home to 13 endowed chairs and professorships supported by endowments totaling over $13.7 million.
HISTORY & MISSION

The college opened its doors under the direction of Dr. Frank W.R. Hubert in 1969. With 1,307 students, and faculty from across the nation, the college was soon heralded as a premier school for teacher preparation.

Now the 4th largest college at Texas A&M University with over 7,000 enrolled students, we are not just a school for teachers.

We are a school for leaders.

We offer 21 undergraduate programs and seven minors across four academic departments: Educational Administration & Human Resource Development (EAHR), Educational Psychology (EPSY), Health & Kinesiology (HLKN), and Teaching, Learning & Culture (TLAC).

GLOBAL EDUCATION

Through immersion in global education opportunities, our students come to understand history, influence, politics, arts, culture, and technology in ways they never realized before. Our students and graduates impact people from all cultures and backgrounds in diverse classrooms, organizations, and communities.

We have more than 20 faculty-developed international experiences to countries including Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, England, Germany, Italy, Ireland, Mexico, Spain, Southern Africa, Tanzania and Taiwan.

TEACHER CERTIFICATION

The College of Education & Human Development has a history of producing the highest number of certified teachers in bilingual education, special education, and STEM-related fields in the state of Texas. We are:

#1 in producing teachers in Math and Science
#1 in producing teachers in English Language Arts and Reading
#1 in producing teachers in General Elementary (Self-Contained)
#1 in producing teachers in Bilingual Education
#6 in producing teachers in Special Education

STUDENT

4,293 White
364 Black
1,558 Hispanic or Latino
262 Asian
18 American Indian
7 Native Hawaiian
130 Multiracial
168 International
19 Other

1,746 Male
5,073 Female

FACULTY

101 Academic Professional Track
21 Tenure-track
88 Tenured
91 Male
119 Female
18 Asian
21 Black
16 Hispanic
155 White

DEMOGRAPHICS

ENROLLMENT

The college has more than 6,000 students studying in four academic departments.

5,218 undergraduates
1,601 graduate
6,819 total

DEPARTMENTS

1. Educational Administration and Human Resource Development (EAHR)
2. Educational Psychology (EPSY)
3. Health and Kinesiology (HLKN)
4. Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC)

PROGRAMS

21 undergraduate
29 master’s
9 graduate certificates
23 doctoral
7 minors
Recent History of the Department of Educational Psychology

Approved by the Regents of Texas A&M University and the Texas Coordinating Board of Higher Education in 1969, the Department of Educational Psychology is one of the five original departments established within the College of Education at Texas A&M University. Today the Department of Educational Psychology (EPSY) is home to a variety of interrelated disciplines and degree options focused on human development and well-being in educational and community contexts. The department offers three undergraduate degree programs that prepare students to work with children and youth in a variety of community and school contexts. The department also offers a range of master's degrees geared towards working professionals in schools, communities, and the corporate world. At the doctoral level, the department has three Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degrees in Educational Psychology, Counseling Psychology, and School Psychology. Students pursuing a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology participate in one of four distinct specialization programs: Bilingual Education; Developmental Sciences; Research, Measurement, and Statistics; or Special Education. The following faculty have served as head of the department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979-1984</td>
<td>Dr. Christopher Borman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-1992</td>
<td>Dr. Michael J. Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1994</td>
<td>Dr. Bruce Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>Dr. Patricia Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-2003</td>
<td>Dr. Douglas J. Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>Dr. Victor L. Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2008</td>
<td>Dr. Michael R. Benz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2016</td>
<td>Dr. Victor L. Willson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-present</td>
<td>Dr. Shanna Hagan-Burke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More information about the department's history spanning 1969 to 2011 is available in Appendix D. What follows is a summary of more recent history, primarily focusing on the period of time that has elapsed since the last Academic Program Review.

Dr. Victor Willson completed eight years of service as EPSY's department head, retiring in June 2016. During his last year, he also served as the department head of Teaching, Learning, and Culture while the college conducted an external in pursuit of a new leader for that unit. The year before the dean had queried the EPSY faculty's preference for an internal versus external search for their next department head. A majority favored an internal search and in the 2016 spring semester two finalists among the applicants completed multi-day interviews. The dean approved the faculty's recommendation and appointed Dr. Shanna Hagan-Burke to serve a 4-year term that began June 2016. Her interim 2-year evaluation from the college and EPSY's faculty, staff, and students produced a favorable recommendation for continuation through the term. An end-of-term evaluation will take place in the spring of 2020. Pending that outcome, offering her reappointment for a second term may be an option.

In terms of faculty composition, six of the department's twelve full professors have retired since the last APR (November 2011) and been replaced over time by the promotion of eight associate professors. The number of full-time faculty has increased from 41 to 44, with minimal
changes in the numbers of associate professors (from 14 to 12) and tenure-track assistant professors (from 9 to 10). Professional track faculty (i.e., full-time faculty with 80% - 90% of their time allocated to teaching) increased from six to nine and, while this change may seem relatively inconsequential, adding two clinical positions and converting a third position from part-time lecturer to full-time clinical faculty enabled the department to cover eighteen additional courses per year.

With respect to academic programming, relatively recent changes include the addition of three distance education graduate programs. The Division of Special Education launched a fully online Special Education master's degree (M.Ed./M.S.) in 2011 that incorporates the required coursework for students to pursue national certification as a Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA). The Division of Counseling Psychology developed an online School Counseling specialization program (yielding an M.Ed. in Educational Psychology) that accepted its first cohort in 2013. Finally, the Division of Learning Sciences revised and reinstituted an Educational Technology master's degree (M.Ed.) in fall of 2014 with the addition of a new full-time clinical faculty member with the expertise to help cover instruction. (A similar program existed in prior years but had been discontinued three years earlier.)

Perhaps the most substantive change has been in leadership structure. In fall of 2017 the department's leadership was expanded by the addition of two associate department head positions, one for Research and Faculty Development and another for Academic Affairs. Faculty who fill these service leadership roles are appointed by the department head. At present, the percentage of effort for these is 25% and 30% respectively during the academic year, plus one month distributed across the three summer months. The responsibilities associated with these positions align with the department's strategic efforts to increase external recognition of faculty, increase supports for research productivity and extramural funding (particularly among junior faculty), ensure the highest quality distance education programming, and increase opportunities for ongoing improvement in faculty's teaching skills.

Other changes within the department since the 2011 APR include the addition of the Neurobiological Lab for Learning and Development, established in 2015 by Dr. Steven Woltering (Director) to create a shared lab facility researchers interested in incorporating neurological and biometric measures into their research. We also collaborated with the university's School of Public Health to successfully launch a Telehealth Counseling Clinic in 2013. This non-profit clinic provides psychological services to the public and generates meaningful research and training opportunities for faculty and students. The telehealth services are provided by a team of EPSY doctoral student trainees and licensed psychologist supervisors. Finally, the department established the Center for Research and Development in Dual Language and Literacy Acquisition (CRDLLA), a university-recognized center that has already served as the epicenter for more than $61.2 million in extramural funding including $48.9 million in federal and state external awards and $12.3 million in private sector funds.
Mission, Goals, & Strategic Planning

Texas A&M University Mission Statement
Retrieved from https://www.tamu.edu/statements/mission.html

Texas A&M University is dedicated to the discovery, development, communication, and application of knowledge in a wide range of academic and professional fields. Its mission of providing the highest quality undergraduate and graduate programs is inseparable from its mission of developing new understandings through research and creativity. It prepares students to assume roles in leadership, responsibility and service to society. Texas A&M assumes as its historic trust the maintenance of freedom of inquiry and an intellectual environment nurturing the human mind and spirit. It welcomes and seeks to serve persons of all racial, ethnic and geographic groups as it addresses the needs of an increasingly diverse population and a global economy. In the 21st century, Texas A&M University seeks to assume a place of preeminence among public universities while respecting its history and traditions.

Texas A&M University Goals (Vision 2020)
Retrieved from http://vision2020.tamu.edu/ with modifications to summarize supporting text

For nearly two decades, Texas A&M University’s strategic planning, budgeting, and administrative priorities have been rooted firmly in Vision 2020: Creating a Culture of Excellence. Vision 2020 is the university’s bold recognition of necessary institutional evolution required to achieve its mission as a land, sea, and space grant institution of global preeminence. Adopted in 1999, more than 250 stakeholders worked to identify Vision 2020's benchmarks, which if achieved, would enhance Texas A&M University’s value to The Texas A&M University System, the State of Texas, and the nation. The university has made tremendous progress and garnered national accolades for its unique combination of core values and academic excellence.

Vision 2020 identifies twelve specific areas of focus that define accepted precepts and goals for the university to target over the course of two decades.

Twelve Imperatives of Vision 2020
1. Elevate Our Faculty and Their Teaching, Research, & Scholarship
2. Strengthen Our Graduate Programs
3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience
4. Build the Letters, Arts, and Sciences Core
5. Build on the Tradition of Professional Education
6. Diversify and Globalize the A&M Community
7. Increase Access to Knowledge Resources
8. Enrich Our Campus
9. Build Community and Metropolitan Connections
10. Demand Enlightened Governance and Leadership
11. Attain Resource Parity with the Best Public Universities
12. Meet Our Commitment to Texas
Texas A&M University Strategic Planning 2015-2020

As the university entered the final phase of Vision 2020, its strategic planning at all levels (including all colleges and divisions) coordinated to be as inclusive as possible. The Office of the Provost, the Faculty Senate, and the Council of Principal Investigators jointly convened four planning forums that were open to all faculty and staff. These efforts yielded four overarching goals and ten corresponding strategies for improvement intended to help the university achieve its Vision 2020's imperatives. (See http://provost.tamu.edu/Strategic-Planning for a more detailed account of the 2015-2020 strategic planning process.)

**GOAL 1: Provide an outstanding educational experience for all students** as evidenced by: enhanced learning outcomes, strong appreciation for the value of the educational experience, high completion rates, timely graduation norms, and high placements upon graduation.

**STRATEGY 1:** Commit to a University culture that values timely completion of degrees at all levels.

**STRATEGY 2:** Commit to a University culture that ensures all students engage in high-impact learning experiences in their curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular experiences.

**STRATEGY 3:** Review and enhance all academic units’ curricular, pedagogical, and career preparation activities, especially the development of our instructors, to optimize value to our students.

**STRATEGY 4:** Strengthen multidisciplinary programs and initiatives, and reinforce their alignment with and recognition by existing disciplinary structures.

**STRATEGY 5:** Enhance our ability to ensure that all faculty, staff, and students, regardless of their identity, are recognized and valued for their contributions at Texas A&M University.

**GOAL 2: Produce impactful new knowledge, innovations, and creative works** as evidenced by: high citation, utilization, and display of scholarly outputs, high levels of support for our scholars, recognition of our scholars, contributions to solving society’s grand challenges

**STRATEGY 4:** (Same as above) Strengthen multidisciplinary programs and initiatives, and reinforce their alignment with and recognition by existing disciplinary structures.

**STRATEGY 6:** Review and refine faculty and staff annual performance and promotion evaluation processes and merit-based incentives to reinforce expectations and reward impact and productivity.

**STRATEGY 7:** Facilitate and support our faculty to publish and exhibit in top-tier venues, to succeed in garnering external funding for their work, and be successfully nominated for significant awards and recognitions.

**STRATEGY 8:** Refine and implement unit budgeting processes to ensure investments are made in facilities, equipment, and personnel that reinforce University expectations.

**GOAL 3: Place the needs of the public good at the forefront of our mission** as evidenced by: (a) Graduating a large number of students who share the University's commitment to serve the public good. (b) Increasing the number of graduating students who identify as African-American or Hispanic. (c) Graduating more than 25% of the students who are first generation college attenders or whose family income is below the State poverty level. (d) Graduating students with a low student debt burden. (e) Translating rapidly our scholarly and creative works to serve and improve society's natural environment, economic environment, and human condition. (f) Exercising responsible stewardship of the State’s resources.
STRATEGY 5: (same as above but ensure University wide) Enhance our ability to ensure that all faculty, staff, and students, regardless of their identity, can thrive at Texas A&M University.

STRATEGY 8: (same as above but ensure University wide) Refine and implement University wide budgeting processes to reinforce University expectations.

STRATEGY 9: Align partnerships with other Agencies and our administrative procedures and operations to optimize our teaching, research, and service mission.

STRATEGY 10: Reinforce and support procedures and initiatives to improve the recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students at all levels and from all backgrounds.

Texas A&M University's mission requires the provision of an exceptional education to undergraduate and graduate students that reflects the changing social and cultural demographics of Texas and the Nation. We must ensure that our graduates are highly sought after, and are prepared to lead, learn, and serve for a lifetime. We must do this while serving the State and Nation in the effective utilization of resources, by striving for high completion rates, in a timely manner, which will lead to lower student debt accumulation. We must accomplish this educational aspect of our mission by enhancing innovative approaches and strong standards in our curricula.
College of Education & Human Development Mission

In 2016 under the leadership of a newly appointed dean, the College of Education and Human Development engaged stakeholders across the college and identified four broad areas of impact we aspire to have: (a) achieve equity in education and health outcomes, (b) improve individual and community quality of life, (c) advance teaching and learning, and (d) develop transformational leaders.

College of Education & Human Development Goals & Strategic Planning 2015-2020

The College's 2015-2020 strategic plan (approved December 2014) included eight goals within the domains of undergraduate education, graduate education, research, and engagement. The focus on these domains corresponded with the mission of Texas A&M University.

Texas A&M University is a creation of the state, and in its origin was designed to prepare educated problem-solvers to lead the state's development. This fundamental mission, born out of the land grant heritage of service, remains today. Texas A&M University's aspiration to be among the best public universities in the country resonates with this historical mandate. The diverse population of Texas should have access to the best public education in America without having to leave the state.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

- **Goal 1: Increase undergraduate diversity** as defined by race, ethnicity, gender and first-generation status through improved recruitment and retention to 20% in two years and 25% in five years.
  - Target recruitment efforts to include diverse high schools, first-generation students and high-need teaching fields
  - Provide need-based scholarships for diverse students

- **Goal 2: Create a climate that fosters and supports retention and development of students from diverse backgrounds**
  - Engage all freshman students in learning communities
  - Invest $50K in the Byrne Student Success Center to engage in retention efforts and learning communities

- **Goal 3: Ensure all students are well equipped with technology skills and highly capable in applying those skills to diverse tasks**
  - Develop a scope and sequence for technology knowledge and skills for each undergraduate program and integrate into specific courses

GRADUATE EDUCATION

- **Goal 4: Prepare doctoral students for the professoriate**
  - Invest $50K to help students submit papers at conferences as part of a required initiative
  - Offer writing courses
  - Track alumni's employment
  - Require teaching experience before graduation
  - Assess rigor of courses
✓ **Goal 5: Create a climate that fosters and supports the development of students and faculty of diverse backgrounds through research and instruction**
  - Invest $20K for faculty recruiting trips to encourage the recruitment of diverse faculty, staff and students
  - Facilitate the retention of diverse faculty, staff, and students

✓ **Goal 6: Prepare Ed.D. and M.Ed. students for success as practitioner-leaders**
  - Continually assess curricula to reflect CEHD values and current trends
  - Assess selection, admission, and retention for applicants

**RESEARCH**

✓ **Goal 7: Increase external funding**
  - Invest $40K to hire a grant writer to assist CEHD research office with proposal development for faculty and invest $75K for two post-doc fellowships in methodology
  - Coordinate workshops on grant writing that are discipline specific through the CEHD research office
  - Identify sources for external funding through CEHD development office
  - Provide incentives for experienced grant staff and/or faculty to mentor others in proposal development and grant management
  - Provide competitive financial support for multidisciplinary collaborations that lead to external grant proposals
  - Provide one-time merit for faculty who submit a grant application to an external funding source

✓ **Goal 8: Increase faculty dissemination of findings in top-tier publications**
  - Provide training incentives and support for faculty to communicate with local, state and national representatives
  - Provide training to faculty, students and research project staff to develop a dissemination plan for writing to laypersons and communicating with media
  - Utilize a wide variety of current technologies through the CEHD communications office to disseminate research highlights to policy makers, stakeholders and academicians

**ENGAGEMENT**

**Goal 9: Support and enhance P-16 research and engagement initiatives**
  - Identify engagement initiatives
  - Invest $3K to sponsor an engagement initiatives
  - Host “Share Day” to strengthen engagement initiatives
  - Invest in additional communications staff to help highlight engagement initiatives

**Goal 10: Increase use of technology-mediated instruction to facilitate access to high-quality programs**
  - Encourage faculty to use podcasting and other technologies in their classes
  - Investigate implementing the undergraduate distance program
  - Increase online certification opportunities
  - Provide professional development certificates and programs as outreach

In Fall of 2018 faculty and staff from across the college convened and identified working groups to lead the development of our next phase of strategic planning (for 2020-2025).
Department of Educational Psychology Mission

Shared Vision: To transform lives through leadership and innovation in education and human development.

Department of Educational Psychology Goals and Strategic Planning

Texas A&M University’s Vision 2020 and the College's 2015-2020 Strategic Plan serve as the foundation for EPSY’s strategic planning goals.

Teaching: Undergraduate Education

- Increase diversity (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and first generation college attendance status) within our undergraduate degree programs through improved recruitment and retention efforts.
  - Coordinate recruitment efforts with the college's undergraduate recruitment office.
  - Increase communications with other departments in the college (i.e., Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture) to identify education majors who may have desire to work with bilingual learners and students with special education needs.
- Optimize enrollments for our undergraduate degree programs.
  - Increase enrollment in our bilingual teacher preparation program. Short-term goal: Admit new cohort of 25-30 students (juniors) every fall semester. Long-term goal: Admit new cohort of 25-30 students (juniors) every fall and every spring semester.
  - Increase cohort sizes in the special education teacher preparation program, admitting 34 new students (juniors) per academic year semester.
  - Stabilize enrollment numbers in the Child Professional Services program. Target: Admitting 35-40 new students each year.

Teaching: Graduate Education

- Increase the number of doctoral students who enter the professoriate.
  - Prioritize full-time admission of full-time (rather than part-time) students.
  - Increase funding opportunities for full-time students.
  - Strategically schedule doctoral level courses and research opportunities to encourage students’ regular presence on campus.
  - Increase workstations in shared secure offices space for full-time doctoral students.
- Prioritize high quality distance education programs at the master’s degree level
  - Increase professional development opportunities to provide faculty with advanced online instruction skills.
  - Incentivize exemplary distance education teaching through the annual review process, post-tenure review criteria, and promotion indicators.
  - Provide faculty with access to instructional design experts.
  - Establish department-level council of distance educators to provide leadership, guidance, and input for strategic efforts to promote continuous improvement in our distance education programs.

Research and Outreach

- Invest in faculty development to increase their success in securing extramural funding to support programmatic research and outreach efforts.
  - Utilize Associate DH of Research and Faculty Development to provide leadership and increase mentorship opportunities.
  - Partner with center directors to provide collaborative research and outreach efforts for faculty and students.
• Elevate faculty and increase opportunities for recognition of their accomplishments.
• Encourage faculty to think strategically about where they disseminate their work.
• Increase opportunities for junior faculty to engage in professional organizations that can provide access to future national recognition.
• Continue engaging the community and state to identify relevant applied research and outreach activities.

Climate
• Provide lower-rank faculty and academic professional track faculty with equitable climate experiences and acknowledgement of their professional accomplishments.
  o Hold monthly mentoring meetings with the department's pre-tenured faculty.
  o Modify annual review portal prompts to solicit more relevant performance indicators for academic professional track faculty.
• Increase opportunities for students to interact with departmental leadership.
• Increase funding support for undergraduates, particularly during the student teaching experience.
• Continue to diversify climate committee membership to include a mix of staff and faculty ranks.
• Increase joint efforts between the department's climate committee and student organizations.
Administrative Structure of Department

Administration

DEPARTMENT HEAD

Dr. Shanna Hagan-Burke, Professor and Douglas J Palmer Endowed Chair in Educational Psychology, currently serves as EPSY department head (DH) following her appointment in 2016. The DH is charged with full budget and personnel administration responsibility. Within this structure, the DH has full assignment and approval authority over curricular and student matters for authorized academic programs. Faculty governance plays a required role with respect to tenure-track faculty hires and department head appointment, although the department's current culture and university expectations have shifted toward greater faculty input. Nonetheless formal department head approval remains for many decisions, even if pro forma. Over the years, EPSY has created and utilized a governance structure based on a multi-level model of distributed authority.

ASSOCIATE HEAD OF RESEARCH & FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Jeffrey Liew, Professor of Educational Psychology, currently allocates 25% FTE to serve as EPSY's Associate DH of Research and Faculty Development. One of the primary responsibilities of this role is to provide ongoing mentorship opportunities for faculty research and outreach (emphasizing but not limited to new faculty). The Associate DH for Research and Faculty Development also leads the department's faculty recognition efforts, strategically pursuing a succession of awards for faculty. The Associate DH in this position also provides leadership to the faculty's annual peer-evaluation team and leads ongoing faculty efforts to identify indicators excellence in research and outreach.

ASSOCIATE HEAD, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Dr. Glenda Byrns, Clinical Professor of Educational Psychology, allocates 30% FTE to serve as EPSY's Associate DH of Academic Affairs. Primary responsibilities for this position include increasing faculty engagement in professional development to improve teaching (including distance education) and increasing opportunities for meaningful evaluation of faculty teaching. The Associate DH for Academic Affairs also leads efforts to utilize summative course evaluation data to inform program improvements and faculty evaluations, interfaces with the EPSY graduate advising office, oversees department-wide course scheduling, and works closely with degree program coordinators and the graduate advising office to expand student communications (including social media).
Academic Division Chairs

The department's faculty within six academic divisions, each of which is administered by a Division Chair who is recommended by the faculty to serve a two-year assignment. Division Chairs may serve consecutive terms with division faculty approval. Responsibilities include leading monthly division faculty meetings, managing division-specific activities and requirements including teaching assignments, course schedules, and oversight of differential tuition budgets for funds generated by academic programs within the division. Division Chairs serve on the department's Executive Council, representing their faculty and academic programs at monthly council meetings. They also respond to a range of DH and college requests for faculty information and academic reports. Division chairs receive an annual administrative stipend of $3,500 and one course release per year, and graduate student assistantship support.

RESEARCH, MEASUREMENT, & STATISTICS

DR. OI-MAN KWOK
PROFESSOR

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

DR. JAMILIA BLAKE
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY

DR. TIMOTHY ELLIOTT
DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR

SPECIAL EDUCATION

DR. GLENDA BYRNS
CLINICAL PROFESSOR

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

DR. FUHUI TONG
PROFESSOR

LEARNING SCIENCES

DR. JAY WOODWARD
ASSOCIATE CLINICAL PROFESSOR
Executive Committee

The DH assumes administrative leadership and utilizes an Executive Committee (EC) comprised of leaders from each of its academic divisions and representatives from the department's pre-tenured faculty and academic professional track faculty. The committee also includes ex-officio non-voting members who typically represent the department on standing college or university committees. Sometimes a given faculty member may serve in dual capacities on the Executive Committee. (As one example, the academic professional track member may also serve as an ex-officio member representing one of the college committees.) The EC meets monthly during the academic year to formally discuss (and approve as appropriate) a range of topics including communications from the dean's office, departmental budget allocations and expenditures, student recruitment and enrollment, and proposed changes in academic programming.

1. Department Head (non-voting chair of committee)

Voting Members:
2. Division Chair of Bilingual Education
3. Division Chair of Counseling Psychology
4. Division Chair of Learning Sciences
5. Division Chair of Research, Measurement & Statistics
6. Division Chair of School Psychology
7. Division Chair of Special Education
8. Elected representative of EPSY's pre-tenured faculty
9. Representative of EPSY's Academic Professional Track Faculty
10. At-large faculty representative (also represents EPSY on Dean's Faculty Advisory Council)

Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members:
1. Student Representative (president of EPSY student organization or her/his designee)
2. EPSY representative serving on the University's Faculty Senate (if any)
3. EPSY graduate advisor
4. Staff representative (typically the department's business administrator)
5. Chair of EPSY Climate Committee
6. An EPSY representative on the college's Council of Principal Investigators
7. Department's representative on the college's
8. EPSY representative on college's Council for Educator Preparation Programs & Undergraduate Activities
9. Director of the department's Counseling and Assessment Clinic

Departmental Faculty Committee of the Whole

Department bylaws of activity and guidelines are considered by the EC or through committee of the whole. EC can decide that any issue should be reviewed and voted on by the entire faculty. Matters affecting all faculty are reviewed and approved for discussion and vote by the entire faculty of the department, defined as all full-time tenured and tenure-track professoriate faculty, full-time professional track professoriate faculty, and full-time permanent lecturers. Both EC and faculty meetings occur monthly during the academic year but are not routinely scheduled during the summer. All matters related to curriculum, student instruction and evaluation, and faculty evaluation, are approved through a bylaw system that requires a first reading at a faculty meeting and vote at the following meeting. Ordinary Roberts Rules of Order are followed for such matters. The Head prepares an agenda prior to a meeting and solicits additional topics from members.
Standing Committees

The department's Tenure and Promotion Committee (T&P), consists of tenured faculty who hold a full or primary (51% or greater) appointment in the department. For decisions about tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, all T&P members deliberate and vote, while decisions regarding promotion to Full Professor only involve full professors. Only members who attend the scheduled T&P meeting may vote, and technology-based participation using methods like Skype are permitted for those unable to physically attend the meeting. Typically, faculty on development leave do not participate, although there is no prohibition as long as they are able to review materials beforehand.

The department's Graduate Faculty Review Committee consists of 4 faculty members who typically serve 3-year terms. This committee reviews faculty research productivity using university- and department-specific criteria and makes a recommendation to the department head regarding whether a given faculty member should be reappointed for another five-year period.

The Post-Tenure Review Committee is comprised of an elected tenured faculty member from each of the department’s six academic divisions. The committee convenes annually to review tenured faculty members’ productivity for the previous three calendar years. They provide recommendations to the department head regarding whether a faculty member has met the department's minimum performance criteria for research, teaching, and service.

The Climate Committee includes a faculty representative from each of the department's academic divisions, two staff members (one representing department-funded staff and another representing staff funded by extramural projects and centers). Members serve two- or three-year terms. The climate committee works closely with college-level diversity and climate initiatives, organizes special events and professional development opportunities centered around climate, and serves as a hub to coordinate broader climate-related activities executed by other faculty and staff.

Other department-level standing committees include the Faculty Awards Committee, which provides nominations for various TAMU and College student scholarship, teaching, research, and staff awards. Led by the Associate DH for Research and Faculty Development, the committee is primarily comprised of previous award winners, along with an undergraduate and graduate student representative.

The department's Scholarship Committee is led by the Associate DH of Academic Affairs and involves one or more EPSY graduate advisors, the department’s faculty representative who serves on the college’s Graduate Instruction Council. The committee also solicits involvement from the department’s division chairs as needed. This committee considers and awards various scholarships and grants for undergraduates and graduates that come from department funds.

Standing Committee Chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Tenure Review</th>
<th>Tenure &amp; Promotion</th>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Graduate Faculty Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Timothy Elliott</td>
<td>Dr. Kimberly Vannest</td>
<td>Dr. Miranda Walichowski</td>
<td>Dr. Yolanda Padron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR</td>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>CLINICAL ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department Resources

Facilities

Harrington Education Center includes the eight-story Harrington Tower and adjacent Harrington Classroom Building. This major office and classroom complex serves as the College of Education & Human Development's primary facility where thousands of Aggies have been educated since it entered into service in the 1970s. EPSY's main departmental office, faculty and staff offices, student workspaces, research and teaching laboratories, and designated centers occupy Harrington Tower's 6th and 7th floors and much of the 1st floor.

Heaton Hall is a neighboring building to Harrington Education Center erected in 1925 and renovated in 1977 to become the university's admissions and records office. Since that time, the College of Education & Human Development acquired Heaton Hall and currently utilizes its first floor to house the college's undergraduate advising office and the Byrns Student Success Center. The college's centralized Research Development Office is located on the second floor.

Milner Hall is a short distance from Harrington Tower and Heaton Hall. Established in 1911 as a dormitory, the building began housing offices and classrooms in 1976. EPSY's Counseling and Assessment Clinic as well as its Telehealth Counseling Clinic are located on the third story of the building.

Bryan/College Station Community Health Center is located just 2.3 miles from Texas A&M University's main campus in Bryan, Texas. As a federally qualified community health center, it provides a variety of services to low-income families including family practice, prenatal care, pediatrics, dentistry, health education, and genetic counseling. In October 2000, EPSY's Counseling and Assessment Clinic has maintained a suite of offices there since 2000 and functions as the psychological counseling and assessment components of this multi-specialty health center.
**Finances**

**State support.** The budget process at TAMU is based on general appropriations to the university from the State of Texas that are derived from a funding formula based on the number of students weighted by course type. This total dollar amount is then allocated to units, but not proportional to the generation.

The amount allocated to the College of Education and Human Development is then allocated to the departments and to College-level administration (assuming teaching is not done at the College level). For EPSY the State funding allocations include both teaching salaries and operational budget to support teaching. State funds are not allocated directly for research or service activities, which must be supported through faculty time and external funding sources. For EPSY, the operational component of the State budget has been essentially flat for the past seven years. Effectively, our annual allocation has shrunk significantly in purchasing power due to inflation, staff salary increases not fully covered by university allocations, and increases in faculty not supported by additional operational dollars.

**Differential tuition and distance education revenue.** In FY11 the Board of Regents approved the application of a special student fee for distance education program and classified it as differential tuition. Differential tuition differs from ordinary tuition in that departments receive a proportion of the revenue. The Provost’s Office retains 15% of all forms of differential tuition to help fund needs-based scholarships based on FAFSA provided requests proportional to the undergraduate or graduate level funds generated. The college retains 20% of the differential tuition funds generated from distance education fees, and 8% of all other forms of differential tuition. The remaining balance is returned to the department.

One of the benefits of differential tuition is the flexibility of ways these funds can be spent, affording the more opportunities to supplement the costs of delivering distance education (i.e., online) degree programs. For instance, departments can use differential tuition funds to pay additional instructors directly for teaching, which is not permissible under most other funding sources due to fees collected by the University.

The current reallocation model for distance education fees enables academic units to establish/grow graduate distance education degrees delivered entirely online. (Note Texas A&M does not offer distance education degree programs at the undergraduate level; the vast majority if distance education degree programs at our institution are at the master’s level.) Many departments including EPSY received permission to offer (and collect distance education fees for) a small number of online undergraduate courses for those who are resident students during the academic year but who could be classified as distance students during the summer months. This program was termed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Funding</th>
<th>Permanent Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>Change from Previous Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>$4,057,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>$4,239,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>$3,606,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$3,707,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$3,886,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$3,951,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$3,773,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$3,733,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>$3,671,879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Faculty total included the college’s former dean (tenured with EPSY) who was working with the Provost.
²Faculty total excluded one faculty member on leave without pay.
Accelerate to Graduate (A2G) and is currently approved as an ongoing summer initiative to permit students who not on campus during the summer to take online courses in order to graduate in a shorter length of time (ideally four years). The A2G program helps students compensate for potential delays in graduation due to scheduling conflicts, changes in major, remedial course preparation, and other unforeseen circumstance so they can graduate within a four-year time frame. However, it should be noted that in the vast majority of instances, distance education fees are not imposed for undergraduates or other students enrolled in face-to-face degree programs. Differential tuitions funds also provide the basis for stable summer course planning, online course development, and faculty and graduate assistant support that is otherwise not available. This is noteworthy given that EPSY’s distance education programs require FTE beyond the teaching load capacity of its full-time permanent faculty. EPSY has elected to strategically reinvests the funds recouped from distance education fees to help cover instructional costs and to support distance education program improvements.

**External funding.** The department’s external funding totals from all sources (i.e., federal, state, and private/nonprofit agencies) are summarized below. Dollar amounts in the New Awards column reflect the total dollar amount (across all years) of a new grant/project awarded during a given fiscal year. New award totals do not include unrecovered indirect cost share (IDC) or other forms of cost sharing. The Budget Expenditures column reflects the sum of all grant expenditures during the corresponding fiscal year (and does not include unrecovered IDC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year &amp; # Core Faculty</th>
<th>New Awards</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$6,513,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$3,356,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$14,700,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$2,189,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$5,107,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$4,026,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$17,095,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$7,397,434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External program accreditations*

- Professional education programs (BIED & SPED) are approved and fully accredited by the State Board of Educator Certification and the Texas Education Agency.

- The Counseling Psychology and School Psychology doctoral programs are each accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA).
May 31, 2018

Via Email with delivery/read receipt

This is official notification that Texas A&M University was assigned the following status under the Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs (ASEP) at the May 18, 2018 State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) meeting:

Accredited

This status was issued by the SBEC under authority of Texas Education Code Section 21.045 based on data from the 2016-2017 academic year. The status is effective from the date it was approved by the SBEC until the next annual accreditation ratings are approved by the SBEC based on 2017-2018 academic year data or other SBEC action.

Please share this information with appropriate members of your staff. If you have any questions regarding this notification, please contact your program specialist Lorrie Ayers at lorrie.ayers@tea.texas.gov or 512-936-2166.

Sincerely,

Tim Miller, Ed.D.
Director of Educator Preparation and Program Accountability
May 14, 2018

Michael Young
President
Texas A&M University
Office of the President
1246 TAMU
College Station, TX 77843

Dear President Young,

At its meeting on April 12-15, 2018 the Commission on Accreditation (CoA) conducted a review of the doctoral Ph.D. program in School psychology at Texas A&M University. This review included consideration of the program's most recent self-study report, the preliminary review (“admin review”), the program's response to preliminary review, the report of the team that visited the program on October 9-10, 2017, and the program's response to the site visit report.

I am pleased to inform you that the CoA voted to reaffirm accreditation of the program, with its next site visit scheduled to be held in 2027. This decision is based on the CoA’s professional judgement that the program has demonstrated that it adheres to the Standards of Accreditation in Health Service Psychology (SoA). The current record indicates that a full review of the program is warranted within 10 years of the last site visit, including interim reporting, to ensure continued adherence to the Standards. The program will be listed among accredited programs in health service psychology on the accreditation web pages. The Commission encourages you to share information about your program's accredited status with agencies and others of the public as appropriate.

Drs. Cindy Carlson, Carlen Henington, Emil Rodolfa, and Jason Williams recused and therefore did not participate in the discussion and vote on your program.

The Commission recognizes the quality of training provided by the program and deems it in adequate compliance with the Standards of Accreditation. The School Psychology program at Texas A&M University is well-supported by the institution. The program aims to “[prepare] psychologists capable of contributing to the academic, emotional, and social-behavioral well-being of children and adolescents through direct and indirect services” (self-study [SS], Standard II.A.1-2). Students are sufficient in number to permit meaningful peer interaction, support, and socialization both within and across years. The program engages in efforts to recruit and retain both students and faculty from diverse backgrounds. Faculty serve as excellent role models and are well-qualified to provide training that is consistent with the aim of the program. The program's communication practices with its students, interested publics, and the accrediting body are complete and transparent.
Accreditation is a process that encourages improvement through continuous self-study and review. The following items represent areas that require additional attention. Please note that you will also receive this feedback online via the CoA Portal.

**Standard II: Aims, Competencies, Curriculum, and Outcomes**

**II.B.1.b:**
The program’s Table 2 identifies the Practicum Evaluation Form (Appendix II.B.1.b.1.2) as one of the evaluation tools used to assess all of the profession-wide competencies, except for research. Review of the Practicum Evaluation Form reveals that students are assessed in five areas, which do not address all of the required profession-wide competencies that Table 2 indicates the form is used to measure. Furthermore, the Table 2 provided at the time of the self-study submission did not identify the elements associated with the competencies. The Commission has since revised the format of Table 2 to allow for more clarity in how the program assesses the profession-wide competencies and their associated elements consistent with Implementing Regulation (IR) C-8 D. By **September 1, 2018**, the program is asked to clarify how it assess student attainment of the profession-wide competencies, and their associated elements, during practicum. In doing so, the program is also asked to submit a revised Table 2.

**II.B.4.a-b:**
The program provided discussion in its self-study regarding how it assesses non-APPIC internship sites. However, it is unclear how the program evaluates the quality and adequacy of all unaccredited internships. Consistent with Standard II.B.4.b, when a student attends an unaccredited internship, it is the responsibility of the doctoral program to provide evidence demonstrating quality and adequacy of the internship experience. Therefore, by **September 1, 2018**, the program is asked to clarify how it is evaluating the unaccredited internships that its students attend. This information must include the information outlined in Standard II.B.4.b.i-vi of the SoA.

**II.D.1.a:**
The program presents proximal data in various documents that reflect the University Assessment Systems analysis. While this analysis may be useful for the program’s self-assessment, the presentation of the program’s proximal data do not allow the Commission to clearly assess that all students have reached the minimum level of achievement in all required competencies and discipline-specific knowledge areas. By **September 1, 2018**, the program is asked to provide revised proximal outcome data aggregated by cohort or year that are directly tied to the profession-wide competencies and discipline-specific knowledge areas and clearly demonstrate all students have met the minimum levels of achievement by graduation, consistent with IR C-18 D.
Standard IV: Faculty

IV.B.1-2:
Table 14a indicates under other non-program responsibilities for the Director of Training, Dr. Cynthia Riccio, that she has a “0% appointment with Texas A&M Institute of Neuroscience.” By September 1, 2018, the program is asked to clarify Dr. Riccio’s role with this other appointment and clarify how this may impact her FTE dedicated to the doctoral program under review.

Standard V: Communication Practices

V.A.1:
The program is reminded that consistent with IR C-26 D, the program must provide information in its public materials regarding trainee admissions, support, and outcome data. Please note that the program’s public information will be reviewed on or after October 1 of each year to ensure that the disclosure data has been updated and is in compliance with the IR.

The program’s response to the Reporting Requirements listed above should be submitted in the online CoA Portal. The program should navigate to the “Follow-Up” tab to respond by the designated due date.

All Implementing Regulations referenced in this letter are available on the accreditation website (www.apa.org/cd/accreditation). The website also provides important updates and policy changes related to the accreditation process. As an accredited program, we encourage you to periodically visit the website to remain current on all new accreditation policies. The Commission on Accreditation would also like to remind you that all accredited programs must inform the accrediting body in a timely manner of changes that could alter the program’s quality. A copy of Implementing Regulation C-27 D (Notification of Changes to Accredited Programs) is attached for your information. Such updates should be submitted via the CoA Portal under the “Substantive Change” tab.

In closing, on behalf of the Commission on Accreditation, I extend congratulations to the faculty and students of the program for their achievements. The Commission also expresses its appreciation for your personal commitment, and the corresponding support of your administration, to develop and maintain the best possible quality of graduate education and training in psychology. If the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation may be of service at any time on administrative matters of accreditation, please call upon us.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Remondet Wall, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation
May 10, 2016

Michael Young
President
Texas A&M University
The Office of the President
1246 TAMU
College Station, Texas 77843

Dear President Young,

At its meeting on April 7-10, 2016 the Commission on Accreditation conducted a review of the doctoral Ph.D. program in Counseling Psychology at Texas A&M University. This review included consideration of the program’s most recent self-study report, the preliminary review of December 4, 2014 and the program’s response to the preliminary review on March 10, 2015, the report of the team that visited the program on April 30 – May 1, 2015, and the program’s response to the site visit report on July 2, 2015, the defer for information letter on August 18, 2015, and the program’s response to deferral on January 28, 2016.

I am pleased to inform you that, on the basis of this review, the Commission on Accreditation (CoA) voted to award accreditation to this program. In so doing, the Commission scheduled the next accreditation site visit to be held in 2020. During the interim, the program will be listed annually among accredited programs of professional psychology in the American Psychologist and on the Accreditation web pages. The Commission also encourages you to share information about your program’s accredited status with agencies and others of the public as appropriate.

Drs. Randy Cox, Carlen Henington, Cindy Carlson, and Emil Rodolfa recused and therefore did not participate in the discussion and vote on your program.

The Commission would like to provide the program with a summary of its review. This is provided below according to each of the accreditation domains. At the end of the letter, the program will be provided with an itemized list of any actions that the program needs to take prior to the next accreditation review.

---

**Domain A: Eligibility**

*As a prerequisite for accreditation, the program's purpose must be within the scope of the accrediting body and must be pursued in an institutional setting appropriate for the doctoral education and training of professional psychologists.*

The program is housed in the College of Education and Human Development at Texas A&M University, which is regionally accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern
Association of Colleges and Schools. The program is located in the Department of Educational Psychology, which provides additional support through foundation courses for the program’s curriculum. The program is clearly supported by university administration and is represented well in institutional budgets and the program’s goals appear to be closely aligned with the institution, college, and department within which it is located. Program materials, curriculum and recruitment indicate respect for and understanding of cultural and individual diversity, particularly to serving the state of Texas and meeting broader societal concerns.

In the deferral letter the program was asked by CoA to provide a copy of the grievance polices relevant to faculty and staff. The faculty grievance policy was provided; however, the program only provided links to the University and College policies for staff grievances, and one of these links was not functional. By September 1, 2017, the program is asked to provide a copy of staff grievance policies.

**Domain B: Program Philosophy, Objectives and Curriculum Plan**

The program has a clearly specified philosophy of education and training, compatible with the mission of its sponsor institution and appropriate to the science and practice of psychology. The program's education and training model and its curriculum plan are consistent with this philosophy.

The program curriculum plan is sequential, cumulative, and graded in complexity. The training goals and objectives are consistently presented and are also closely aligned with the department, college, and university mission. The substantive area of counseling psychology is well-represented in the program goals and curriculum plan, with adequate integration of vocational psychology, developmental perspective, and diversity throughout.

The program ensures that all students demonstrate understanding in the biological, cognitive, affective, and developmental aspects of behavior, as well as individual differences, assessment and diagnosis, and effective interventions. In addition, research methodologies and techniques of data analysis are appropriately addressed. The program has responded effectively to the deferral letter in addressing adequacy of readings and content for graduate-level instruction for biological aspects of behavior, cognitive and affective aspects of behavior, ethics, and professional standards and ethics.

The program provided information within the deferral letter to show that EPSY 606: *Motivation and Emotion for Optimal Learning and Performance* covers the broad and general domains of cognitive and affective aspects of behavior. While the syllabus demonstrates the use of original source readings and some coverage of these areas, it was not entirely clear to the Commission that this course, by itself, provides students with sufficient broad and general training in these required areas. The program is reminded that beginning January 1, 2017 coverage in cognitive and affective aspects of behavior must be consistent with the SoA. In its next self-study, the CoA will be looking to determine how the program addressed coverage of cognition and affect with respect to its adherence to the SoA.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.
Domain C: Program Resources
The program demonstrates that it has resources of appropriate quality and sufficiency to achieve its education and training goals.

The program has a core faculty with sufficient credentials and experience to provide mentorship for students in both research and practice, and the core faculty is augmented by qualified associate and adjunct faculty members. The program recruits and admits well-qualified students who demonstrate a clear fit to program training goals, and the number of students provide ample opportunity for peer interactions and socialization. The program has adequate office space, technical support, training materials and physical facilities to support their educational objectives. In addition, students are able to access an array of student support services.

In response to the deferral letter from CoA, the program adequately addressed the sufficiency of clerical support available to the program and provided sufficient information about the steps and agreements used to form and maintain formal relationships with external practicum sites.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

Domain D: Cultural and Individual Differences and Diversity
The program recognizes the importance of cultural and individual differences and diversity in the training of psychologists.

Cultural and individual differences and diversity is clearly a strong aspect of the program’s philosophy, training, and activities. There is clear evidence of strong and sustained policies and actions for recruitment and retention of both students and faculty from diverse backgrounds. The integration of multiculturalism throughout the curriculum is readily apparent. The emphasis on diversity is also reflected in the surrounding department and college policies and goals.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

Domain E: Student-Faculty Relations
The program demonstrates that its education, training, and socialization experiences are characterized by mutual respect and courtesy between students and faculty and that it operates in a manner that facilitates students’ educational experiences.

Students and faculty both report positive relationships within the program. These appear to be supported by regular gatherings, strong advising relationships, and regular interaction through research and supervision as well as didactic training.

In its response to the CoA deferral letter, the program clarified that all students are notified and asked to acknowledge receipt of electronic annual evaluation feedback. In addition all students are encouraged to meet with their advisors and chairs to discuss the evaluation. However, it is not clear how the program ensures that all students are consistently provided with this opportunity for discussion and guidance, consistent with Domain E.4 (a-c). By September 1,
2017, the program is asked to describe how it ensures that all students have the opportunity to discuss with advisors/supervisors the extent to which they are meeting the program’s requirements.

The program was asked to address concerns regarding faculty accessibility. In its response to deferral, the program notes that faculty “make an attempt to be responsive in a timely manner” and that students are welcome to call and text faculty, as well as contact them via email (p. 5). However, the program did not address its expectations or strategies for assessing faculty availability or responsiveness. By September 1, 2017, the program is asked to discuss specific efforts made to assess the sufficiency of faculty availability in terms of their ability to provide sufficient guidance and supervision, and any specific changes made to improve faculty accessibility.

**Domain F: Program Self-Assessment and Quality Enhancement**

The program demonstrates a commitment to excellence through self-study, which assures that its goals and objectives are met, enhances the quality of professional education and training obtained by its students, and contributes to the fulfillment of its sponsor institution’s mission.

**Domain F.1(a): Outcome Data**

The program, with appropriate involvement from its students, engages in regular, ongoing self-studies that address its effectiveness in achieving program goals and objectives in terms of outcome data (i.e., while students are in the program and after completion).

The program has made some important gains in collecting and using distal data that are directly tied to program goals and philosophy.

The program was asked to provide proximal data that clearly demonstrate the program’s success in achieving its goals, objectives, and competencies. In response to the deferral the program provided a list of students who had not met competencies over the past 5 years (pp. 5-6). While the CoA appreciates the program’s efforts to respond to this issue, the program has not provided complete proximal data for all students that are clearly tied to the program’s goals, objectives, and competencies. The current presentation/aggregation of the data only represents outliers, and does not demonstrate success in meeting program aims. By September 1, 2016, the program is asked to provide current aggregated proximal data that demonstrate that all students for the past 7 years have met the programs expected goals, objectives, and competencies upon program completion. These data should be presented in a manner consistent with IR C-32 (attached).

The program also did not address how it uses the proximal and distal data it collects to assess its effectiveness in achieving its goals and objectives. In response to the deferral the program provided information about student evaluation procedures (p. 7); not the methods and procedures used to review the outcome data it collects in order to facilitate program improvement. By September 1, 2016, the program is asked to demonstrate how it uses data in a meaningful way to allow for program self-evaluation and enhancement, consistent with IR C-32.
The program is strongly encouraged to consult with the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation to ensure that it is collecting and using data in a way that supports its ability to evaluate and improve program efforts, in addition to evaluating individual student performance.

**Domain G: Public Disclosure**

*The program demonstrates its commitment to public disclosure by providing written materials and other communications that appropriately represent it to the relevant publics.*

The program’s materials are accurate and readily accessible on the webpage. The webpage is easy to navigate, and appropriate links are available for institutional policies and procedures. The program has updated their materials to more clearly explain the required admissions interview for program applicants.

The program’s website accurately presents student outcome data, consistent with Implementing Regulation C-20. Please note that the program’s public information will be reviewed on or after October 1 of each year to ensure that the disclosure data has been updated and is in compliance with the most recent version of IR C-20. The most current version of IR C-20 is attached for your information.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

**Domain H: Relationship with Accrediting Body**

*The program demonstrates its commitment to the accreditation process by fulfilling its responsibilities to the accrediting body from which its accredited status is granted.*

The program abides by policies and procedures and is in good standing with regard to accreditation fees.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

In order to keep the Commission informed of the program’s commitment to the ongoing self-study process, the program is asked to address the following issues in a narrative response by September 1, 2017:

- Provide a copy of staff grievance policies.

The program is asked to address the following issues in a narrative response by September 1, 2017 for formal review by the Commission:

- Describe how the program ensures that all students have the opportunity to discuss with advisors/supervisors the extent to which they are meeting the program’s requirements. Provide specific efforts made to assess the sufficiency of faculty availability and any changes made to improve faculty accessibility.
The program is asked to address the following issues in a narrative response by September 1, 2016 for formal review by the Commission:

- Provide current aggregated proximal data that demonstrate that all students for the last 7 years have met the program’s expected goals, objectives, and competencies at program completion.
- Demonstrate how the program uses data in a meaningful way to allow for program self-evaluation and enhancement.

While these items are considered an addendum to the data provided in the Annual Report Online (ARO), they are not to be submitted online. The program’s response to the items listed above should be identified as ‘Narrative Response – Program Review’ and mailed or faxed to the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation by the designated due date(s).

The accreditation website (www.apa.org/ed/accreditation) provides important updates and policy changes related to the accreditation process. As an accredited program, we encourage you to periodically visit the website to remain current on all new accreditation policies. The Commission on Accreditation would also like to remind you that all accredited programs must inform the accrediting body in a timely manner of changes that could alter the program’s quality. A copy of Implementing Regulation C-19 (Notification of Changes to Accredited Programs) is attached for your information.

Please note that at the time of your next self-study submission, your program will be reviewed under the new Standards of Accreditation (SoA). Additional information on the SoA and the 2017 implementation and transition to the new standards can be found on the accreditation website at http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/accreditation-roadmap.aspx. Please contact the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation with any questions related to the SoA.

In closing, on behalf of the Commission on Accreditation, I extend congratulations to the faculty and students of the professional psychology program for their achievements. The Commission also expresses its appreciation for your personal commitment, and the corresponding support of your administration, to develop and maintain the best possible quality of graduate education and training in psychology. If the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation may be of service at any time on administrative matters of accreditation, please call upon us.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Remondet Wall, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation
**Progress Since 2011 APR**

**Date of Last APR**
November 6-8, 2011

**Analysis**

The department's undergraduate programs prepare students to work with children and youth in a variety of community and school contexts. The Special Education and Bilingual Education teacher certification programs were established in response to the state's need for more teachers in those areas the A&M Regents' subsequent intent to increase the number of TAMU graduates in those areas. Our mission to produce high quality teachers was embedded in the program proposals submitted to the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, President, and Board of Regents.

There are external indicators of evidence for each of the department's teacher education programs. In 2016 Texas Education Agency contracted an independent study of the Bilingual Education Program due to dramatic increases in state certification pass rates among program graduates; their goal was to identify replicable program features that could be implemented in other bilingual education teacher preparation programs throughout the state. Similarly, the Special Education teacher preparation program was subject to rigorous external review in 2017 and selected as one of ten exemplary teacher preparation programs by the *Raise Your Hand Texas Foundation*. The 10-year, $100 million dollar project aims to (a) support university-based teacher preparation programs that address the needs of 21st century learners, (b) elevate the status of teaching as a profession, and (c) inspire top students to pursue teaching. *Raise Your Hand Texas* provides grant funding to the program to support up to ten new special education majors per year with 4-year (full tuition) scholarships to pursue degrees in Special Education.

At the graduate level, the department's master's degree programs provide professionals with advanced skills for employment in a variety of educational, clinical, and business contexts. To date, our prioritization of high-quality distance education instruction has yielded formal recognition of three EPSY faculty as Exemplary Distance Educators by the national Quality Matters organization (Byrns & Montague in 2017, Lynch in 2016); we also have a growing number of master's level online courses recently certified (within past 36 months) as meeting Quality Matters standards. The department's Ph.D. programs offer preparation for successful careers in higher education, which aligns with university- and the college-level strategic goals. The number of EPSY Ph.D. graduates receiving jobs in academia continues to rise, with the greatest increases observed among graduates in the Special Education and Bilingual Education specializations. The departments Counseling Psychology and School Psychology Ph.D. programs also prepare graduates for clinical careers as licensed psychologists. Each of those programs are accredited and in good standing with the American Psychological Association.

An earlier section of this study-study contained summaries of the strategic plans for Texas A&M University, the College of Education and Human Development, and The EPSY Department. The department has purposefully aligned its strategic goals with Texas A&M University's Vision 2020 imperatives and corresponding strategic plan. The college's strategic plan also provides a mechanism for easily linking departmental efforts to the bigger picture. As such, EPSY's strategic planning process included an examination of how proposed activities are congruent with the direction of the college and of the university. EPSY's current strategic priorities align with the first, second, third, sixth, and twelfth imperatives of the university's Vision 2020. The department's strategic priorities also correspond with the college's strategic efforts related to undergraduate education (college goals 1 & 2), graduate education (college goals 4 – 6), research (college goals 7 & 8), and engagement (college goal 10).
Improvements since Previous APR

**Leadership.** Modifications to the department's leadership structure reflect a substantive change since the department's 2011 APR. In fall of 2017, EPSY added two part-time associate department heads to its leadership team: one for Research and Faculty Development (25% FTE during academic year) and another for Academic Affairs (30% FTE during academic year). These positions also include one month of summer salary distributed across the summer months.

Essential functions for the Associate DH for Research and Faculty Development include chairing the EPSY Awards Committee and working with the DH to strategically plan a sequence of award nominations for a given faculty member. While the DH has maintained the same level of involvement in terms of time, this position has added considerable leadership to focus on awards for faculty and staff. These strategic changes paid off and faculty in the department are garnering well-deserved recognition via highly prestigious awards including:

(a) 2 University Presidential Impact Fellowship Awards in 2017 (Liew) and 2018 (Blake)
(b) 1 University Distinguished Professor Award in 2017 (Elliott)
(c) 3 University-Level Distinguished Achievement Awards for 2017: 
   - Research (Elliott) & Teaching (Byrns & Riccio)
(d) 4 college-level awards in 2018: Outstanding New Faculty Award (Castro-Olivo), Early Career Research Award (Woltering), Senior Scholar Research Award (Liew), and Outstanding Mentorship Award (Kwok)

These highly competitive internal awards were targeted to better situate faculty for external recognition. The Associate DH for Research and Faculty Development also plays an integral role in leading the annual faculty peer-evaluation process and mentoring pre-tenured faculty.

EPSY's Associate DH for Academic Affairs position interfaces closely with the department's graduate and undergraduate advising offices and functions to (a) increase professional development opportunities that improve teaching (including distance education) and (b) implement meaningful evaluation procedures of faculty teaching. The Associate DH for Academic Affairs also leads efforts to utilize summative course evaluation data to inform program improvements and faculty evaluations, oversees department-wide course scheduling, and works closely with degree faculty who serve as program coordinators in conjunction with advisors to expand student communications (including social media).

**Distance Education.** Another area of change since the 2011 APR is the department's increased attention to distance education programming and corresponding allocation resources to support online course offerings and professional development opportunities for faculty in this area. Thus far, three EPSY faculty have earned formal recognition as Exemplary Distance Educators by the national Quality Matters organization and a growing number of the department's online courses are certified as meeting Quality Matters standards. In the past year, we have established a department-level council of distance educators that has led EPSY's efforts to:

(a) Institute a blind peer-review process for our distance education courses to determine whether they meet university standards for equivalency to face-to-face courses and student contact hours.
(b) Establish a standard set of student course evaluation items specifically for distance education courses.
(c) Interface with the department's graduate advising office to offer synchronous online orientation sessions for students admitted to distance education degree programs.
(d) Conceptualize a new professional track faculty position whose primary responsibilities will include instructional support for developing and delivering online courses.
ACADEMIC

PROGRAMS & CURRICULA

DEGREES
ADMISSIONS
OPPORTUNITIES
OUTCOMES
**Programs Offered**

EPSY offers 9 approved degrees (3 PhD, 4 master's level, & 2 undergraduate) and 3 graduate certificates. Some of the department's degrees are comprised of distinct concentration areas (undergraduate) or specializations (graduate).

### 2018-19 Department of Educational Psychology Academic Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES &amp; CONCENTRATIONS</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bilingual Education EC-6 (teacher certification program)</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Special Education EC-12 (teacher certification program)</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.S. in University Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Child Professional Studies (non-certification program)</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor in Creative Studies</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASTER'S DEGREES &amp; SPECIALIZATIONS</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.Ed./M.S. in Bilingual Education</strong> <em>Online</em>*</td>
<td>Part or Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.Ed./M.S. in Educational Psychology</strong> <em>Online</em>* 4 specialization options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creativity &amp; Cognition (M.Ed.) *Online</td>
<td>Part or Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developmental Sciences (M.Ed./M.S.)</td>
<td>Part or Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Research, Measurement, &amp; Statistics (M.Ed./M.S.)</td>
<td>Part or Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School Counseling (M.Ed.) *Online</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.Ed. in Educational Technology</strong> <em>Online</em>*</td>
<td>Part or Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.Ed./M.S. in Special Education</strong> <em>Online</em>*</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCTORAL DEGREES &amp; SPECIALIZATIONS</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology</strong></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ph.D. in Educational Psychology</strong> 5 specialization options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bilingual Education</td>
<td>Part or Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developmental Sciences</td>
<td>Part or Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learning Design &amp; Technology</td>
<td>Part or Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Research, Measurement, &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>Part or Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Special Education</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ph.D. in School Psychology</strong></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRADUATE CERTIFICATES

| Applied Behavior Analysis *Online                                   | --          |
| Education & Social Sciences Advanced Research Methods              | --          |
| Latino Mental Health                                                | --          |
| Prevention Sciences                                                 | --          |
Program Curricula

Undergraduate Degrees & Concentrations

B.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies: Bilingual Education EC-6 (teacher certification program)

The bilingual undergraduate education program is committed to serving culturally and linguistically diverse students across Texas, the United States, and around the world. The mission of the Hispanic Bilingual Education Undergraduate Program is to prepare students to be highly qualified teachers. Field-experiences, coursework and other academic requirements further prepare students to become educators capable of meeting the educational needs of the increasing culturally and linguistically diverse student populations and their families. The program offers a variety of courses in language and literacy acquisition (L1 and L2), culture, pedagogy, assessment, foundations of bilingualism, latest technology, and more.

B.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies: Special Education EC-12 (teacher certification program)

The mission of the Special Education EC-12 Teacher Certification Program is to prepare the highest quality professional educators to meet the diverse educational needs of students with disabilities in grades EC (Early Childhood) through grade 12. This program prepares professional educators to be state and national leaders in the field of special education through becoming critical consumers of research and implementing best practices throughout their careers.

B.S. in University Studies: Child Professional Services

The Child Professional Services concentration prepares individuals to work with children in various organizations, which support youth development. The degree plan is a flexible 120-hour program that enables a student to combine a prescribed concentration, two minors, the core curriculum and electives to create a comprehensive degree that aligns with their individual professional interest. The program prepares graduates for careers in civic, social or religious organizations; hospitals or non-profit organizations; or family and community services.
Master's Degrees & Specializations

M.Ed./M.S. in Bilingual Education  *Online
The online master's degree in Bilingual Education is committed to serving culturally and linguistically diverse students across Texas, the United States, and around the world. The program equips students with the necessary knowledge and research to increase success in bilingual education or related fields. Coursework is designed to deepen knowledge and strengthen credentials in the area of bilingualism, bi-literacy and cross-cultural awareness by focusing on teaching and learning skills for those working as teachers, researchers or curriculum developers, at the early childhood, elementary, secondary, and/or post-secondary levels. The program is appropriate for teachers who seek certification in bilingual education as well as current bilingual education teachers working to advance their level of expertise.

M.Ed./M.S. in Educational Psychology: Creativity & Cognition specialization  *Online
The online master's specialization in Creativity & Cognition expands students' understanding of creative thinking and learning and encourages the personal creativity of professionals while equipping them with knowledge and skills to foster creativity and effective learning in others. The program of study also promotes an awareness of ways creative thinking can provide a competitive advantage in problem-solving and promotes a deeper understanding of learning and instruction.

M.Ed./M.S. in Educational Psychology: Developmental Sciences specialization
The master's specialization program in Developmental Sciences is based on the premise that psychological theory and empirical research can inform and improve education by increasing our understanding of how people learn, develop, think, and solve problems; and how instruction and technology influence these processes. Development and application of measurement and statistical methods to facilitate empirical research on these issues are thus crucial. Central to our mission is promoting human learning and development. To do so, we develop theory, study new approaches made possible by emerging technologies, and use quantitative and qualitative methods to conduct research, all with the goal of developing innovative real-world applications.

M.Ed./M.S. in Educational Psychology: Research, Measurement, & Statistics specialization
The master's specialization program in Research, Measurement and Statistics (RMS) focuses on a broad range of quantitative and methodological techniques including multivariate statistics, item response theory, hierarchical linear modeling, structural equation modeling, time series analysis, growth modeling, and Monte Carlo study.

M.Ed in Educational Psychology: School Counseling specialization  *Online
The online master's specialization program in School Counseling prepares teachers to become highly qualified school counselors. The program of study is based on the premise that well-trained school counselors play an integral role in the academic and personal development of K-12 students. Advanced school counseling students undertake an intensive and supervised two-semester internship experience in a public or private school setting. Students complete 400 onsite hours of counseling activities and receive weekly supervision. The student handbook provides more information, including Texas Education Agency internship placement requirements.
M.Ed. in Educational Technology  *Online

The online master’s degree in Educational Technology prepares educators to design, develop, implement, and evaluate technology-based educational materials and methods, as well as to conduct research on the effectiveness of specific design features of educational materials and methods. Our courses emphasize students’ development of a) skills necessary for developing instructional and research resources utilizing current and emerging technologies, b) abilities to apply instructional design models to the development of effective instruction, and c) an understanding of how people learn in these interactive environments. Courses typically employ a project-based approach in which students design media-rich resources that are evaluated through feedback from both peers and faculty. Graduates of the master’s degree program are employed in a wide variety of settings, frequently serving as instructional designers in corporations or as technology leaders in K-12 school districts and higher education institutions.

M.Ed./M.S. in Special Education  *Online

The online master’s degree in Special Education is intended for individuals with a solid background in education, behavior, disability, or related fields. A teaching certificate is not required, but teaching or clinical experience working with individuals with disabilities is highly desirable. Interested individuals should have a commitment to work in the field or pursue additional graduate training after receiving a degree. Additionally, the program works best for professionals who are self-motivated and can manage the rigor of a 36-credit hour, two-year fully online master’s program. Successful graduates of the program have been general educators, special educators, behavior coaches, administrators, counselors, and therapists.
Doctoral Degrees & Specializations

Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology

The Counseling Psychology program at Texas A&M University (TAMU) offers doctoral education and training in psychology, with the expressed intention of preparing students for the practice of professional psychology. It endorses and subscribes to the scientist-practitioner model for the training of professional psychologists. The primary mission of the program is the development of psychologists who recognize the importance of and are equipped to engage in scholarly inquiry and the application of various methods to the resolution of problems encountered at the individual level, in institutions/clinics, and at the societal/community level. The program endeavors to train psychologists capable of contributing to the health care of diverse populations, from perspectives of prevention and intervention. The training program attempts to equip students to work in a variety of private and institutional settings, including public/private schools and universities, the military, hospitals, and various government agencies. The program emphasizes and promotes diversity issues related to the practice of psychology, as well as addressing achievement and mental health disparities among minority populations. Rigorous academic standards are maintained, and teaching, supervision, and research experiences are made available so students may successfully compete for academic positions at colleges and universities throughout the country as well as university counseling centers, VA hospitals, mental health facilities, and the military.

Ph.D. in Educational Psychology: Bilingual Education specialization

The Bilingual Education specialization program prepares graduates for university and educational leadership positions including consultation and evaluation, teacher training and supervision, and program coordination. A combination of coursework, field-based experiences, program competencies, and dissertation research ensure both breadth and depth of training. Program faculty have expertise in bilingual assessment, curriculum development, research methodology, program evaluation, distance teaching formats, and instructional design.

Ph.D. in Educational Psychology: Developmental Sciences specialization

The doctoral specialization program in Developmental Sciences is based on the premise that psychological theory and empirical research can inform and improve education by increasing understanding of how people learn, develop, think, and solve problems. Development and application of measurement and statistical methods to facilitate empirical research are essential features of the program. The program utilizes an Apprentice Scholar model, in which students develop a rich understanding of what is known and are encouraged to explore and discover what has yet to be learned. Graduates acquire the necessary knowledge, skills, and experiences to become university faculty, researchers, or leading professionals in schools, business, and industry.

Ph.D. in Educational Psychology: Learning Design & Technology specialization

The doctoral specialization program in Learning Design & Technology provides students with a rich understanding of how technology can address existing educational goals in innovative ways. Students also develop a strong skill set in research methods appropriate to the field. Research opportunities focus on the use of emerging technologies in the design of innovative educational materials. Faculty mentors help students develop a program of study that aligns with their research interests and provide opportunities to assist in faculty-led research projects. The program is highly valued by employers, and program graduates' skills are in great demand. Graduates find employment as faculty in higher education, administrators in K-12 school districts, or
As professionals in industry who share their expertise in instructional design, training, and evaluation efforts.

Ph.D. in Educational Psychology: Research, Measurement, & Statistics specialization
The doctoral specialization program in Research, Measurement and Statistics (RMS) focuses on a broad range of quantitative and methodological approaches including multivariate statistics, item response theory, generalizability theory, hierarchical linear modeling, structural equation modeling, time series analysis, growth modeling, and Monte Carlo study. The RMS program is committed to preparing the next generation of research methodologists and program graduates are in high demand for higher education academic positions and school- and industry-based jobs in measurement and evaluation.

Ph.D. in Educational Psychology: Special Education specialization
The Special Education (SPED) doctoral program is a full-time course of study that prepares students for academic positions in universities and research institutions. The program offers challenging coursework grounded in the field’s most current evidence and the latest advancements in research methodologies. Doctoral students receive valuable research and teaching competencies that provide a competitive advantage upon graduation. The program consists of extensive coursework in cutting-edge research design and statistical methodologies, providing a strong background in educational research. Students take specialized coursework and engage in an apprentice model to achieve additional core competence in grant writing, research and college teaching.

The faculty have a longstanding history of federally funded research projects, providing opportunities for doctoral students gain valuable grant management and collaborative research experience. Students receive mentorship to conduct their own original research and disseminate their work by presenting at national conferences and publishing in high-quality journals.

Ph.D. in School Psychology
The School Psychology doctoral program provides students with thorough and comprehensive knowledge of the profession, advanced research skills, and extensive training in the competencies required for practice. The final basis for granting the degree is a candidate’s grasp of the subject matter of a broad field of study, a demonstrated ability to do independent research, and demonstrated competencies for practice as a health service professional. In addition, the candidate must have acquired the ability to express thoughts clearly and forcefully in both oral and written languages.
GRADUATE CERTIFICATES

Applied Behavior Analysis *Online

The Department of Educational Psychology offers an Applied Behavior Analysis Certificate designed for school-based professionals, direct service providers, job coaches, or family members seeking skills to support individuals with challenging behaviors, autism spectrum disorders, developmental disabilities, or other unique needs that require behavioral interventions.

Education & Social Sciences Advanced Research Methods

The Graduate Certificate in Education and Social Sciences Advanced Research Methods allows students in the College of Education and Human Development to add to their degree's minimum requirements for training in research methodology. The certificate testifies to a student's successful mastery of advanced competencies in education and social sciences research methods, with emphasis on quantitative or qualitative approaches. The Certificate requires 12 hours of advanced research methods courses and evidence of the student's submission of a manuscript for publication as the main author, or as a co-author.

Latino Mental Health

The Graduate Certificate in Latino Mental Health offers graduate students in doctoral professional psychology programs an opportunity to receive in-depth training in Latino mental health. Using a scientist-practitioner approach, the program requires students to complete practice and research oriented courses.

Prevention Sciences

The purpose of the Prevention Sciences Certificate is to provide students from a variety of majors an interdisciplinary perspective on the science and practice related to the prevention of mental, emotional, and physical health problems and the promotion of well-being in these same domains.
DEGREE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

*Brief descriptions for courses referenced in degree plans are located in Appendix E.
## Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Studies (INST)
### Bilingual Education Degree Plan (PK-6)  Catalog 141

**Name ______________________________**  
**UIN ______________________________**

### Basic Requirements (19 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLS 206</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 207</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 202, 301</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 320, 321</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVE ARTS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 303, EPSY 435</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFB 482</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Required to Complete Bilingual Education Emphasis (12 hours)

*BEFB 470 3  
*BEFB 472 3  
*BEFB 474 3  
*BEFB 476 3

### Courses Required to Complete Spanish Emphasis (15 hours)

**SPAN 311 or 312 3  
**SPAN 302 3  
**SPAN 303 (W) 3  
**SPAN 320 3  
**SPAN 331, 332, 341, 342, 350, 410, 411, 413, 421, 445, 450 3

### Professional Studies (24 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 273</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 364</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*TEFB 410</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*TEFB 412</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*TEFB 413</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*RDNG 467</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***BEFB 425</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***BEFB 426</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Students must be admitted into professional phase of program before enrollment in upper level coursework.

** Prerequisites: SPAN 101, 102, 201 and 202  
*** Student Teaching semester  
(a) Must make a grade of B or higher  
(W) Writing Intensive Course

### Interdisciplinary Studies (42 hours)

#### COMMUNICATION / ENGLISH (6 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 103, 104</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 210</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### READING (9 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 351</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 461 (W)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 361</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MATH (12 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 140, 141, 166</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 131, 142</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 365</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 366</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### LIFE AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES (9 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 101, BIOL 107, BIOL 111, BIOL 113</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 101, CHEM 106/116, GEOG 203/213, PHYS 201, PHYS 202, GEOL 101</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 120</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AMERICAN HISTORY (6 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIST 105, 106</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 226</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Undergirding Disciplines (12 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST 210 (a)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPFB 210</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 371</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 353</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses that must be taken concurrently:  
- TEFB 410, TEFB 412, TEFB 413 & RDNG 467 (Methods)  
- RDNG 351 & 361  
- BEFB 472 & 474 and BEFB 470 & 476

**Note:**  
- No grade of D will be accepted in any coursework.  
- Students must maintain a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.75.  
- Degree plans are subject to change in order to meet state requirements.  
- Students are responsible for adhering to course and degree plan requirements.

**Total Hours Required for Graduation: 124**

Foreign Language Requirement ___________  
(2 semesters or 2 years in high school)

http://epsy.tamu.edu/
Name _______________________________ UIN _______________________________

### Basic Requirements (18 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLS 206</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 207</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 320, 321</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVE ARTS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE, PHILOSOPHY &amp; CULTURE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH/KINE 214</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Required to Complete Special Education Emphasis (34 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPED 302 (a) (B or higher)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SPED 310 (W)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SPED 311</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SPED 312</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SEFB 420 (W)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SPED 314</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SPED 442</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SPED 471</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*TEFB 413</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EDCI 365</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SPED 414</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Studies (18 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 273</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPFB 210</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPFB 301</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPFB 401</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**SEFB 425</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Must make a grade of B or higher
(W) Writing Intensive Course

* Students must be admitted into professional phase of program before enrollment in upper level coursework.

** Student Teaching semester

Foreign Language Requirement ____________________________
(2 semesters or 2 years in high school)

### Interdisciplinary Studies (39 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS (9 hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 103, 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 203, 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATH (12 hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 140, 141, 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 131, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIFE &amp; PHYSICAL SCIENCES (9 hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 101, BIOL 107, BIOL 111, BIOL 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 106/116, GEOL 203/213, GEOL 101, GEOL 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL STUDIES (9 hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIST 105, 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 301, 305, 335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Undergirding Disciplines (15 hours)

| INST 210 (a) (B or higher) | 3       |
| INST 301                   | 3       |
| INST 222                   | 3       |
| INST 362                   | 3       |
| INST 363                   | 3       |

Note:
- No grade of D will be accepted in any coursework.
- Students must maintain a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.75.
- Degree plans are subject to change in order to meet state requirements.
- Students are responsible for adhering to course and degree plan requirements.

Certifies to teach:
- Special Education PK-12
- General Education PK-6
- ESL

Total Hours Required for Graduation: 124

Student _______________________________ Date __________
Advisor ______________________________ Date __________

http://epsy.tamu.edu/
Texas A&M University  
College of Education / Department of Educational Psychology  
Bachelor of Science in University Studies (USEH) – Non Certification  
Catalog 141

COLLEGE:  Education and Human Development  
AREA OF CONCENTRATION:  Child Professional Services

MINOR #1:  Human Resource Development or Creative Studies  
MINOR #2:  Sociology

### CORE CURRICULUM (42 HRS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 103, 104</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 203, 210 or COMM 203</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 140, 141, 166</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 131, 142 or PHIL 240</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFE AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFE AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 120</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE, PHILOSOPHY, AND CULTURE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVE ARTS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 222</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 105</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 106, 226</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 206</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 207</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AREA OF CONCENTRATION (24 HRS)

12 hours of 300-400 level coursework required in area of  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPFB 210</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 214</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 273</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 320</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 321</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 210</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 301</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 435</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Degree plans are subject to change as mandated by the state.  
- Students are responsible for adhering to prerequisites and co-enrollments.  
- Only one minor can be selected from the same college as the area of concentration.  
- 36 hours of 300-400 level coursework is required in the degree

### HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (HRDV) MINOR (18 HRS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHRD 203</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHRD 210</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHRD 371 (W)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHRD 372</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHRD 374</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHRD 315, 405, 408 or 413</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CREATIVE STUDIES (CRST) MINOR (15 HRS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 430 (fall)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 431 (summer)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 432 (fall)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 433 (spring)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 489</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOCIOLOGY (SOCI) MINOR (15 HRS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCI ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI ELECTIVE (W)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ELECTIVES (21-24 HRS)

** 21 hours required if HRDV minor is selected  
** 24 hours required if CRST minor is selected (one elective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE ** (W)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Hours Required for Graduation: 120  
Minimum gpa to maintain is 2.0

http://epsy.tamu.edu

__________________________  ________________________
Student Signature          Date

__________________________  ________________________
Advisor Signature          Date

Foreign Language Requirement  
2 years of the same foreign language in high school or  
2 semesters of the same foreign language in college are

W/C Requirement (W) (C) Requirement  
Two writing courses or  
One writing course and one communication course
Counseling Psychology Ph.D.
Program Requirements

Discipline-Specific Knowledge: ADVANCED INTEGRATIVE KNOWLEDGE IN SCIENTIFIC PSYCHOLOGY

Competency: Understanding and demonstrating advanced integrative knowledge of multiple basic discipline-specific content areas (listed in Category 2)

Required academic/ training activities
Course work in CPSY 626, EPSY 627, SPSY 612, advanced field practicum placements and the CPSY 683 Assessment Practicum, research and dissertation credits, internship.

When assessed End of semester course grades; annual reviews by program faculty, portfolio submitted for comprehensive examination; practicum evaluations, internship evaluations; dissertation defense.

Discipline-Specific Knowledge: RESEARCH METHODS, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, & PSYCHOMETRICS

Competency: Understanding and demonstrating advanced integrative knowledge of research methods, statistical analyses, and psychometrics

Required academic/ training activities: Course work as described in ESPY 640, EPSY 641, EPSY 625, and advanced statistics and/or research design course; CPSY 683; CPSY 685, CPSY 690, CPSY 690, CPSY 691

When assessed End of semester course grades; annual reviews by program faculty, portfolio submitted for comprehensive examination; practicum evaluations, internship evaluations; dissertation defense.

PROFESSION-WIDE COMPETENCIES

Competency: Understanding and demonstrating advanced integrative and independent ability to conduct research and scholarly activity, and critically evaluate and disseminate research and other scholarly activity that contributes to the knowledge base.

Required academic/ training activities: Research team involvement, research, direct study and dissertation credits; writing assignments in classes

When assessed End of semester grades; annual review conducted by faculty; portfolio assessment of artifacts and activities; dissertation

Competency: Understanding and demonstrating knowledge of professional ethical and legal standards, recognize ethical dilemmas that may occur and apply ethical decision-making processes to resolve these, and conduct self in an ethical manner in all professional activities.

Required academic/ training activities: Course work in CPSY 662, CPSY 664, CPSY 683, CPSY 684; CPSY 685, CPSY 690, CPSY 691, SPSY 612, EPSY 627

When assessed Course grades; annual reviews by program faculty, portfolio submitted for comprehensive examination; practicum evaluations, internship evaluations

Competency: Understanding and demonstrating knowledge of individual and cultural diversity, relevant theories and the empirical knowledge base, ability to work effectively with others from diverse background and identities, and be able to integrate awareness of their own personal attitudes may affect how they understand and interact with others.
Required academic/training activities: Course work in CPSY 672, CPSY 626, CPSY 632, CPSY 633, CPSY 679, EPSY 627, SPSY 612, CPSY 639, CPSY 664, CPSY 683, CPSY 684, CPSY 685, CPSY 691
When assessed Course grades; annual reviews by program faculty, portfolio submitted for comprehensive examination; practicum evaluations, internship evaluations

Competency: Understanding and demonstrating professional values and attitudes (including integrity, deportment, professional identity, lifelong learning, self-reflection, responsiveness to feedback, and overall professional effectiveness).
Required academic/training activities
Course work in CPSY 672, CPSY 626, CPSY 632, CPSY 633, CPSY 679, EPSY 627, SPSY 612, CPSY 639, CPSY 664, CPSY 683, CPSY 684, CPSY 685, CPSY 691; membership in professional association, attendance at a professional conference
When assessed Course grades; annual reviews by program faculty, portfolio submitted for comprehensive examination; practicum evaluations, internship evaluations

Competency: Understanding and demonstrating professional communication and interpersonal skills (including maintenance of effective relationships, ability to produce and comprehend verbal, nonverbal, and written communication for various audiences) across academic, social and professional arenas

Required academic/training activities: Course work in CPSY 631, CPSY 672, CPSY 633, CPSY 666, CPSY 683, CPSY 689, CPSY 691
When assessed Course grades; annual reviews by program faculty, portfolio submitted for comprehensive exam; practicum evaluations, internship evaluations; dissertation defense.

Competency: Understanding and demonstrating knowledge of diagnostic classification systems, client strengths and psychopathology, and psychological assessment practices grounded in the best available empirical literature, within appropriate contexts.

Required academic/training activities: Course work in CPSY 626, CPSY 632, CPSY 679, EPSY 625, EPSY 627, CPSY 683, CPSY 684
When assessed Course grades; annual reviews by program faculty, portfolio submitted for comprehensive examination; practicum evaluations, internship evaluations

Competency: Understanding and demonstrating knowledge of and competency with psychological interventions and associated literature base, utilizing evidence-based approaches effectively, and modifying these approaches consistent with ongoing evaluation and as indicated.

Required academic/training activities: Course work in CPSY 631, CPSY 633, CPSY 639, CPSY 664, CPSY 666, CPSY 683, CPSY 684, CPSY 689
When assessed Course grades; annual reviews by program faculty, portfolio submitted for comprehensive examination; practicum evaluations, internship evaluations

Competency: Understanding and demonstrating knowledge of supervision models and practices.

Required academic/training activities: Course work in CPSY 666, CPSY 683
When assessed End of the semester course grades and practice evaluations; annual reviews

Competency: Understanding and demonstrating knowledge of and competency with consultation models and practices, knowledge and respect for the roles and perspectives of other professions.

Required academic/training activities: Course work in CPSY 689, CPSY 683, CPSY 691
When assessed End of the semester course grades and practice evaluations; annual reviews
### Bilingual Education Core – 27 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIED 610</td>
<td>Bilingual Assessment &amp; Monitoring Students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 611</td>
<td>Dual Language Program Methodologies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 612</td>
<td>Content Area Instruction for Bilingual Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 613</td>
<td>Spanish/English Biliteracy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 614</td>
<td>Bilingual Education Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 616</td>
<td>Spanish for Bilingual and Dual Language Classrooms</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 619</td>
<td>Second Language Acquisition in Pre-K-12; Advanced Theory &amp; Practice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 620</td>
<td>Current Issues in Bilingual Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 632</td>
<td>Research in Second Language Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research and Evaluation – minimum 15 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIED 615</td>
<td>Teacher Action Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 617</td>
<td>Evaluation of K12 Programs w Bilingual &amp; Language Minority Students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 640</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis in Educational Research I (Prerequisite: EPSY 636)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 641</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis in Educational Research II (Prerequisite: EPSY 640)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>[Select additional research course in consultation with faculty advisor]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>[Select additional research course in consultation with faculty advisor]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Practica and Directed Studies - 12 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIED 683</td>
<td>Field Practicum Bilingual Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 683</td>
<td>Field Practicum in Grant Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 683</td>
<td>Field Practicum in College Teaching/Supervision</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 685</td>
<td>Directed Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Electives – 9 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>[Select elective courses in consultation with committee &amp; chair]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>[Select elective courses in consultation with committee &amp; chair]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>[Select elective courses in consultation with committee &amp; chair]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>[Select additional research course in consultation with faculty advisor]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dissertation – minimum 12 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>[Select elective courses in consultation with committee &amp; chair]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>[Select elective courses in consultation with committee &amp; chair]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational Psychology Ph.D.
Developmental Sciences
Specialization Program Requirements

FOUNDATION COURSES (9-12 credit hours)
EPSY 602  Educational Psychology (3 credit hrs.)
EPSY 673  Learning Theories (3 credit hrs.)

At least one of the following:
EPSY 646  Issues in Child and Adolescent Development (3 credit hrs.)
EPSY 647  Life Span Development (3 credit hrs.)

SPECIALIZED COURSES (12-18 credit hours)

At least two of the following learning sciences courses:
EPSY 606  Motivation and Learning (3 credit hrs.)
EPSY 634  Educational Neuroscience (3 credit hrs.)
EPSY 648  Intelligence and Creativity (3 credit hrs.)

At least two of the following developmental sciences courses:
EPSY 671  Interpersonal Relationships (3 credit hrs.)
EPSY 689  Social and emotional development and interventions (3 credit hrs.)
EPSY 689  Temperament, Behavior Problems, and Psychopathology (3 credit hrs.)

RESEARCH COURSES (minimum 21 credit hours)
EPSY 622  Measurement and Evaluation in Education (3 credit hrs.)
EPSY 635  Educational Statistics (3 credit hrs.)
EPSY 636  Techniques of Research (3 credit hrs.)
EPSY 625  Advanced Psychometric Theory (3 credit hrs.)
EPSY 640  Experimental Design in Education I (3 credit hrs.)
EPSY 641  Experimental Design in Education II (3 credit hrs.)
EPSY 633  Qualitative Research Design and Data Collection (3 credit hrs.)

DISSERTATION RESEARCH (minimum 12 credit hours)
EPSY 691  Dissertation Research Hours (variable credits)

ADDITIONAL ELECTIVE COURSEWORK (1 or more credit hours)
Courses both within and outside of EPSY (including additional courses in educational psychology or research may count toward elective coursework. Students should consult with their advisor or program committee to identify appropriate electives.

- The Developmental Sciences Specialization requires a minimum of 64 credits beyond a master’s degree to earn a Ph.D. (The minimum is 96 credits for those without a Master’s degree.)
- Core course requirements may be waived for students who have successfully comparable graduate coursework and/or demonstrate requisite knowledge and skills.
## Educational Psychology Ph.D.
### Learning Design and Technology
#### Specialization Program Requirements

### FOUNDATION COURSES (15 credit hours)
- EPSY 602 Educational Psychology (3 credit hrs.)
- EPSY 673 Learning Theories (3 credit hrs.)
- EDTC 602 Educational Technology: Field, Theory, Profession (3 credit hrs.)
- EDTC 654 Instructional Design: Techniques in Educational Technology (3 credit hrs.)
- EDTC 689 Review of Research in Educational Technology (3 credit hrs.)

### SPECIALIZATION COURSES (minimum 12 credit hours)
At least two of the following learning design and technology courses:
- EDTC 608 Online Course Design (3 credit hrs.)
- EDTC 641 Educational Game Design (3 credit hrs.)
- EDTC 642 Designing for Mobile Learning (3 credit hrs.)
- EDTC 651 E-Learning Design and Development (3 credit hrs.)
- EDTC 655 Instructional Design II (3 credit hrs.)

At least two of the following learning sciences courses:
- EPSY 606 Motivation and Learning (3 credit hrs.)
- EPSY 634 Educational Neuroscience (3 credit hrs.)
- EPSY 646 Issues in Child and Adolescent Development (3 credit hrs.)
- EPSY 647 Life Span Development (3 credit hrs.)

### CORE RESEARCH DESIGN & METHODOLOGY COURSES (minimum 21 credit hours)
- EPSY 622 Measurement and Evaluation in Education (3 credit hrs.)
- EPSY 635 Educational Statistics (3 credit hrs.)
- EPSY 636 Techniques of Research (3 credit hrs.)
- EPSY 625 Advanced Psychometric Theory (3 credit hrs.)
- EPSY 640 Experimental Design in Education I (3 credit hrs.)
- EPSY 641 Experimental Design in Education II (3 credit hrs.)
- EPSY 633 Qualitative Research Design and Data Collection (3 credit hrs.)

### ADDITIONAL ELECTIVE/SPECIALIZATION COURSEWORK (4 or more credit hours)
Courses both within and outside of EPSY (including additional courses in educational psychology or research) may count toward elective coursework. Students should consult with their advisor or program committee to identify appropriate electives.

### DISSERTATION RESEARCH (minimum 12 credit hours)
- EPSY 691 Dissertation Research Hours (variable credits)

- The Learning Design and Technology specialization requires a minimum of 64 credits beyond a master’s degree to earn a Ph.D. (The minimum is 96 credits for those without a Master’s degree.)
- Select courses may be waived for students who have successfully completed comparable graduate coursework and/or are able to demonstrate requisite knowledge and skills.
PREREQUISITE COURSES (15 CREDITS)

EPSY 602*: Educational Psychology
EPSY 622*: Measurement and Evaluation in Education
EPSY 635*: Educational Statistics
EPSY 636*: Techniques of Research
EPSY 673*: Learning Theories

*Prerequisite course requirements may be waived for students who have comparable previous coursework or demonstrate requisite knowledge skills. Students who believe they may meet these criteria should consult their advisor.

CORE COURSES (27 CREDITS)

EPSY 625: Advanced Psychometric Theory
EPSY 640: Experimental Design in Education I
EPSY 641: Experimental Design in Education II
EPSY 646: Issues in Child & Adolescent Development or EPSY 647: Lifespan Development
EDTC 654: Instructional Design or EDTC 608: Online Course Design
EPSY 633: Qualitative Research Design and Data Collection
EDAD 623: Advanced Fieldwork Methods
EHRD 656: Narrative Analysis
EPSY 637: Qualitative Grounded Theory Methodologies

ELECTIVES – minimum 16 HOURS

TBD In consultation with dissertation committee and chair

DISSERTATION RESEARCH – minimum 12 HOURS

EPSY 691: Dissertation Research Hours (Minimum 12 credits)
Educational Psychology Ph.D.
Special Education
Specialization Program Requirements
Revised 9-07-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED CORE SPED COURSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Required: 21 credits)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Credits: ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 618 Preparation for the Professoriate in SPED &amp; Allied Fields <em>(Fall Year 1)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 603 Foundations of Special Education <em>(Spring Year 1)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 619 Critical Research &amp; Practice Issues in SPED <em>(Fall Year 2)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 624 Professional Development in Research <em>(Spring Year 2)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 612 Special Education Law &amp; Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 689 Special Topics Seminar 1: Topic Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 689 Special Topics Seminar 2 Topic Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CORE STATISTICS/RESEARCH DESIGN COURSES  |
| *(Required: 15 credits beyond EPSY 635 & 636)* |
| Total Credits: ____ |
| Foundation |
| EPSY 635 Educational Statistics |
| EPSY 636 Techniques of Research |
| Required |
| EPSY 640 Exp Design in Ed I |
| EPSY 641 Exp Design in Ed II |
| EPSY 630 Single Case Exp Design |
| EPSY 643 Applied Multivariate Methods* |
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### SPED Doctoral Emphasis Requirements Checklist

#### CORE COMPETENCIES

*(Variable: Approximately 15 credits)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required: <strong>Ongoing Collaborative Research Participation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May require final written products. (Students who are not being paid to participate with a research project may register for 1-3 credits of EPSY 691 per semester.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students may earn more or less than 15 credits toward fulfilling these competencies.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required: <strong>Pre-Dissertation Research Project</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requires final written product suitable for publication. (Students may register for 3-6 credits of EPSY 691.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Those earning less than 15 credits may take additional coursework (if needed) to ensure a minimum total of 75 credits required to earn a doctorate.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required: <strong>Collaborative Grant Writing</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requires final documentation &amp; faculty verification signatures. (Student may register for 0-3 cr. of SPED 683.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required: <strong>College Teaching</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typically two semester sequence requiring faculty verification signatures. (Students who are not being paid as a GA to assist with the course may register for 3-6 credits of SPED 683.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Credits earned for work toward core competencies may not be used to replace coursework in other required areas (i.e., SPED core courses, core statistics/design courses, SPED-related area specialization coursework, or dissertation hours).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly recommended: <strong>Field Supervision</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typically one or two semesters requiring faculty verification signatures. (Students who are not being paid to supervise may register for up to 3 credits of SPED 683.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DISSERTATION RESEARCH

*(Minimum requirement: 12 credits)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPSY 691 Dissertation Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes: The SPED Emphasis Program requires a minimum of 75 credits beyond a master’s degree to earn a Ph.D. (The minimum is 96 credits for those without a Master’s degree.)
School Psychology Ph.D.
Program Requirements

The School Psychology Program is a traditional, full time program. Most students complete a minimum of three (3) full-time academic years of graduate study plus internship prior to receiving the doctorate. Part-time enrollment is discouraged as all coursework and field experiences are sequenced. The program is designed for completion of all program requirements, including internship and dissertation, within five (5) years, but about 40% take an additional year. Continuous enrollment is required.

**Residency Requirement**

A student entering the program with a baccalaureate degree must spend at least one academic year, plus one semester in resident study here; a student who enters with a master’s degree must spend at least one academic year in resident study. Enrollment for each semester must be a minimum of 9 credit hours each to satisfy the residence requirement.

**Degree Requirements**

Students entering from the baccalaureate are required to obtain the M.Ed. following completion of 36 credit hours, usually conferred in December of the second year. The doctoral degree requires a minimum of 64 credits beyond the master’s degree. Most students take 100-110 credits.

All students are required to complete core courses in health service psychology covering discipline specific knowledge, and theory and techniques for clinical skills in assessment, intervention, and consultation, and research. Students entering with prior graduate coursework in school psychology or related field may be able to waive out of some courses. Students also take an additional 12 credits in their area of interest (strand) for depth and specialization.

All students are required to complete two semesters of therapy practicum in the Counseling and Assessment Clinic, one semester of integrated assessment practicum with cases in the local school districts and/or the Counseling and Assessment Clinic, and two full semesters (600 hours) of school-based experience. Exceptions can be made for those entering with their LSSP and prior school experience to allow for one semester to be in an alternate setting. Most students complete additional field experiences in their area of interest. A year-long internship, APA accredited site strongly recommended, is required as the culminating practice component to the doctoral program.

All students are expected to engage in research activities beginning in their first year. Students are expected to obtain experience in all aspects of research and to present and publish as part of the research experience prior to undertaking their dissertation. Students select one additional research course to support their dissertation project and/or to support their career goals. The program requires that students pre-proposal in spring prior to applying for internship (unless they have already proposed) with proposal and comprehensive examinations completed no later than October 1 of the year they wish to apply for internship. It is recommended that data collection be completed prior to the start of internship; some students are able to defend their dissertation prior to beginning internship.
Admissions Criteria:

Admissions Criteria: Bilingual Education Doctoral Specialization Program (EPSY Ph.D.)

I. Academic Potential (0-5 points)  
   - GRE / Related Predictor  
   - GPA/ Transcripts  
   - Previous degrees (e.g., Bachelor or Master's degree in a related area such as English as a Second Language, Bilingual Education, Curriculum & Instruction)  

II. Personal Statement and Fit with Program (0-5 points)  
   - Personal background/experiences related to bilingual education  
   - Application should reflect research interest areas  
   - Awareness of BIED doctoral program goals  
   - Knowledge of the field of bilingual education  
   - Extent of alignment with available BIED faculty interest areas  
   - Career goals to work in higher education or an educational research settings  
   - Extent of alignment with available BIED faculty interest areas  

III. Professional and Personal Experiences (0-5 points)  
   Considering factors such as:  
   - Research experiences  
   - Prior scholarly accomplishments (e.g., publication/ scholarly presentation)  
   - Experiences with linguistically/culturally diverse populations  
   - International experiences  
   - First in family to attend college  
   - Relevant alternative educational experiences  

IV. Letters of Recommendation (0-5 points)  
   - Letters speak to applicant's scholarly potential (rather than clinical)  
   - Letters are provided by supervisors/advisors (rather than peers/friends)  
   - Letters from individuals in higher education settings are preferred  

V. Additional Information (0-3 points)  
   - Scholarly writing sample  
   - Resume

Committee Determination:  

Total Score: ___/23  

_____Invite Candidate for Interview  _____Deny*  

*Basis of Denial:  
___ Application did not meet required criteria.  
___ Application did document sufficient academic potential.  
___ Applicant's academic and professional goals do not align with BIED doctoral program.  
___Other:
Admissions Criteria: Developmental Sciences and Learning Design & Technology Specialization Programs (EPSY Ph.D.)

I. Cognitive/Scholastic Performance (0-3 pts)
   - GRE Verbal
     [<450/<150 = 0, 450-499/150-152 = 1, 500-599/153-159 = 2, >600/>160 = 3]
   - GRE Quantitative
     [<450/<141 = 0, 450-499/141-143 = 1, 500-599/144-148 = 2, >600/>148 = 3]
   - GPA/Transcripts [< 3.0 = 0, 3.0-3.4 = 1, 3.4-3.6 = 2, >3.6 = 3]

II. External Validation (0-3 pts)
   - Indicators of research skills/experiences in reference letters
   - Indicators of research potential conveyed in reference letters
   - Prior research experiences reflected in resume, statement, or reference letters

III. Research and/or Applied Experiences (0-3 pts)
   Considering factors such as:
   - Evidence of relevant research and applied experiences
   - Years of prior experience as research assistant of equivalent
   - Extent of applied work experience
   - Former Research Experience Including Co-authorship of Research

IV. Match with Specialization Program and Available Faculty Advisor (0-3 pts)
   Considering factors such as:
   - Interests and Career Aspirations Reflected in Personal Statement
   - Nature of prior experiences
   - Available Faculty Advisor that Aligns with Applicant's Interests

V. Other Characteristics (0-3 pts)
   Considering additional factors reflected in the application such as:
   - Evidence of personal, life, or volunteer and/or related work
   - Experiences that could add value to the program and field of study

Committee Determination:
   Total Score: ____/15

_____ Invite Candidate for Interview  _____ Deny*

*Basis of Denial:
   ___ Application did not meet required criteria.
   ___ Application did document sufficient academic potential.
   ___ Applicant's academic and professional goals do not align with this doctoral program.
   ___ Other:
Admissions Criteria: Research, Measurement & Statistics (RMS) Doctoral Specialization Program (EPSY Ph.D.)

I. **Academic Potential (0-5 pts)**
   - GRE / Related Predictor
   - GPA/ Transcripts
   - Previous degrees (e.g., Bachelor or Master’s degree in a related area such as Statistics)

II. **Personal Statement and Fit with Program (0-5 pts)**
   - Personal background/experiences related to educational statistics or research methods
   - Application should reflect research interest areas
   - Awareness of RMS doctoral program goals
   - Knowledge of the field
   - Extent of alignment with available RMS faculty interest areas
   - Career goals to work in higher education or an educational research settings

III. **Professional and Personal Experiences (0-5 pts)**
    Considering factors such as:
    - Research experiences
    - Prior scholarly accomplishments (e.g., publication/ scholarly presentation)
    - Relevant alternative educational experiences

IV. **Letters of Recommendation (0-5 pts)**
   - Letters speak to applicant's scholarly potential
   - Letters are provided by supervisors/advisors (rather than peers/friends)
   - Letters from individuals in higher education settings are preferred

V. **Additional Information (0-3 pts)**
   - Scholarly writing sample
   - Resume

**Committee Determination:**

Total Score: ____/23

_____Invite Candidate for Interview   _____Deny*

*Basis of Denial:
___ Application did not meet required criteria.
___ Application did document sufficient academic potential.
___ Applicant’s academic and professional goals do not align with RMS doctoral program.
___ Other:
Admissions Criteria: Special Education Doctoral Specialization Program (EPSY Ph.D.)

Required Criteria for Admission to Doctoral Program

____ Agreement to engage in full-time doctoral studies (Yes/No)
____ Prior experience working with individuals with or at risk of disabilities
____ Bachelor or Master's degree in a related area (e.g., SPED/BLNG/ED/PSYCH)
____ Fit with TAMU's doctoral program: Professional goals are compatible with program goals
____ Career goals for obtaining position in higher education or educational research settings

Preferred Criteria for Admission to Doctoral Program (0-3 pts)

____ Teacher certification or instructional experience in school settings (0 – 3)
____ Completed Master's degree in related field
____ Extent of alignment with available SPED faculty interest areas

I. Academic Potential (0-10 pts)

- GRE / Related Predictor (0 – 10)
- Transcripts (GPA, prior coursework, prior degrees)
- Prior scholarly accomplishments (e.g., peer reviewed publications)

II. Personal Statement and Fit with Program (0-7 pts)

- Application should reflect research interest areas (0 – 7)
- Awareness of SPED doctoral program goals
- Knowledge of the field of special education
- Extent of alignment with available SPED faculty interest areas

III. Professional and Personal Experiences (0-5 pts)

Considering factors such as:

- Prior research involvement (e.g., participation, publications, presentations)
- Experiences with linguistically/culturally diverse populations
- Experiences working with individuals with disabilities
- International experiences
- Bilingual (or multilingual)
- First in family to attend college
- Relevant alternative educational experiences

IV. Letters of Recommendation (0-5 pts)

- Letters speak to applicant's scholarly potential (rather than only vocational) (0 – 5)
- Letters are provided by supervisors/advisors (rather than peers/friends/relatives)
- Letters from individuals in higher education settings are preferred

Committee Determination:

Total Score: ____/30

____ Invite Candidate for Interview    ____ Deny*

*Basis of Denial:

____ Application does not meet required criteria.
____ Application does not provide evidence of sufficient academic potential.
____ Academic and professional goals do not align with SPED doctoral program.
____ Other:
Admissions Criteria: School Psychology Ph.D.

I. Cognitive/Scholastic Performance (0-3 pts)  
   - GRE Verbal  
     \[<450/<150 = 0, 450-499/150-152 = 1, 500-599/153-159 = 2, >600/>160 = 3\]  
   - GRE Quantitative  
     \[<450/<141 = 0, 450-499/141-143 = 1, 500-599/144-148 = 2, >600/>148 = 3\]  
   - GPA/Transcripts  
     \[< 3.0 = 0, 3.0-3.4 = 1, 3.4-3.6 = 2, >3.6 = 3\]

II. External Validation (0-3 pts)  
   - Exceptional letters of reference from well-respected professionals  
   - Indicators of professional behaviors reflected in resume, statement, or references  
   - Indicators of leadership reflected in resume or reference letters  
   - Prior research experiences reflected in resume, statement, or reference letters

III. Work Experience/Professional Identity (0-3 pts)  
   - Evidence of relevant work experiences with children  
   - Engagement with Relevant Professional Associations  
   - Application Goal Statement (reflects understanding of program and strong writing skills)

IV. Other Characteristics (0-3 pts)  
   - Evidence of work with diverse and/or at-risk populations  
   - First in family to attend graduate school  
   - Dual/multi-language speaker  
   - Additional strong personal characteristics

Committee Determination:  
   Total Score: \[\text{ }/15\]  
   - Invite Candidate for Interview  
   - Deny*

Basis of Denial:
Admissions Criteria: Counseling Psychology Ph.D.

I. Evidence of Academic Abilities (0-7 pts averaged of faculty ratings) ______
   - GRE Verbal
   - GRE Quantitative
   - GPA/ Transcripts
   - Other evidence

II. Relevance of Previous Education (0-2 pts) ______

III. Professional Identification (0-4 pts)
     One point each for:
     - Membership in one or more related national organizations
     - Elected office in relevant professional associations
     - Professional certification related to desired specialty
     - Recognition/award from related professional organization

IV. Other Academic Accomplishments (0-5 pts)
    Including:
    - Master's thesis on record
    - One publication
    - Two or more publications
    - Recipient of grant

Committee Determination: Total Score: _____/14
   _____Invite Candidate for Interview   _____Deny*

Basis of Denial:
Number of Degrees Awarded per Year & Average Time to Degree

Number of Degrees per Year*

Changes in the total number of degrees awarded annually for the previous five years vary by degree level. Undergraduate totals are variable, with an overall modest increasing trend. The number of master’s degree awarded has steadily increased, due in part to the creation of new distance education master’s programs (i.e., School Counseling). The total doctoral degrees awarded has also varied.

Although the department is interested in modest growth for the EPSY PhD specializations (i.e., Bilingual Education; Developmental Sciences; Learning Design and Technology; Research, Measurement, and Statistics; and Special Education), small decreases in Counseling Psychology and School Psychology doctoral cohorts would be advantageous given the current doctoral advising loads of existing faculty. The School Psychology doctoral program’s current cohort sizes are larger than the cohorts they graduated between 2013 and 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Degree Levels Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies¹</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology²</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology³</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Interdisciplinary Studies data reflect both Special Education and Bilingual Education

²Educational Psychology master’s degree data reflect 4 specialization programs: Research, Measurement, and Statistics; School Counseling; Creativity; Cognition, Creativity, Instruction, and Design

³Educational Psychology doctoral degree data reflect 5 specialization programs: Bilingual Education; Developmental Sciences; Learning Design & Technology; Research, Measurement, & Statistics; and Special Education.
On average, undergraduates who enrolled as freshman earn their degrees in approximately four years, with virtually no variability among students in the SPED and BIED teacher preparation programs (i.e., INST degrees) and little variability with a slight decreasing trend for students in CPS (i.e., USEH degrees). At the master's level, SPED and EPSY majors took the least amount of time to earn a degree (approximately 2 years on average), while EDTC majors time to degree varied considerably by year, ranging from 2.41 years (2016-2017) to 4.50 years (2014-2015 graduates). The SPED master's degree program and some of the EPSY master's degree specialization programs are cohort-structured, which keeps most students' progression within a specific timeline. Alternately the Educational Technology master's degree program is more flexible, allowing students to progress one course at a time if they choose to do so.

### Average Time to Degree for 2012-13 through 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>INST</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USEH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>BIED</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDTC</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>CPSY</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPSY</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Report includes First-Time in College and First-Time Graduates/Professional students, does not include Transfer students. INST = Interdisciplinary Studies (i.e., SPED and BIED undergraduate teacher preparation programs), USEH = University Studies (i.e., Child Professional Services), BIED = Bilingual Education, EDTC = Educational Technology, EPSY = Educational Psychology, SPED = Special Education, CPSY = Counseling Psychology, SPSY = School Psychology*
ACADEMIC ENHANCEMENTS & HIGH-IMPACT OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS

CENTERS, CLINICS & SHARED LAB FACILITIES

STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

SCHOLARSHIPS, FELLOWSHIPS & OPPORTUNITIES
High-Impact Educational Practices

High-Impact educational experiences (HIPs) are a set of student-centered pedagogical learning practice shown to promote student engagement, deepened learning, increased persistence and retention, satisfaction, knowledge acquisition, and attainment of education goals. The College of Education and Human Development is committed to offering high-impact learning activities for our students, as evidenced by the 2015-2020 strategic plan (Goal 4), where we seek to “Prepare undergraduate students to engage in lifelong learning and lifelong health and wellness through Aggies Commit to Transforming Lives.”

High-Impact Criteria
The following criteria are used within the common characteristics of high impact practices education practices:

a. Invest time and effort to purposeful tasks that deepen students’ commitment
b. Interact with peers, staff, advisors, and/or faculty about substantive matters usually over extended periods
c. Experience diversity through contact with people who are different from themselves
d. Receive frequent feedback about their performance – both formal and informal – in settings that allow them to respond to that feedback
e. Are provided opportunities to integrate synthesize and apply learning gained from their classroom/discipline in a range of contexts
f. Are provided opportunities to become aware of their values and beliefs and thus to better understand themselves in relation to others and the larger world.
g. Service learning applications should specify approximate that takes place in a community setting.

2017 Rate of HIP Participation at Graduation by Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Community</th>
<th>Writing Intensive</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>1st Year Seminar</th>
<th>Intern/Field Experience</th>
<th>Study Abroad</th>
<th>Service Learning</th>
<th>UG Research</th>
<th>At Least 2 HIPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>30.25%</td>
<td>99.74%</td>
<td>56.53%</td>
<td>9.12%</td>
<td>44.77%</td>
<td>26.81%</td>
<td>15.18%</td>
<td>40.44%</td>
<td>91.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEHD</td>
<td>21.91%</td>
<td>99.94%</td>
<td>41.12%</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
<td>67.01%</td>
<td>22.76%</td>
<td>51.72%</td>
<td>29.68%</td>
<td>88.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY</td>
<td>50.89%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>34.82%</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>29.46%</td>
<td>83.93%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All percentages are measured at time of graduation.
Centers, Clinics & Shared Lab Facilities
The Center for Research and Development in Dual Language and Literacy Acquisition (CRDLLA) is housed in the Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education and Human Development at Texas A&M University. In August 2013, the Board of Regents approved the creation of the center and its operation as a designated Center within the Texas A&M University System. Today it conducts research and service for state and federal entities in the areas of teacher professional development and English language acquisition for English learners through rigorous science instruction and curriculum. The center also conducts research internationally in non-English speaking countries, such as Costa Rica and China, to promote English language learning.

CRDLLA’s primary mission is to develop research that supports second language learners in schools to achieve academically through programs that promote dual languages and English language and literacy acquisition. Secondary goals include conducting research (e.g., assessment and evaluation), providing professional development for teachers and administrators, developing research-based educational materials, and providing leadership for teachers, administrators, and/or families in the areas of dual language and English language and literacy acquisition.

The support for these programs comes in the form of the center’s grant funding—more than $48.9 million in federal and state monies, and $12.3 million in private sector funds—totaling more than $61.2 million. Although it is challenging at times to secure the resources and monies to support the center’s mission and vision, the impact the center’s research is making
in the state of Texas and the nation is inspiring. The current grant portfolio is directly impacting over 20,800 students, 5,005 teachers, 2,320 principals and school leaders, and has an innumerable indirect impact on many more students, teachers, principals, school leaders, parents, and communities. CRDLLA partners with local, state, national, and international organizations, including school districts across the state, the Texas Education Agency, the U.S. Department of Education, international entities, and businesses in the private sector. The CRDLLA center is also the home of the Journal of Research and Practice in Dual Language and Literacy Acquisition. The CRDLLA center has over 100 affiliated faculty from the College and Texas A&M University.

**HIGHLIGHTS**

- Through the duration of the OBEPCT Project, seven ESC Regions and 160 school districts were identified to participate in the Online Bilingual Prep Course Program.
- Within these participating ESC Regions and school districts, 342 in-service teachers were enrolled and serviced in Online Bilingual Prep Courses.
- Through the ETELL Project, 70 school districts have been serviced across several ESC Regions. We continue to increase the number of participating school districts.
- Within these participating ESC Regions and school districts, over 450 in-service teachers enrolled the Bilingual and/or ESL Certification Preparation courses.
- During 2017-2018, the first year of implementation, Project LISTO collaborated with 117 fifth grade science teachers from 67 school campuses in 35 school districts.
- During 2017-2018, Project LISTO worked with 57 fifth grade treatment teachers who received ongoing virtual professional development and live remote coaching to support the implementation of literacy-infused science lessons to 1,368 fifth grade students.

**A-PLUS Grant**

Accelerated Preparation of Leaders for Underserved Schools (A-PLUS) grant, awarded to the Education Leadership Research Center and the Center for Research and Development in Dual Language and Literacy Acquisition, consists of five main components aiming at building teaching and administration capacities all over Texas.
**Center Director:** Dr. Dalun Zhang

The Center on Disability and Development (CDD) at Texas A&M University is a federally designated and funded University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD). The mission of the CDD is to support individuals with disabilities and their families to be change agents who are valued, contributing community members, as self-defined, through education, research, and knowledge dissemination. As a federally designated UCEDD, we engage in four core functions that (a) provide pre-service training and continuing education; (b) provide training and technical assistance, and services and support, to individuals with disabilities, family members, and professionals; (c) conduct research and evaluation; and (d) disseminate information. In the 2016-2017 fiscal year, the CDD has leveraged $7.19 million in additional federal and state funding beyond the $570,000 annual funding. Below is a list of CDD and affiliated projects and activities in the 2016-2017 fiscal year.
OUR IMPACT

698 Students and teachers who took part in research studies with Project PACT, Project ELM, and the IVCS Project conducted to improve reading and language development in students from pre-K to high school.

58 Adults with disabilities received certification in direct support.

115 Texas A&M students active in Aggie Guide Dogs and Service Dogs puppy raising service program.

29 Puppies raised since 2005 preparation for specialized service dog training.

10,113 = 1,000 people served
People served at one or more of the CDD’s outreach and service projects in 2015.

87 Adults with disabilities in certification program.

148 Undergraduate TAMU students.

76 Graduate TAMU students.

206 Children with disabilities, siblings, parents, and Texas A&M students who participated in Camp LIFE, an inclusive weekend camping adventure.

6870 hours Autism Assessment and Interventions

Intensive behavioral interventions provided to children with autism spectrum disorder in 2012-2013 through the CDD’s Autism Assessment Research and Intervention Clinic.

1700 Farmers and ranchers with disabilities who received training, support, and accessibility equipment to continue working in their field of farming and ranching through the CDD’s AgrAbility partnership project.

INFOGRAPHIC AND RESOURCES SHARED WEBSITES

Visits to CDD-affiliated websites: 414,404
Unique visitors to the CDD sites: 77,564

DISABILITY RELATED PRESENTATIONS & TRAINING

2015 Regional and State Disability Conferences: 1000+ participants
2016 Texas Transition Conference: 551 participants
Person-Centered Practices Training: 690 participants

DISABILITY TIPS for FIRST RESPONDERS

A mobile-friendly website includes information about disability-specific supports, an acronym guide, and disability resources in Texas.

Site Views: 3,300 Users from all 50 states and in 40 countries across the world have accessed disabilitytips.tamu.edu
COUNSELING & ASSESSMENT CLINIC

Clinic Interim Director: Dr. Krystal Cook-Simmons

The Counseling and Assessment Clinic (CAC) is a psychological services, research, and training clinic operated under the administration of EPSY. The CAC provides low-cost, high quality psychological services to the community and is a critical to the preparation and professional training of the department’s Counseling Psychology and School Psychology doctoral students, providing opportunities for their initial psychotherapy and assessment experiences. The CAC has been in operation since 1984 and its services are divided between the CAC-Community Health Center (CAC-CHC) in Bryan providing counseling services and the CAC-Milner providing assessment services. All contacts in the CAC are tied to practicum coursework and supervised by TAMU faculty who are licensed psychologists. During the last 5 years, we have averaged over 2000 sessions for our counseling clinic and 750 sessions for our assessment clinic.

The CAC provides an intensive, individualized training experience for our professional psychology doctoral students. There are a range of presenting challenges in the CAC. For child counseling, approximately half of the referral issues involve externalizing behaviors (e.g., oppositionality, parenting problems, ADHD) while the other half involve mood disorders (e.g., anxiety, depression) as well as communication problems. For adult counseling, the majority of the problems involve anxiety and depression as well as relationship issues (e.g., couples counseling). Because we train novice therapists, less than 15% of our adult clientele have serious mental illness (e.g., schizophrenia, bipolar disorder). Our assessment services often focus on evaluating learning disorders and ADHD. Overall, the CAC benefits the local community by providing access to low cost psychological services; in the most recent last five years we provided 13,000 hours of professional services with a “retail” value of over $1.5 million.
The CAC operates under a collaborative and team oriented treatment guideline. In other words, communication and consultation is encouraged between service coordinators, student clinicians, supervisors, and the clinic director in order to ensure that the best quality of care is provided to all our clients. Please read the summaries below to understand the role each individual plays in this collaborative process when providing clinical care.

**Graduate Student Clinicians.** All therapy, counseling, and assessment services are provided by graduate student clinicians currently working on their doctoral degree in either School Psychology or Counseling Psychology in the Department of Educational Psychology at Texas A&M. All student clinicians are assigned to a supervision group led by a faculty member licensed in psychology for the purposes of training. Each student receives several hours of supervision in group and individual format to receive guidance on their cases.

**Faculty Supervisors.** The faculty supervisors provide clinical supervision to the student clinicians. Supervisors provide student clinicians with advice and guidance in their treatment planning, assessment decisions, and work with clients. All supervising faculty are licensed in the state of Texas to provide psychological care. Supervisors may change each semester. For a short biography and description of clinical focus for our faculty supervisors please click here.

**Service Coordinators.** The service coordinators are advanced graduate students in either the Counseling Psychology or School Psychology program at Texas A&M. The service coordinators conduct the daily administrative duties at the clinic and manage the services provided to clients at the clinic under the supervision of the clinic director. The service coordinators conduct phone interviews and provide information regarding clinic services to potential clients to ensure that our services match their needs.

**Clinic Director.** The CAC director, Dr. William Rae, is responsible for the oversight of the clinic and supervises the service coordinators and administrative secretaries. The CAC director facilitates clinic assignments, supervision, research ventures, and ensures that the clinic operates under the most current legal and ethical guidelines. In addition, the clinic director provides additional supervision to student clinicians when necessary.

Retrieved from: [http://cac.tamu.edu/](http://cac.tamu.edu/)
Lab Director: Dr. Steven Woltering

The Neurobiological lab for Learning and Development (NLD), located at 715A Harrington Tower on the main TAMU campus, promotes the use of neurobiological theory and biometric technology in the field of education. As such, the NLD is a bridge between the disciplines of Neuroscience, Psychology, and Education.

Research: The NLD officially opened in 2016 and has over 20 lab members/associates from various departments at TAMU (graduate and undergraduate students).

Project include (Selection):
- Eye tracking and literacy development
- Wearable biofeedback and mindfulness medication
- Brain correlates of impulsivity in obese adolescents
- Sleep in cognitively impaired adults

Mission Statement:

The long-term mission has Research, Education, and Outreach components:

Research: afford faculty and students to integrate neurobiological measures into their research to develop novel research questions.

Education: provide courses and workshops informing educators, clinicians and social scientist of the responsible use and interpretation of neurobiological measures.

Outreach: Translate outcomes of our research into applications at, for example, clinics and schools.

Facilities: The NLD consists of a large analysis/meeting space as well as two sound-proof and temperature controlled testing rooms. Equipment is state-of-the-art and consists of wearable biofeedback devices, high-density electroencephalography, 1000+Hz Eye tracking, psychophysiology (heart rate, skin conductance, respiration rate), and a gold-standard polysomnography (located at clinical facility).

For overview, please also see this video:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=1&v=if5X121f8oE

For more information, please visit the NLD website at: http://nld.tamu.edu/
Lab Directors: Dr. Timothy Elliott and Dr. Carly McCord

The Telehealth Counseling Clinic (TCC) is a non-profit psychological service, research, and training clinic operated by the Department of Educational Psychology and the School of Public Health at Texas A&M University. The TCC provides free counseling services to the Brazos Valley. Our services are provided by a team of doctoral-level trainees and licensed psychologist supervisors. The mission of the Telehealth Counseling Clinic is to work collaboratively with community stakeholders to improve accessibility and quality of care to underserved populations. The TCC strives to create sustainable solutions that improve the well being of the community and its residents.

What is Telehealth?

Telehealth is the use of technology to deliver health care services from a distance. At the TCC, counselors located on the Texas A&M University campus use telephone and videoconferencing technology to meet with clients at our five partner locations. By using video and phone to meet with clients, we are able to provide free services to as many individuals, families, and communities as possible. Our research shows that clients who receive counseling services through telehealth experience symptom improvements in as few as four sessions.

Types of Counseling Services

The TCC offers several types of counseling, and we are always developing new services to meet our clients' needs. On average, clients use about nine sessions to achieve their treatment goals. We have provided over 8,000 hours of services since we opened in 2009 (that’s nearly $1 million worth of free counseling).

Individual Counseling for Adults is our most frequently used service. Adult clients are matched with one of our counselors for weekly appointments. Counseling sessions are usually 45 minutes in duration. TCC counselors help clients cope with depression, anxiety, relationship problems, grief, traumatic events, suicidal thoughts, and other mental health concerns.

Individual Counseling for Adolescents (ages 13 and up) is also available for families struggling with emotional, behavioral, and adjustment-related concerns. Counselors treating younger clients will usually include parents/caregivers in the treatment process to achieve the best outcomes for every family.

Couples Counseling is available for married or unmarried partners who want to address relationship issues including communication, conflict resolution, grief, family planning, or other concerns.

Mindfulness Groups meet weekly and are designed to help clients learn relaxation and mindfulness skills for stress management.

Retrieved from: https://telehealthcounseling.org/
Lab Director: Dr. Oi-man Kwok

The Educational Research and Evaluation Laboratory (EREL) opened in 1983 as a resource for EPSY faculty and graduate students. Over time, the EREL has become a resource for students throughout the college (and university) who take our quantitative research courses and/or work as research assistants and data analysts for faculty research projects. The mission of the lab is to support research through the provision of technology resources and analysis experience. During Fall 2018 the department and college invested in a substantial update for the EREL, expanding the number of work stations, replacing all equipment and furniture, and establishing a secure area with specialized machines and software to run more complex simulations conducted by faculty and doctoral students.

Additional student resources managed by the college and university are available in Appendix F
Student Organizations

Bilingual Education Student Organization
Educational Psychology Student Organization
Student Council for Exceptional Children
Student Affiliates of School Psychology
What is our mission?
To advocate for language minority students to maintain their native language and master English while succeeding academically.

We do this by:
• Promoting awareness (both on campus and in our community) of our organization, program, T.A.M.U. and most importantly, Bilingual Education and its benefits.
• Following important legislation affecting Bilingual Education, ensuring that members are kept up-to-date and take action to share/maintain a grass-roots advocating efforts when necessary.
• Offering volunteer and community service opportunities for the benefit of our community with a focus on Hispanic families.
• Practicing the Spanish language among members.
• Promoting social ties and networking among members.

Retrieved from http://aggiebeso.wixsite.com/tamu
Educational Psychology Student Organization

ABOUT US

To support graduate students in the EPSY department by representing the student body to faculty, planning social events and enrichment events. The purpose of this organization is to serve as a liaison between the graduate students and faculty members of the department of educational psychology serve as a source of information for graduate students promote social activities involving both graduate students and faculty members promote participation in professional activities and impact departmental, college, and University policies affect EPSY graduate students.
Student Council for Exceptional Children (SCEC) is a branch of the international organization of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). CEC is a nonprofit association. Its mission is carried out in support of special education professionals and others working on behalf of individuals with exceptionalities by (a) advocating for appropriate governmental policies; (b) establishing professional standards; (c) providing continuing professional development; (d) advocating for newly and historically underserved individuals with exceptionalities; and (e) helping professionals achieve the conditions and resources necessary for effective professional practice. SCEC is an outlet for students who are interested in serving and learning about individuals with exceptionalities as well as the professional field of special education.

Retrieved from https://scectamu.weebly.com/

ABOUT US
Student Affiliates of School Psychology

ABOUT US

The Student Affiliates of School Psychology (SASP) strives to connect graduate students with one another as they prepare for a lifetime commitment of advocating for children and their families. This organization serves as an avenue by which students can stay abreast of current issues that impact the field of school psychology.
Overview of Scholarship Opportunities

GRADUATE

Graduate Merit Fellowship (4-year award totaling approximately $126,000)

Graduate Merit Awards are university fellowships open to U.S. citizens who enroll in full-time doctoral studies. These awards are designed to attract top graduate students (Strategic Priority 2) who match the demographic character of Texas (Strategic Priority 2), with preference given to students entering a PhD program and who plan to enter the professoriate (Strategic Priority 7). The Award is limited to incoming students and provides four years of funding.

$25,000 – Fellowship Stipend – 1st year (funded by university)
$63,000 – Graduate Assistantship minimum $21,000/yr. for 3 years (funded by department)
$36,000 – Payment toward Resident Tuition and fees ($9,000.00/ yr. for 4 years)
$2,112 – One year Insurance reimbursement

Note: EPSY is responsible for funding years 2-4 for Graduate Merit Fellowships.

Graduate Diversity Fellowship (4-year award totaling approximately $147,300)

Established to increase the diversity of the graduate student population at Texas A&M University, Diversity Excellence Fellowships are university fellowships open to U.S. citizens who enroll in full-time doctoral studies. These awards support the development of high achieving scholars who show promise of distinguished careers and whose life and research experiences and/or employment background will contribute significantly to academic excellence at TAMU and maximize educational benefits of diversity for all students.

$54,000 – Fellowship Stipend ($18,000/ yr. for years 1-3)
$27,000 – Payment toward Resident Tuition and fees ($9,000.00/ yr. for 3 years)
$35,100 – .25 FTE Graduate Assistantship with insurance ($11,700/ yr. for 3 years)
$31,200 – .50 FTE Graduate Assistantship with tuition and insurance ($22,200 for year 4)

Note: EPSY is responsible for funding graduate assistantships for all 4 years.

College Strategic Research Award (1-year award totaling approximately $36,000)

The college sponsors Strategic Research Awards targeting full-time Ph.D. students who have demonstrated exceptional academic performance and exhibit potential for generating a number of academic products (including peer-reviewed manuscript submissions, conference presentations, etc.) during the award period. Recipients receive a one-year graduate assistantship-research, allowing them to devote time to work with their advisors on high-impact research activities. The 12-month assistantship includes a monthly stipend ($2,000), tuition, and benefits.

Notes: The majority of full-time EPSY doctoral students receive funding. Many have either a department-funded graduate assistantship (GA) or a graduate assistantship associated with a faculty member’s grant or research project. Others secure graduate assistantships with another department/unit at Texas A&M University. Many of the department’s GA positions are associated with course or program support and are typically occupied by more experienced students. Non-departmental assistantship opportunities are posted on Jobs for Aggies.

When an out-of-state student is awarded any competitive Texas A&M scholarship or fellowship totaling of $1,000 per year or more, the student is allowed to pay in-state tuition rates for the academic year, which can provide an overall savings of $7,000 - $10,000 over the course of each academic year.
UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS

Special Education undergraduate students are eligible to receive any of three dedicated scholarships:

1. State of Texas Special Education Recruitment and Retention Grant Scholarships
2. Glenn G. & Sharon L. Gibson Scholarship
3. Andrea E. McKenna '08 Memorial Scholarship
4. Charles Butts Scholarship for Aspiring Special Education Teachers

Bilingual Education undergraduate students program are also eligible for the following scholarships:

1. TEACH Grant Program
2. Texas Educational Aide Exemption
3. Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant
4. Hispanic Scholarship Fund
5. The Gates Millennium Scholar Program

Charles Butts Scholarship for Aspiring Special Education Teachers

ABOUT
The first round of scholarships was granted for the 2018-19 school year. Approximately 100 scholarships will be provided in the first year, spread across 11 partner university teacher preparation programs. Over time, the scholarship program will grow to include 500 teaching scholars annually.

Support for Charles Butt Scholars
In addition to scholarship funding, the Raising Texas Teachers initiative will supplement the rigorous education scholars receive through partner programs by providing teacher candidates opportunities to benefit from ongoing professional development, mentoring and feedback from teachers and principals, and connections with fellow Charles Butt scholars across Texas.

This combination of education and supports is designed to ensure teacher candidates practice and develop pedagogical skills in authentic classroom settings, observe masterful teaching in action, reflect on feedback from expert teachers and school leaders, and participate in a community that fosters professional growth.

Retrieved from: https://ryht.education.tamu.edu/

2018 Scholarship Winners
Transformational Learning Fellows Program
Retrieved from: http://education.tamu.edu/student-services/transformational-learning-fellows

Program Overview
Our program recognizes students who commit to engaging in high impact, transformative learning experiences. Student Fellows have passed various milestones while enrolled at Texas A&M University.
As a result of participation in the fellows program, students will be able to:
- Engage in purposeful learning activities to gain skills, knowledge, and competences.
- Examine and make connections across courses and co-curricular experiences.
- Exhibit the skills necessary to receive, organize, reorganize, and interpret new knowledge.

Who is eligible? Any CEHD undergraduate student that is in good academic standing.

What are the program requirements?
Ongoing Involvement in the fellows program includes:
- Participation in academic, professional, and personal milestones throughout your educational experience
- Submission of completed milestones on a regular basis
- Completion of required reflection activities

What are milestones and how do I know what counts towards the fellows program?
Milestones are course-based and co-curricular experiences. They provide students with an opportunity to engage in deep and meaningful learning. Common Milestones include: studying abroad, service learning projects, completion of a professional skill-building workshop, and/or an internship.

What are the benefits?
- Engage in deeper and more meaningful experiences within the College and University.
- Receive a medal recognizing you as a fellow upon graduation.
- Complete experiences and gain skills that are desirable by employers.
- Focus on your academic, personal, and professional development. Milestones help you make purposeful decisions as you work towards your own success.
Aggie ACHIEVE: Academic Courses in Higher Inclusive Education & Vocational Experiences

Founder and Faculty Advisor: Dr. Carly Gilson

Program Overview

Through Aggie ACHIEVE, these students can have this experience. Our program will align coursework, internship opportunities, and extracurricular activities with each student’s academic interests and employment goals.

In the first two years, students will be introduced to college life through seminars focused on independent living, career awareness and self-determination. These will prepare students for inclusive employment with on-campus internship opportunities.

The last two years will focus on career development and field specialization, including opportunities for off-campus paid internships in a student’s field of interest.

Students in the program will have access to campus and community life similar to that of their peers without disabilities on campus. They will be able to:

- Audit one course at TAMU per semester*,
- Pursue active membership in clubs and student organizations,
- Participate in orientation events and campus programs, and
- Develop lifelong relationships with faculty, staff and peers on campus.

Organization & Leadership

Housed within the Department of Educational Psychology in the College of Education and Human Development, Aggie ACHIEVE was recently approved by the Offices and Provost and will be a signature program of the Center on Disability and Development, a nationally recognized University Center of Excellence on Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD).

1. Create a four-year postsecondary pathway for students with IDD in Texas in preparation for inclusive, paid employment and independent living.

2. Provide multiple options for inclusive on- and off-campus housing for students.

3. Enable students to have an immersive and inclusive college experience in which they have access to all services and supports available to any TAMU student.

Transforming the future of our students also means expanding opportunities and experiences of our TAMU students already on campus. This program has the ability to improve attitudes and create opportunities of growth for those who will go on to key corporate, community and civic leadership roles around the country after graduation.
The mission of SRW is to recognize and celebrate student research at Texas A&M University by providing an opportunity for students to present research and to foster an environment for students, faculty, staff, and administration to learn about the research occurring at Texas A&M University.

Formed in 1994 as a one-day poster event, Student Research Week (SRW) 2019 celebrates its 22nd annual research extravaganza. Each year SRW allows hundreds of students from both the graduate and undergraduate levels to present their research in form of oral or poster presentations. Not only does it showcase student research at Texas A&M, SRW honors excellence in research giving a huge value booster to a student's career.

SRW is one of the primary events held by the Graduate and Professional Student Council (GPSC) in conjunction with the Office of Graduate Studies, Vice President for Research, Department of Student Life, and Undergraduate Programs & Academic Services, academic colleges, administrators, faculty, and staff. SRW is planned and organized by students thus making this event a unique student initiative.

SRW events include expert panels, resource tables, presentations by industrial partners, research symposiums, and keynote addresses from esteemed speakers. In addition to these sessions, every student has the opportunity to volunteer during the week and support their peers by attending any of the poster or oral presentation sessions. Graduate students that volunteer to serve as judges gain immensely from this valuable experience.
Study Abroad Programs

For the third year in a row...

ATM is the #1 public U.S. institution for sending students abroad

5,231 Aggies went on study, intern, research, and volunteer abroad programs in FY 2016-17.

Retrieved from: http://studyabroad.tamu.edu/

Spring 2019 INTERNATIONAL FIELD TRIP OPPORTUNITY
AUSTRALIA, Sydney & Cairns

ABOUT
Undergraduate or graduate students who enroll in designated sections of INST 301, EPSY 602 or EPSY 656 classes or in a variable credit EPSY 480 Directed Studies for Spring 2019 will travel on an international field trip designed to increase their awareness of cultural practices and education systems outside of the United States. Students will be fully immersed through experiential learning activities unique to Australia and especially chosen for this trip.

As part of this experience, students will visit local schools to see “education in action” at the primary and secondary level, explore Australia’s indigenous culture and learn to throw a boomerang, attend a production at the Sydney Opera House, interact with Amiria Wildlife by moribading in the Barrier Reef, cuddle with a koala at an adventure zoo, and enjoy Bondi beach and a rainforest waterhole known only to locals. Every aspect of this trip has been planned by an Australian native who will be leading us all on a journey of a lifetime!

DEADLINE TO APPLY: NOVEMBER 1, 2018

FINANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$1,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans. Texas &amp; Field Trips</td>
<td>$590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to Australian Passport</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Expenses (meals included)</td>
<td>$850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Report to Instructor</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad Program Office Fee</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ESTIMATED COST</td>
<td>$3,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trip Coordinators: Dr. Jay Woodward
Department of Psychology
410B Reaves Hall
College Station, TX 77843
Phone: (979) 845-3030

Faculty Leader (EPSY 656): Dr. Jeff Lowe
jdlowe@tamu.edu

Spring 2018 INTERNATIONAL FIELD TRIP OPPORTUNITY
Amsterdam, The Netherlands & Paris, France

ABOUT
Undergraduate or graduate students who enroll in designated sections of INST 301, EPSY 602 and EPSY 673 for Spring 2018 will participate in an international field trip designed to increase their awareness of cultural practices and education systems outside of the United States, particularly those inherent to the central European regions of France and The Netherlands. Students will be fully immersed through experiential learning activities especially chosen for this trip.

As part of this experience, students will visit local schools to see “education in action” at the primary and secondary level, tour a STEM-based children’s museum with Dutch students, visit world-renowned museums and monuments, participate in day tours of Paris and The Netherlands, and end the trip at Disneyland Paris to see how this park accommodates guests with developmental disorders and/or learning disabilities.

DEADLINE TO APPLY: OCTOBER 12, 2017

FINANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$2,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans. Texas &amp; Field Trips</td>
<td>$590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to Australian Passport</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Expenses (meals included)</td>
<td>$850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Report to Instructor</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International airfare</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ESTIMATED COST</td>
<td>$4,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Leader (EPSY 602): Dr. Jay Woodward
djw@tamu.edu

Faculty Leader (EPSY 673): Dr. Steven Welcomes
SWelcomes@tamu.edu

http://studyabroad.tamu.edu
Student Employment Opportunities

PATHS PROGRAM
Texas A&M University

PATHS is currently hiring Program Aides/Mentors for:
• Bridge to Career
• WACO
• Project LEAP
• PATHS Program

Ideal program aides/mentors will:
• Seek opportunities to teach students with disabilities
• Have experience working with individuals with disabilities (not a requirement)
• Have work availability up to 10-20 hours per week

APPLY ONLINE!!!
paths.tamu.edu

For more information
contact Tracy Glass
Phone: 979-845-4461
Email: tglass@tamu.edu
Website: paths.tamu.edu

Aggie Guide-Dogs and Service-Dogs
at Texas A&M University

Our purpose is to educate about, fundraise for, and promote the training and use of service dogs and to increase awareness about how these animals help individuals with disabilities who use them.

Become a Trainer It’s easy!
Ag looks for new trainers from the time they are a puppy to about one year old. We hold 3 potential trainer classes every semester that are required for you to become a trainer through our program. There is no prior experience necessary to become a trainer through our organization. Once you complete any of the steps, they do not expire.

Step 1
• Attend our 3 Potential Trainer Classes. They always start over at the beginning of each semester.

Step 2
• Complete 8 hours of clicker training volunteer hours and then pass a clicker test administered by the trainer supervisors.

Step 3
• Our Trainer Supervisors will watch you handle our dogs at a minimum of two different Campo Trainers.

Step 4
• Receive manual and pass a written test covering the AGD Training Manual.

Step 5
• Pass home inspection and go through 2 interviews. The first interview is with the Trainer Supervisor. The second one is with the Trainer Supervisors as well as the Pappy Lambert, President, and Dr. Alice Blue-McLendon DVM.

www.ags.tamu.edu
AggieGuideDogsandServiceDogs@gmail.com

Camp LIFE

CAMP COUNSELORS NEEDED
Come make a child’s Camp LIFE experience awesome!

Held twice a year in Burton, Texas, Camp LIFE provides recreation for children with disabilities ages 5 and older and their siblings.

• Often counts as field-based hours
• Volunteers must be 18 years or older
• Many of the Camp’s counselors are preservice special education students at A&M
• A low counselor to camper ratio ensures that each camper with a disability receives the support he or she needs to fully participate in all activities of their choice

If you are interested in applying online go to camplife.tamu.edu, for more information please contact Aimee Day ataday@tamu.edu or 979-862-2913.
Assessment of student learning outcomes

Texas A&M University utilizes WEAVEonline as a central repository to document assessment procedures and outcomes for all degree-granting programs. Overseen by the university’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation, all of the university’s academic degree (and certificate) programs document their assessment of student learning outcomes in WEAVEonline. Programs enter information annually and determine the extent to which student performance indicators meet pre-established goals and criteria. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation also evaluates academic degree programs annually, assigning a rating of exemplary, acceptable, or needs improvement for the following dimensions: (a) stated mission, (b) identified learning outcomes, (c) selection of measures to assess student outcomes, identified targets (i.e., performance benchmarks), (d) interpretation of findings, and (e) action plan (e.g., ‘next steps’) for continued improvements. The following table reflects the most recent evaluation ratings for each of the department’s assessment plans for evaluating student outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016-2017</th>
<th>Department of Educational Psychology</th>
<th>Executive Summary Evaluation</th>
<th>WEAVEonline Assessment Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS INST - Bilingual Education</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS INST - Special Education</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS USEH - Child Professional Services</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>Master’s Degree Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEd/MS Bilingual Education</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEd Educational Technology</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS/MEd EPSY - Learning Sciences</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS/MEd EPSY - School Counseling</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEd/MS Special Education</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD EPSY- Bilingual Education Specialty</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD EPSY - Learning Sciences</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD School Psychology</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD Special Education</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate in Applied Behavioral Analysis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate in Prevention Science</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Analysis Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Exemplary, E = Acceptable, N = Needs Improvement, N/A = No Score
Appendix G provides summary reports from WEAVEonline for each of the department's undergraduate and graduate academic programs for the past five academic years, reflecting the extent to which students met identified learning outcomes and summarizing an action plan for the following year. Assessment information added to WEAVE is linked to the university's student learning outcomes, Vision 2020, as well as other strategic plans and goals.

Analysis

Analyses and subsequent action plans identifying program improvements for each degree program and specialization area are included in Appendix G. These plans are located at the end of each annual WEAVEonline report summarizing the evaluation of student outcomes. Adapting to the WEAVEonline system has presented some challenges over the years as the system is cumbersome, uses atypical terminology for some standard assessment components, and in some instances requires programs to modify their evaluation to ‘fit’ the system. Moreover, the WEAVEonline system is not well-suited for documenting the broader range of student assessment information that academic programs collect. Other units across campus have expressed similar challenges and the university has adopted a new product that we will transition to now that the recent reaccreditation process with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC) has been completed.
PROFILE

FACULTY

PUBLICATIONS
GRANTS
TEACHING LOAD
DIVERSITY
QUALIFICATIONS
The dog chased the ball.
The ball was chased by the dog.

Active Voice: the subject performs the action.
The girl parked the car.
Passive Voice: the subject receives the action.
The car was parked by the girl.
Core Faculty

Number of Core Faculty*

As of Fall semester 2018, the department had thirty-five core faculty members, defined as full-time faculty holding tenured/tenure-track positions. Of the department’s 35 core faculty members, ten hold the rank of assistant professor, twelve are associate professors, and thirteen are full professors. The number of core faculty has varied across the last decade, ranging from 41 in 2009-2010 to 29 during the 2016-2017 academic year. EPSY faculty members are housed in one of six academic units (i.e., divisions) that administer a range of academic programs at undergraduate and graduate levels. The following table summarizes the core faculty assigned to each of the department’s academic divisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC DIVISION UNIT</th>
<th>Fall 2018 CORE FACULTY BY RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASSISTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Measurement, &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty / Student Ratio*

The numbers of students in relation to all faculty (excluding graduate teaching assistants) varied between 2013 and 2017, with relatively higher ratios for undergraduate and master’s levels observed in 2015. With the exception of 2016, Ph.D. student to faculty ratios were virtually the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Publications (most recent 5 years) *

The department’s core faculty members published an average of 19.5 products during the most recent five-year period (2014-2018). Of those publications, the majority (14.37) reflected peer-reviewed journal articles. Not surprisingly, there was variability by rank. Among assistant professors, the number of peer-reviewed journal articles per year ranged from 1.00 to 3.67, with these junior faculty publishing just under two articles per year on average. During the same 5-year period, tenured faculty averaged 3.41 referred journal articles per year and 4.78 publications per year overall. Publication productivity varied by rank among tenured faculty. Referred journal articles among tenured associate professors ranged from 0.20 to 3.40 per year with an average of 2.53. Full professors published an average of 4.15 refereed articles per year (range 1.20 – 8 per year).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-2018 Publication Averages</th>
<th>Core Faculty Average Publications Per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Publications Per Year</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Several assistant professors received a terminal degree within the past two years. Accordingly, annual publication rates for assistant professors were calibrated by dividing the total number of publications produced between 2014 and 2018 by the larger value of either (a) number of years post-PhD or (b) number of years from the first publication during that timeframe.

External Grants (most recent 5 years) *

External Funding. The department’s combined extramural funding amounts from all sources (i.e., Federal, State, and private/nonprofit agencies) are summarized below. Historically the majority of the department’s extramural funds have come from federal sources. For instance, federal grants accounted for 64% of the 2017-2018 budgeted funds, compared to 18% from state awards and 18% from private sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Core (&amp; Total) Faculty</th>
<th>Extramural Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>35 (38)</td>
<td>$7,062,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>39 (45)</td>
<td>$7,313,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>38 (45)</td>
<td>$5,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>41 (48)</td>
<td>$5,219,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>39 (46)</td>
<td>$6,513,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>35 (43)</td>
<td>$3,356,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>33 (40)</td>
<td>$14,700,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>35 (44)</td>
<td>$2,189,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>34 (44)</td>
<td>$5,107,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>31 (41)</td>
<td>$4,026,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>29 (38)</td>
<td>$17,095,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>32 (41)</td>
<td>$7,397,434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Load*

Between 2013 and 2017, core faculty teaching efforts were predominantly in graduate-level courses. Moreover, the percentage of undergraduate-level credit hours taught by any/all core faculty steadily declined from 12.4% in 2013 to 3.6% in 2017. This decrease may be due in part to the addition of professional track faculty, whose teaching loads are typically greater than double that of a core faculty member. Alternately, the percentage of core faculty who engaged in graduate-level credit hour production increased over each of the five years, from 86.9% in 2013 to 93.6% in 2017.
Core Faculty Salary Data with College, University, and Peer Institution Comparisons

Weighted Average Faculty Salary Comparisons vs Peers vs TAMU University-wide vs College\(^{(1)(2)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year &amp; Ranks</th>
<th>Avg. Salary</th>
<th>Head count</th>
<th>Avg. Salary</th>
<th>Head count</th>
<th>Avg. Salary</th>
<th>Head count</th>
<th>Avg. Salary</th>
<th>Head count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY</td>
<td>$121,291</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$110,886</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>$131,392</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>$113,688</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Results</td>
<td>$109,588</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$171,598</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$99,587</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$87,707</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU-wide</td>
<td>$110,886</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$119,046</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>$99,587</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$87,707</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Ed</td>
<td>$123,085</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$141,880</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$141,880</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$121,824</td>
<td>121,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY</td>
<td>$87,968</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$74,766</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>$91,941</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>$82,589</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Results</td>
<td>$77,549</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$81,926</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$99,130</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>$84,757</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>$88,291</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$93,265</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>$100,585</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>$88,750</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Ed</td>
<td>$92,664</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$105,857</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>$100,585</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>$88,750</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/TT weighted avg(^{(4)})</td>
<td>$76,750</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$82,551</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>$82,551</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>$72,278</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2014        |             |            |             |            |             |            |             |            |
| EPSY        | $119,418    | 14         | $109,588    | 175        | $139,046    | 818        | $119,151    | 31         |
| Peer Results| $77,549     | 12         | $81,926     | 83         | $99,130     | 529        | $84,757     | 28         |
| TAMU        | $88,291     | 12         | $93,265     | 126        | $100,585    | 574        | $88,750     | 30         |
| College of Ed| $92,664     | 12         | $105,857    | 133        | $100,585    | 574        | $88,750     | 30         |
| T/TT weighted avg\(^{(4)}\) | $76,750     | 12         | $82,551     | 114        | $82,551     | 114        | $72,278     | 10         |

| 2015        |             |            |             |            |             |            |             |            |
| EPSY        | $123,654    | 14         | $111,360    | 166        | $141,880    | 803        | $121,824    | 121,824    |
| Peer Results| $81,926     | 12         | $93,265     | 126        | $99,130     | 529        | $84,757     | 28         |
| TAMU        | $88,291     | 12         | $93,265     | 126        | $100,585    | 574        | $88,750     | 30         |
| College of Ed| $92,664     | 12         | $105,857    | 133        | $100,585    | 574        | $88,750     | 30         |
| T/TT weighted avg\(^{(4)}\) | $76,750     | 12         | $82,551     | 114        | $82,551     | 114        | $72,278     | 10         |

| 2016        |             |            |             |            |             |            |             |            |
| EPSY        | $121,188    | 11         | $123,085    | 234        | $144,559    | 916        | $126,931    | 126,931    |
| Peer Results| $87,265     | 12         | $93,265     | 126        | $100,585    | 574        | $88,750     | 30         |
| TAMU        | $88,291     | 12         | $93,265     | 126        | $100,585    | 574        | $88,750     | 30         |
| College of Ed| $92,664     | 12         | $105,857    | 133        | $100,585    | 574        | $88,750     | 30         |
| T/TT weighted avg\(^{(4)}\) | $76,750     | 12         | $82,551     | 114        | $82,551     | 114        | $72,278     | 10         |

| 2017        |             |            |             |            |             |            |             |            |
| EPSY        | $122,389    | 12         | $118,096    | 149        | $143,740    | 938        | $123,892    | 123,892    |
| Peer Results| $88,291     | 12         | $93,265     | 126        | $100,585    | 574        | $88,750     | 30         |
| TAMU        | $88,291     | 12         | $93,265     | 126        | $100,585    | 574        | $88,750     | 30         |
| College of Ed| $92,664     | 12         | $105,857    | 133        | $100,585    | 574        | $88,750     | 30         |
| T/TT weighted avg\(^{(4)}\) | $76,750     | 12         | $82,551     | 114        | $82,551     | 114        | $72,278     | 10         |

(1) Source: Annual faculty salary survey submission data for fulltime instructional faculty

(2) Relative market percentage is EPSY T/TT weighted average divided by comparison T/TT weighted average

(3) Not including the department being compared to its' college peers

(4) Weighted average includes only top three Tenure/Tenure track ranks
Faculty Other than Core

The department also has an additional nine full-time Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty who are integral in fulfilling our academic mission and provide instructional leadership through coordinating the majority of the department's undergraduate and master's degree programs. 10% service.

Number

Eight of the department's APT faculty are in clinical lines (1 assistant, 5 associate, and 3 full clinical professors) with a workload distributions that are 80% teaching, 10% research, and 10% service. The remaining APT faculty member is an Instructional Professor and has a workload distribution of 90% teaching and

Other Faculty Publications

Although professional track faculty have minimal (e.g., 10% for clinical lines) or no (0% for instructional lines) allocated research time, their professional dissemination efforts include some level of publication activity. During the most recent 5-year period, eight of the department's nine APT faculty produced at least one publication product, averaging 4.67 total publications between 2014 and 2018 (range 0 - 11). Moreover, six of nine APT faculty coauthored one or more referred articles during that time period (ranging from 0 – 6). This level of publication productivity is notable given the heavy teaching loads, academic leadership service, and additional professional commitments among this group of faculty. Abbreviated curriculum vitae with performance summaries for 2014-2018 are available in Appendix B for APT faculty members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-2018 Publication Types</th>
<th>Average APT Faculty Publications Per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASSISTANT (n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Publications (referred &amp; non-refereed)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Faculty External Grant Awards

None of the department's academic professional track faculty currently serve as the lead PI on an externally funded grant award. However the department's sole Assistant Clinical Professor (Dr. Fogarty) has been consistently active as a co-PI on several federally funded randomized control trials and her contributions on those projects have been substantial.

Other Faculty Teaching Load

With very few exceptions, the department's faculty who are not in tenure-track positions have held academic professional track positions, which include clinical lines (clinical assistant, clinical associate, and clinical full) and instructional lines (instructional assistant, instructional associate, instructional full). Clinical faculty positions have an allocation of 80% teaching, 10% service, and 10% research. The allocated teaching load for a clinical faculty member translates to 8 courses per academic year. Instructional faculty positions have workload distribution of 90% teaching and 10% service. As such, the allocated teaching load for an instructional faculty member is 9 courses per academic year.
Historically the non-tenure track faculty who taught in EPSY have been long-term academic professional track faculty. Collectively, this group of individuals was responsible for the majority of undergraduate credit hour production between 2013 and 2017, producing between 68.7% (2015) and 80.3 (2017) of the total number of undergraduate semester credit hours. Their involvement in graduate credit hour production has increased over the past five years, perhaps due in part to the addition of new clinical faculty and their involvement in some of the relatively new online master’s degree programs the department offers. The table below summaries the percentage of undergraduate- and graduate-level credit hours produced by non-tenure track faculty in 2013-2017 (identified in rows entitled % of Level). The table also indicates the percentage of faculty for a given rank/title faculty who were involved with undergraduate- and graduate-level credit hour production (via rows labeled % of Rank).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other EPSY Faculty</th>
<th>Undergraduate-Level Credit Hours</th>
<th>Graduate-Level Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Lecturer</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Level</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Rank</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Level</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Rank</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Prof</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>2,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Level</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Rank</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Level</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Rank</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over the past five years, the ethnic composition of the department’s faculty has varied, with the percentage of faculty from diverse ethnicities or race ranging from 48% (fall 2018) to 42% (fall 2015). The total percentage of ethnically diverse undergraduate students remained virtually the same (34%, 33%, 36%, 33%) between 2015 and 2018, similar to patterns among graduate students (i.e., 31%, 29%, 32%, 34%).

At the beginning of FY 2019 (i.e., September 2018) the department had 44 faculty members, the majority of whom were female (66%). Gender proportions for the subset of tenured and tenure-track faculty (N = 35) were similar to those overall. The proportion of ethnic minorities as of fall 2018 was greater among tenured/tenure-track faculty than professional track faculty.
Faculty Qualifications

The department and Texas A&M University adhere to the faculty qualifications put forth by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools’ Commission on Colleges and its *Principles of Accreditation*.


---

**Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges**

**FACULTY CREDENTIALS**

- **Guidelines** -

Standard 6.2.a (*Faculty qualifications*) of the *Principles of Accreditation* reads as follows:

For each of its educational programs, the institution justifies and documents the qualifications of its faculty members.

When an institution defines faculty qualifications using faculty credentials, institutions should use the following as credential guidelines:

a. Faculty teaching general education courses at the undergraduate level: doctorate or master’s degree in the teaching discipline or master’s degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).

b. Faculty teaching associate degree courses designed for transfer to a baccalaureate degree: doctorate or master’s degree in the teaching discipline or master’s degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).

c. Faculty teaching associate degree courses not designed for transfer to the baccalaureate degree: bachelor’s degree in the teaching discipline, or associate’s degree and demonstrated competencies in the teaching discipline.

d. Faculty teaching baccalaureate courses: doctorate or master’s degree in the teaching discipline or master’s degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).

e. Faculty teaching graduate and post-baccalaureate course work: earned doctorate/terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline.

f. Graduate teaching assistants: master’s in the teaching discipline or 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline, direct supervision by a faculty member experienced in the teaching discipline, regular in-service training, and planned and periodic evaluations.

Approved: College Delegate Assembly, December 2006

Updated for Revised Principles: April 2018
Texas A&M University's Office of the Dean of Faculties also notes the following in its Guidelines for Validating Instructor Credentials to Teach. Retrieved and reported verbatim from https://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITODOF/Documents/Guidelines/credentialing/credentialing_guidelines.pdf

At Texas A&M University and its branch campuses in Galveston and Qatar, the primary indicator used to gauge instructors' qualifications to teach is a terminal degree in the discipline of instruction. In some cases, faculty members are considered qualified for instruction based on factors other than an in-discipline terminal degree, such as:

- Terminal degree in a closely related field
- A master's degree or at least 18 semester credit hours of graduate-level coursework in the same or a closely related field
- Professional licensure or certification in a related field or profession
- Significant professional, research, or teaching experience in the same or closely related field

**Semester-based Credentialing Process**

The office of the dean of faculties assumes responsibility for checking the teaching qualifications for faculty. Colleges and departments oversee hiring of graduate assistants who serve as instructors-of-record.

We use the federal Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) codes to determine whether or not an instructor's educational background is in the same discipline as courses he/she teaches. The CIP codes for courses are maintained in the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's course inventory for Texas A&M University. The CIP code of each instructor's highest earned degree is maintained in an on-campus faculty database. Because faculty members sometimes teach courses that are closely related to but not the same as their highest-earned degree, we worked with deans and department heads to establish a cross-walk that documents similar disciplines. As new faculty are hired, we request both the highest-earned degree CIP code and the CIP codes for courses the faculty member is qualified to teach so we are able to update our database and cross-walk.

Immediately prior to the first day of classes, we compare the CIP code for each instructor's highest-earned degree to the CIP code for course sections the instructor is teaching. If degree and course CIP codes are not an exact match, we then check the cross-walk to determine whether or not the instructor is qualified to teach the course because the disciplines are similar. If the degree and course CIP codes still do not match, we contact the instructor's dean and ask for additional information in order to verify and document the instructor's qualifications to teach the course.

**Recommendations for Colleges and Departments**

**Courses**—Course CIP codes are designated by the department or unit administering the course, typically when the course is first proposed. Generally, the CIP code requested for a course should be the same as the CIP code affiliated with the administrative unit or degree program.

Course CIP codes for all Texas A&M University programs are included in an inventory maintained by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and may be downloaded from the Board's data server (http://www.txhighereddata.org/interactive/UnivCourse). We recommend departments periodically review CIP codes assigned to their courses to ensure alignment between the CIP code, course content, and degree program. Administrative units wishing to change CIP codes assigned to courses already listed on the THECB inventory should contact Texas A&M University Curricular Services for information regarding the request and approval process.

**Faculty**—Information on instructor qualification is required for new faculty at the time of hire to update data resources used for the semester-based credentialing process. Administrative units complete and submit credentialing to the Office of the Dean of Faculties along with other request-to-hire materials. In the DOF Electronic Hiring Portal, administrative units will be required to complete the credentialing information regarding the faculty member's highest earned degree, courses the individual is expected to teach, and the individual's qualifications to teach assigned courses.
Analysis

The number of full-time faculty members in the department is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of its academic programs. Moreover, evaluation metrics used by the university and college to assess faculty teaching, research, and service provide indicators of overall faculty performance.

The department’s faculty teaching loads are markedly lower than college and university averages. As reflected in university comparison data, a large proportion of the courses the department teaches are graduate courses, and professional track (i.e., other faculty) teach a majority of the undergraduate courses offered by the department. There are contextual aspects of the department’s degree programs that influence these load differences. The department’s Counseling Psychology, School Psychology, Bilingual Education, and Special Education programs (at both graduate and undergraduate levels) are clinical in nature, expensive to administer, and are similar in some ways to medical teaching models that require apprenticeships with close supervision. This intensive preparation has resulted in low teaching loads associated with those particular majors. Relatedly, Counseling Psychology and School Psychology doctoral programs require a 1 year internship for every student that must be completed prior to graduation, which adds to the department’s time to degree length for Ph.D. programs.

High impact learning experiences continue to be a priority for EPSY, as reflected in the fact that 100% of our undergraduates engaged in two or more high impact learning experiences by graduation. The department has recently increased attention and efforts to expand study abroad opportunities for students and is working to increase undergraduate research experiences.

As noted by the university, last year’s program outcome assessment data reveal notable improvements in our degree programs’ action plans (which are based on student performance data). The university’s appraisal of our degree programs’ mission statements, outcomes, and measures continue to reflect high marks as well. In the upcoming year we will adopt a different product for reporting degree program performance goals and objectives as the university transitions from WEAVEonline to a system better suited for our needs.

This past year EPSY has diverting more attention and resources to student recruitment and retention efforts, focusing on increasing the racial and ethnic diversity of our undergraduate programs. We are strategically recruiting from high schools and junior colleges that reflect our target demographics (i.e., Latino and Black students as well as males for our teacher preparation programs). The department is also working to make more financial supports available to our full-time student teachers with the greatest financial need.

With respect to research productivity, the department continues to be among the highest ranked programs for multiple Academic Analytics metrics in comparison to peer EPSY programs. In particular, citation data reflect the relevance of their work to other scholars in their fields. There are exceptions. For instance, Academic Analytics data regarding book authorships are markedly lower than data assessing some of the other research metrics. This is not surprising given the department’s prioritization of peer-reviewed works. In addition, some of the disciplines within the department place far less emphasis on books. EPSY’s Total Awards and Awards per Faculty member as indexed in Academic Analytics is an area warranting considerable improvement. The level of external recognition for our faculty is incongruent with its strong performance on many other key performance metrics in Academic Analytics. As a result, the department has recently increased its focus on external awards and is developing a strategic plan to garner external recognition for several highly productive faculty.
EPSY also continues to strategically investing in existing faculty to elevate their research productivity and impact in order to mitigate the potential influence of several recent faculty retirements. As is likely the case for others, *Academic Analytics* does not accurately reflect the amount of external funding our faculty are securing to support their research and outreach efforts. In addition to using *Academic Analytics* data as a tool for determining the department’s relative standing among peers, EPSY has also begun analyzing and tracking faculty citation data in SCOPUS, which more accurately reflects some of our disciplines, takes seminal works that remain heavily cited into account, and is currently subject to fewer errors/omissions than Academic Analytics. The graphic below illustrates the department’s relative performance at the end of 2017 on several research indicators indexed in *Academic Analytics*.

**Department of Educational Psychology Core Faculty’s Relative Performance on Key Research Indicators Indexed in Academic Analytics**

![Department of Educational Psychology Core Faculty’s Relative Performance on Key Research Indicators Indexed in Academic Analytics](image-url)
PROFILE

STUDENT

ENROLLMENT
DIVERSITY
RETENTION
GRADUATION
PUBLICATIONS
Doctoral, Masters, and Baccalaureate

Enrollment, including % of full-time students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester and Classification Levels</th>
<th>Student Enrollment Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014: Undergraduate</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015: Undergraduate</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016: Undergraduate</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017: Undergraduate</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018: Undergraduate</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Diversity / Demographics*

As illustrated in the bar graph below, relative changes in the number of diverse students for a given ethnic category were fairly similar and in general reflected very modest increases.
An examination of student ethnic data presented in proportion to an overall number of students at a given point in time indicates that changes in a given category may be more reflective of overall student more so than any substantive proportional increase for a given ethnic group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment and Ethnicity</th>
<th>Year of Fall Semester Headcount</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Student Enrollment</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Ethnic Origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Only</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black only + 2 or more/1 Black</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino of any Race</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Only</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more/excluding Black</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian Only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown or Not Reported</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Only</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Top 10 Percent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Top 10</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Generation Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not First Generation</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED Bilingual Ed. (undergrad &amp; master's)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY Counseling Psychology (PhD)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDIS SPED &amp; BIED (lower-division)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTD Educational Technology (master's)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY Ed. Psychology (master's &amp; doctoral)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST SPED &amp; BIED (upper-division)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED Special Education (master's)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY School Psychology (PhD)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEH Child Professional Services (ugrad)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proportion of undergraduate and graduate students considered diverse with respect to ethnicity remained largely unchanged between 2015 and 2018. Differences in the percentages of diverse students between undergraduate and graduate populations were minimal. While undergraduate percentages were slightly greater than graduate in 2015, 2016, and 2017, there was only a percentage point difference between them in 2018.

### Extent of Racial and Ethnic Diversity and Underrepresented Minorities among EPSY Students 2015 - 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year and Degree Level of Students</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black/AA</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>American Indian /Native Alaskan</th>
<th>Total Diverse</th>
<th>Total Under-Represented Minorities</th>
<th>Multi-racial Excluding Black</th>
<th>Total % Diverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 Ugrad</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Ugrad</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Ugrad</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Ugrad</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retention Rates* and Graduation Rates*
Retention data summaries include department- and college-level information for a ten-year period. While the primary focus of this self-study is 2011-present, data from 2006 – 2010 are provided for comparative purposes.

**Undergraduate Student Retention Rates (excluding transfer students)**
Undergraduate student retention data (excluding transfer students) for the department and the college are based on headcounts of full-time students during initial entry year. Percentages of those students who either remained or graduated after 1-6 years of study are reported for cohorts entering years 2006 - 2017. With the exception of 2014 (64%), first-year retention rates among non-transfer students within the department have improved since the last APR review cycle. However, first-year retention rates the cohort entering 2017 reflect a declining trend (from 82% during 2012 to 70% 2016). Third-year retention rates appear largely unchanged between the previous and current APR reporting period.

### Undergraduate Full-time First time Headcount Retention/Graduation Rates
(Retained/graduated from the same College as initially enrolled)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Entry Year &amp; Initial Head Count</th>
<th>1 - Yr % Within Dept.</th>
<th>2 - Yr % Within Dept.</th>
<th>3 - Yr % Within Dept.</th>
<th>4 - Yr % Within Dept.</th>
<th>5 - Yr % Within Dept.</th>
<th>6 - Yr % Within Dept.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPSY Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 32</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 31</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 36</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 50</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 34</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 34</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 45</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 49</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 54</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 37</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 31</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Education and Human Development</th>
<th>1 - Yr %</th>
<th>2 - Yr %</th>
<th>3 - Yr %</th>
<th>4 - Yr %</th>
<th>5 - Yr %</th>
<th>6 - Yr %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006 449</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 512</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 420</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 481</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 511</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 533</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 576</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 796</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 803</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 811</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 733</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undergraduate Full-time Transfer Student Retention Rates
Retention and graduation rates for undergraduate transfer students are summarized below, reflecting the percentages who remained or graduated after within 6 years of study. The department experienced modest increase in first-year retention rates during the current reporting period in comparison to rates from the department’s last APR timeframe, with 88% of the 368 students enrolled during 2016 retained at the end of their first year. Likewise, full-time undergraduate student graduation rates within five years were higher in 2012 (77%) than 2006 (63%).

### Fulltime Undergraduate Transfer Student Retention/Graduation Rates

(Retained/graduated from the same Department as initially enrolled)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Entry Year &amp; Initial Head Count</th>
<th>1 - Yr % Retained</th>
<th>1 - Yr % Graduated</th>
<th>2 - Yr % Retained</th>
<th>2 - Yr % Graduated</th>
<th>3 - Yr % Retained</th>
<th>3 - Yr % Graduated</th>
<th>4 - Yr % Retained</th>
<th>4 - Yr % Graduated</th>
<th>5 - Yr % Retained</th>
<th>5 - Yr % Graduated</th>
<th>6 - Yr % Retained</th>
<th>6 - Yr % Graduated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPSY Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 19 73%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 15 100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 26 76%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 21 71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 12 83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 22 72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 18 77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 19 84%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 24 79%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 26 76%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 24 95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education and Human Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 243 83%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 253 77%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 232 78%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 190 76%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 157 84%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 206 83%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 259 81%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 299 88%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 306 87%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 368 86%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 368 88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Doctoral Student Retention Rates

Doctoral student retention and graduation data are based on headcounts during entry year and the percentages of students who remained or graduated at the end of 1, 3, 5, and 7 years. The college’s 3-year graduation rates for doctoral students was higher across years, which is not surprising given that EPSY’s Ph.D. programs have longer programs of study. The department’s percentages of students graduated at the five-year mark exceeded the college’s, with the exception of 2004 and 2011. Likewise, the department’s 7-year graduation rates exceeded the college’s except for 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Entry Year &amp; Initial Head Count</th>
<th>1-Year % Retained</th>
<th>1-Year % Graduated</th>
<th>3-Year % Retained</th>
<th>3-Year % Graduated</th>
<th>5-Year % Retained</th>
<th>5-Year % Graduated</th>
<th>7 Year % Retained</th>
<th>7 Year % Graduated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPSY Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Education and Human Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cohort Entry Year &amp; Initial Head Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>1-Year % Retained</strong></td>
<td><strong>1-Year % Graduated</strong></td>
<td><strong>3-Year % Retained</strong></td>
<td><strong>3-Year % Graduated</strong></td>
<td><strong>5-Year % Retained</strong></td>
<td><strong>5-Year % Graduated</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 Year % Retained</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Master’s Student Retention rates
Department- and college-level retention and graduation percentages for master’s students were based on headcounts during entry year and subsequent percentages of those students who either remained or graduated after 1, 2, 3, and 4 years of study. The following tables reflect ten years of retention data (2002 – 2014). The department 2-year and 3-year graduation percentages varied but the general trends for those have increased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Entry Year &amp; Initial Head Count</th>
<th>1-Year % Retained</th>
<th>1-Year % Graduated</th>
<th>2-Year % Retained</th>
<th>2-Year % Graduated</th>
<th>3-Year % Retained</th>
<th>3-Year % Graduated</th>
<th>4-Year % Retained</th>
<th>4-Year % Graduated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPA Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education and Human Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Degrees per Year*

The number of undergraduate degrees awarded decreased between 2014 and 2018. There was also a modest decrease in doctorates, from 175 to 168. However there has been considerable growth in master's degrees awarded, which is not surprising given new distance education programs implemented during the current reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Full Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Full Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Full Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>88.92%</td>
<td>89.72%</td>
<td>85.98%</td>
<td>89.42%</td>
<td>87.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>22.45%</td>
<td>20.38%</td>
<td>17.41%</td>
<td>74.23%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>69.14%</td>
<td>75.15%</td>
<td>74.40%</td>
<td>74.40%</td>
<td>70.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Average Time to Degree (most recent 5 years) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. (Freshman entry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>BIED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDTC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>CPSY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPSY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Report includes First-Time in College and First-Time Graduates/Professional students, does not include Transfer students. INST = Interdisciplinary Studies (i.e., SPED and BIED undergraduate teacher preparation programs), USEH = University Studies (i.e., Child Professional Services), BIED = Bilingual Education, EDTC = Educational Technology, EPSY = Educational Psychology, SPED = Special Education, CPSY = Counseling Psychology, SPSY = School Psychology*

### Percentage of Full-Time Doctoral Students with Institutional Financial Support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The department strives to fund all full-time doctoral students to alleviate some of the financial burden of graduate school and enable students to focus on rigorous academic programs of study. During the most recent five-year period (2012-2017), the percentage of Counseling Psychology students who received some level of financial support ranged from 57% (2013-14) to 100% (2015-16). The percentage funded students in an Educational Psychology doctoral program ranged from 56% (2013-2014) to 96% (2016-2017). In the School Psychology doctoral program, 65% of the students received institutional funding during 2013-2014, compared with 100% during the 2016-2017 academic year. Two patterns are evident across all three programs. First, substantially lower percentages of full-time students were funded during the 2013-2014 academic year. Second, larger proportions of students received institutional financial support during the more recent academic years (i.e., 2015-2016 and 2016-2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counseling Psychology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Funded</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Amount</td>
<td>$13,750</td>
<td>$13,125</td>
<td>$14,608</td>
<td>$19,463</td>
<td>$17,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Psychology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Funded</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Amount</td>
<td>$14,646</td>
<td>$13,985</td>
<td>$15,169</td>
<td>$18,719</td>
<td>$18,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Psychology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Funded</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Amount</td>
<td>$14,167</td>
<td>$13,235</td>
<td>$14,141</td>
<td>$16,524</td>
<td>$20,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Institutional Financial Support Provided for Doctoral Students***

With the exception of the 2013-2014 academic year, the average amount of funding for full-time doctoral students has increased over the past five years, with School Psychology students experiencing the greatest increase. Differences in funding averages between the 2012-2013 and 2016-2017 academic years were $3,459 among Counseling Psychology Students, $3,659 among Educational Psychology Students, and $6,235 among School Psychology students. These improvements coincided with departmental and division efforts to identify more funding support for doctoral students.
Student Publications / Presentations (most recent 5 years) *

The department is increasing its efforts to prepare doctoral students for professorial/research roles. The percentage of doctoral students graduating between 2013 and 2017 with at least one publication ranged between 72% and 90%. Percentages with one or more peer-reviewed journal article ranged from 63% to 79%. However, the total publications across students increased from 48 for 2016 graduates to 106 for 2017 graduates. Moreover, the average number of peer-reviewed journal publications increased from 1.24 per student in 2013 to 3 per student in 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year &amp; Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Peer-Reviewed Article</th>
<th>Any Publication</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013 25</td>
<td>16 (63%)</td>
<td>18 (72%)</td>
<td>23 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 28</td>
<td>23 (82%)</td>
<td>23 (82%)</td>
<td>24 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 31</td>
<td>24 (77%)</td>
<td>26 (77%)</td>
<td>29 (94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 20</td>
<td>17 (85%)</td>
<td>18 (90%)</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 29</td>
<td>23 (79%)</td>
<td>24 (83%)</td>
<td>28 (97%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The current retention data may not adequately reflect true retention rates within the department's undergraduate programs. Attrition among students in the SPED and BIED teacher preparation programs has been extremely low once students are fully admitted to these concentration program areas (which does not occur until their professional phase, typically at the beginning of the junior year). Prior to professional phase we have limited contact with students who may elect to apply for the SPED and BIED concentrations. As freshman and sophomores they are in the college's general INST (Interdisciplinary Studies) degree program. The department is working with the college to establish better internal tracking mechanisms for the numerous distinct concentration programs that comprise the INST degree.

Aspects of the department's strategic plan, particularly goals associated with undergraduate programming, were established in response to some of the enrollment, retention, and time to graduation data summarized in this section. The goals to increase diversity and optimize enrollments are of particular relevance:

- Increase diversity (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and first generation college attendance status) within our undergraduate degree programs through improved recruitment and retention efforts.
  - Coordinate recruitment efforts with the college's undergraduate recruitment office.
  - Increase communications with other departments in the college (i.e., Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture) to identify education majors who may have desire to work with bilingual learners and students with special education needs.

- Optimize enrollments for our undergraduate degree programs.
  - Increase enrollment in our bilingual teacher preparation program. Short-term goal: Admit new cohort of 25-30 students (juniors) every fall semester. Long-term goal: Admit new cohort of 25-30 students (juniors) every fall and every spring semester.
  - Increase cohort sizes in the special education teacher preparation program, admitting 34 new students (juniors) per academic year semester.
  - Stabilize enrollment numbers in the Child Professional Services program. Target: Admitting 35-40 new students each year.

In terms of graduate program enrollment, we are committed to modest growth for the EPSY PhD specialization programs (i.e., Bilingual Education; Developmental Sciences; Learning Design and Technology; Research, Measurement, and Statistics; and Special Education). However, stabilizing Counseling Psychology and School Psychology doctoral cohorts would be advantageous given the doctoral advising load capacities of existing faculty. EPSY's online master's degree programs target admissions of 28 to 38 students each year. Most are on track with the exception of the Bilingual Education master's degree.

The department has made progress in its goal to increase the number of doctoral students who enter the professorate. Higher numbers of funded doctoral students, greater annual funding amounts per student, and high publication rates among doctoral students reflect some of our progress related to this area. However, an improved mechanism for documenting Ph.D. graduates' employment data is needed, particularly among graduates in EPSY specialization programs. The Division of Special Education has internally tracked their doctoral graduates in recent years and boasts a substantial increase in the number of graduates entering higher education. Whereas the vast majority of SPED graduates remained in public school leadership prior to 2007, more than 65% of their graduates since 2010 are in faculty positions. The currently available data are incomplete for some of the other specializations.
Concluding Observations

The Educational Psychology Department’s degree programs reflect a variety of interrelated disciplines focused on human development and well-being in educational and community contexts. These programs directly contribute to the land grant mission of Texas A&M University and help advance its strategic goals by:

- Increasing the number of effective teachers and educational professionals in Texas’ schools by ensuring their instructional expertise and knowledge of social/emotional learning to meet the needs of diverse learners in Texas’ schools.
- Expanding schools’ and communities’ capacities to support individuals with disabilities and empowering adults with disabilities through self-determination.
- Increasing access to education and mental health services among bilingual learners and their families.
- Providing graduate students with the professional preparation and supervised practicum experiences to become effective school counselors, school psychologists, and counseling psychologists.
- Preparing doctoral students for the professoriate and ensuring that the next generation of higher education faculty in Educational Psychology are able to (a) establish a meaningful applied research agenda that advances the social sciences and (b) be effective educators both in and outside of college classrooms and capable of providing transformational learning experiences for undergraduate and graduate students.

This self-study reflects progress the department has made over the past 7 years and identifies some challenges/opportunities to prioritize during the upcoming years.

Progress

- Recent changes in the department’s leadership reflect the addition of two associate department head positions, one for Research and Faculty Development and another for Academic Affairs. Faculty who fill these service leadership roles are appointed by the department head. At present, the percentage of effort for these is 25% and 30% respectively during the academic year, plus one month distributed across the summer. The responsibilities associated with these positions align with the department’s strategic efforts to increase external recognition of faculty, increase supports for research productivity and extramural funding (particularly among junior faculty), ensure the highest quality distance education programming, and increase opportunities for ongoing improvement in faculty’s teaching skills.
- Other changes within the department since the 2011 APR that that have provided students with high impact learning opportunities include:
  a. Addition of a Neurobiological Lab for Learning and Development, a shared lab facility for researchers and students interested in utilizing neurological and biometric measures for research.
  b. Launch of a Telehealth Counseling Clinic that provides psychological services to the public, particularly those in underserved rural areas, and generates meaningful research and training opportunities for faculty and students that serves as a training ground for advanced doctoral students in our professional psychology programs under the supervision of licensed psychologists.
  c. Establishment of the Center for Research and Development in Dual Language and Literacy Acquisition, which already serves as the epicenter for more than $61.2 million in research expenditures for applied research and outreach efforts that are reaching thousands children, families, and school-based personnel throughout the state of Texas and beyond.
• Efforts to have a broader range of EPSY faculty, staff, and students involved in climate efforts yielded some highly successful events. For instance, in response to professional preparation needs of our graduate students, we identified and brought in a Dr. Todd Savage, a leading scholar who provided multiple colloquiums on Supporting Transgender and Gender Diverse Students in Schools and at Home. The event exceeded our expectations and, after querying the college’s interest, we moved the event to the MSC to accommodate more 100 participants including faculty, staff, students, and representatives from other TAMU campus organizations who attended the day of events.

• Targeted efforts to increase student supports, particularly for undergraduates, has resulted in considerable success for our SPED undergraduate program. In addition to the Aspiring Teacher Scholarship Award Program (funded by Raise Your Hand Texas Foundation), a substantial increase in donor interest has resulted in some sizeable gifts, one of which is an endowed scholarship fund.

• At the doctoral level, we have invested more resources and energies to identify funding for full-time students; the data reflect improvements in this area.

• In response to the growing number of master’s degree programs and specializations delivered via distance education, the department has increased its focus and allocated additional resources for distance education.
  o Increased professional development opportunities for faculty teaching online (and offered incentives for faculty to participate).
  o Established a distance education council comprised of faculty with skills and leadership responsibilities in this area.
  o Recently instituted a peer-evaluation process to assess quality of distance education courses including their adherence to faculty-student contact hour requirements and comparability to corresponding face-to-face versions of courses.

• Faculty research, outreach, and recognition also impact our academic programming. Retaining talented and productive faculty who involve students in research and outreach activities is critical to our mission to provide high impact learning opportunities and to prepare doctoral students for the professoriate.
  o PI Investment Initiative: The department is investing funds to establish the PI Investment Initiative, allowing faculty hire an expert (external to TAMU) to review and provide feedback for external grant proposals for nationals/federal agencies.
  o Faculty Recognition: The responsibilities of EPSY’s newly appointed Associate DH for Research and Faculty Development strategically included a focus on external recognition of faculty. This position assumed leadership of EPSY’s Awards Committee and expanded the committee’s focus to include external recognition opportunities. As a result, departmental nominations for internal awards have become more strategic, recognizing that these are pre-requisite achievements for some of our rising stars.
  o Engagement: The department continues to strategically invest in applied research and outreach activities that are poised to have the greatest impact on our community and state. Current priorities include work affiliated with our two university-designated centers (CRDDLLA and CDD), the Telehealth Clinic, and the Counseling and Assessment Clinic. We have also prioritized research labs within the department that are configured to facilitate collaborations and shared usage. A successful example of this lab model is the Neurobiological Lab for Learning and Development, which regularly hosts collaborators (and their graduate students) across the department, college, and university. We are in the process of establishing similar collaborative/shared usage models with two additional labs: Biometric Literacy Indicators for Neurodevelopmental Disorders in Children, (BLINC) and a Behavioral and Social Emotional (BASE) Research Lab.
Challenges and Opportunities

- As college teaching in the twenty-first century continues to evolve and the demand for distance education options increases, we must be prepared to provide high quality online learning environments that maximize student learning. The department has allocated funds for a new clinical faculty line, seeking someone with expertise in learning design and technology. A percentage of this individual's time will be service-oriented, managing professional development opportunities and providing instructional design support for EPSY faculty and graduate students who work with online courses. This academic professional track faculty will also have teaching assignments for courses related to online course design in our Learning Design and Technology degree programs.

- One current challenge (albeit a welcome one) is determining the most effective and efficient mechanism for documenting and coordinating the efforts of multiple groups and individuals who are focused on increasing faculty, staff, and student awareness regarding matters related to climate, diversity, and equity. We are exploring new ways that the department's Climate Committee (comprised of faculty and staff) can partner with student organizations to facilitate professional development and engagement opportunities.

- Recruiting and providing financial support for our BIED Undergraduate program remains a top priority, and one for which we have made little progress. We are hopeful that recent efforts to work more closely with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs Irby and partner with Colleagues in the TLAC department will yield effective strategies for growing this vital undergraduate program.

- More information is needed to better understand why the Bilingual Education master's program enrollment remains low. The degree targets existing teachers who work (or desire to work) in bilingual education classrooms. Given the acute shortage of certified Bilingual Educators, the program should have considerably higher enrollment. Faculty in the Division of Bilingual Education were awarded a competitive internal grant to evaluate and develop an enrollment plan; they are currently the process of establishing paid focus groups of existing school-based personnel to learn more about the financial, logistical, and support needs of existing teachers who would benefit from participating in this degree program.

- Keeping up with the growing demand for high-quality distance education programs is a challenge we (and other institutions) face. Maintaining quality and academic rigor is at the forefront of our distance education efforts, as is ensuring students in online learning environments receive sufficient supports. Providing faculty with ample professional development opportunities and supports to stay abreast of the latest online teaching advancements will remain a priority for the department.

- The numbers out-of-department students enrolling in the EPSYs quantitative research courses has varied over the years, making it difficult to project instructional FTE needs. Other departments in the college have developed their own versions of key statistics courses, however improved communications across departments are improving our ability to forecast the numbers of students we need to serve. Over the past two years, EPSY has experienced increasing numbers of undergraduate and doctoral students trying to access the department's quantitative research (i.e., statistics) courses, surpassing our instructional capacity among core faculty in our Division of Research, Measurement, and Statistics. We are contemplating the proposal of a new professional-track position to help stabilize instructional demands and reduce reliance on adjunct faculty for these courses.
Appendix

A. Faculty CVs: Core Faculty
Biographical Information

Dr. Sandra Acosta, Ph.D.
Tenured Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=sacosta

Education

2010 Ph.D. Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
1997 M.A. Spanish University of St. Thomas
1971 M.A. Education University of Wisconsin

Professional Experience

2018-present Associate Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2010-18 Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University

Areas of Research Specialization

Biliteracy, oral language, action research

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total £</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>1st Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>w/ student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 14; Student co-authors in bold font.)


Hsu, H-Y., Lin, J-H., Kwok, O., Acosta, S., & Willson, V. (2017). The impact of intra-class correlation (ICC) on the effectiveness of level-specific fit indices in multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM): A


---

### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Totals</th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

BIED 613: Spanish/English Biliteracy/ [F14, F15, F16, F, 17, F18] *online*

146
BEBB 470: Bilingual Assessment and Monitoring [Sp15, Sp16, Sp17, Sp18]
BEBB 476: Content Area Instruction for Bilingual Programs [Sp15, Sp16, Sp17, Sp18]

Select External Service Activities
Current Editorial Boards:
Research in the Schools
Biographical Information

Dr. Eunkyeng Baek, Ph.D.
Tenure Track Assistant Professor [50% Research, 40% Teaching, 10% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology - Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=baek

Education
2015 Ph.D. Curriculum and Instruction University of South Florida
2006 M.A. Industrial and Organizational Psychology Korea University
2003 B.S. Psychology Sungshin Women’s University

Professional Experience
2017-present Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2016-17 Visiting Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University

Areas of Research Specialization
Multilevel modeling, Single-case data analysis, Level-1 error structure

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 4; Student co-authors in bold font.)
Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
EPSY 640: Experimental Design in Education I [F16, F17, F18]
EPSY 641: Experimental Design in Education II [Sp17, Sp18]
EPSY 656: Survey Instrument Development [F16, Sp17, F17] *online*
EPSY 690: Survey Research Method [F16] *online*
EPSY 622: Measurement and Evaluation in Education [F16, Sp17] *online*

Select External Service Activities
Current Peer-reviewed Journal Reviewers:
Behavior Research Method
Behavior Modification

National Leadership Positions:
2010-present Members, American Educational Research Association
Biographical Information

Dr. Jamilia J. Blake, Ph.D.
Tenured Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.cehd.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=jjblake

Education
2007    Ph.D.  Educational Psychology  University of Georgia
2003    M.Ed.  Educational Psychology  University of Georgia
2000    B.S.  Psychology   University of Georgia

Professional Experience
2014-present  Associate Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2007-14  Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University

Areas of Research Specialization
Bullying/victimization; racial/ethnic disparities in school discipline

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$1,279,717</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present  \( n = 22; \text{ Student co-authors in bold font.} \)


Peguero, A., Marchbanks, M. P., Varela, K. S., Eason, J., & Blake, J. J. (in press). Too strict or too lenient?: Examining the role of school strictness with educational and juvenile justice outcomes. *Sociological Spectrum*


Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Totals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

- SPSY 638: Prevention Science and Systems Consultation [F17, F18]
- SPSY 628: Consultation Theory and Techniques [Sp14]
- SPSY 683: Consultation Theory and Techniques Practicum [F15]
- SPSY 620: Prevention Science Seminar [F14, Sp15]
- SPSY 617: Diagnosis of Emotional Disturbance in Children [F15, F14]
- EPSY 605: Effects of Culture, Diversity, and Poverty on Youth and Families [F18, F16, F15, F14]
- CPSY 601: Multicultural Counseling in the Schools [Su 15]*online*
- CPSY 603: School Counseling Group Interventions [Su 17, Su 16, Su 15] *online*

Select External Service Activities

Current Editorial Boards:
- Journal of School Psychology
- Journal of Black Psychology

Current Federal or International Review Panels:
- Institute of Educational Sciences

National Leadership Positions:
- 2017-present Member, American Psychological Association Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessments (http://www.apa.org/science/leadership/tests/)
- 2014-2016 Chair, American Psychological Association Division 16 Committee for Ethnic Minority Affairs (CEMA)
Biographical Information

Dr. Lisa Bowman-Perrott, Ph.D.
Tenured Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]  
Department of Educational Psychology-Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=ljbp

Education
2001  Ph.D.  Education  University of Virginia
1993  M.Ed.  Agency Counseling  College of William & Mary
1991  B.A.  Psychology  Hampton University

Professional Experience
2015-present  Associate Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2007-15  Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2002-2006  Assistant Research Professor, Juniper Gardens Children’s Project (JGCP; non-tenure track)  University of Kansas
2001-2002  Postdoctoral Research Associate, JGCP  University of Kansas

Areas of Research Specialization
Meta-analysis; single-case research; academic and behavioral interventions for at-risk students

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Private/Other</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Private/Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$1,190,126</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$3,180,830</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 7; Student co-authors in bold font.)

analysis of single-case research on behavior contracts: Effects on behavioral and academic outcomes among children and youth. *Behavior Modification, 39*(2), 247-269. doi: 0.1177/0145445514551383 (Published first online September 26, 2014.)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

- **SPED 620**: Bilingual Special Education I [Sp14, Sp15] [Su15, Su16, Su17] *online*
- **SPED 624**: Doctoral Seminar: Professional Development in Research [Sp15, Sp16, Sp17, Sp18]
- **SPED 442**: Teaching Students with Emotional & Behavioral Disorders [Sp14, F14, F15, Sp16, F16, F17, Sp18, F18]
- **SPED 683**: Field Practicum (e.g., College Teaching Competency) [Sp 14, F14, F15, Sp16, F16, Sp18, F18]
- **SPED 685**: Directed Studies [Su16, Su17, Su18]
- **SPED 691**: Research [Sp14, F14, Sp15, Su16, Sp18]

### Select External Service Activities

**Associate Editorships:**

- Associate Editor, School Psychology Review (2014-Present)

**Current Editorial Boards:**


**Current Federal or International Review Panels:**

- Institute of Education Sciences (20 2019)

**National Leadership Positions:**

2007-2010  Elected National Board of Directors Member, Association for Positive Behavior Support
Biographical Information

Dr. Daniel Brossart, Ph.D.
Tenured Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology - Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://dataportal.education.tamu.edu/Documents/rkPbE9U0tp2AtQx6fUP7sEK.pdf

Education
1996 Ph.D. Counseling Psychology University of Missouri-Columbia
1990 M.A. Counseling Psychology University of Missouri - Columbia
1987 B.A. Biblical Studies & Psychology Evangel University

Professional Experience
2003-present Associate Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
1996-2003 Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University

Areas of Research Specialization
Intervention research, behavioral health process research

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Private/Other</th>
<th>Career Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Private/Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>$482,191</td>
<td>$779,114</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>$496,831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present  (n = 9; Student co-authors in bold font.)


**Professional Presentations Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/ International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Doctoral Advising Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Committee Roles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)**

- CPSY 689: Field Practicum [F14, Sp14, F15]
- CPSY 639 Practicum I [Sp14, F15, Sp17]
- CPSY 664 Practicum II [F14, F15]
- CPSY 633: Introduction to Group Process I [Sp16, Sp17, Sp18]
- CPSY 631: Techniques of Counseling [F14, F15, F16, F18]

**Select External Service Activities**

**Current Editorial Boards:**

- Military Psychology
- Journal of Clinical Psychology
Biographical Information

Dr. Mack D. Burke, Ph.D.
Tenured Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology - Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=mburke_aggie

Education
2001 Ph.D. Special Education University of Oregon
2003 M.A. Special Education University of Oregon
1995 B.A. Special Education University of West Florida
1995 B.A. History University of West Florida

Professional Experience
2009-present Associate Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2005-2009 Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2001-2005 Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology University of Georgia

Areas of Research Specialization
Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, Reading Problems, Positive Behavioral Supports, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, International Special Education

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$1,249,469</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 17) Student co-authors in bold font.


Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Co-chair</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Co-chair</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

**Graduate**
- SEFB 618: Behavior Management-- BCBA Certification Sequence Course [F13, F14, F16, F018] *online*
- EPSY 630: Single-Case Research Design [Fa 2018] *online*
- SPED 689: Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports- Doctoral Seminar [Su2013, Su2016]

**Undergraduate**
- SEFB 471: Classroom Management and Behavioral Interventions [F13, F14]

Select External Service Activities

**Associate Editorships:**
- Reading and Writing Quarterly (2012-2013)

**Current Editorial Boards:**
- Journal of Special Needs Education in Ireland (2018-present)
- Behavior Modification (2017 – present)
- School Psychology Review (2016-present)
- Assessment for Effective Intervention (2006 – present)

**Current Federal or International Grant Review Panels:**

**National Leadership Positions:**
- 2016 – present: American Institutes for Research, National Center on Intensive Intervention Behavioral Progress Monitoring Technical Review Committee Member
- 2014- 2015: Association for Positive Behavior Supports, Dissemination Committee Member
- 2010: Association for Positive Behavior Supports, Evaluation Committee Member
Biographical Information

Dr. Linda Castillo, Ph.D.
Tenured Full Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=lcastillo

Education
1999 Ph.D. Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
1996 M.S. Educational Psychology University of Utah
1994 B.A. Psychology Texas State University

Professional Experience
2011-present Full Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2007-11 Associate Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2000-07 Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
1999-00 Assistant Professor, Ed. Admin, Counseling, & Psychology Tarleton State University

Areas of Research Specialization
Marianismo, Latina college student mental health, cultural construct scale development

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$529,459</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,442,495</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 — Present (*n = 24; Student co-authors in bold font.*)
https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192718765074


Additional citations for years 2015 – 2014 are located on my CV.
https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=lcastillo

### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-chair</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

- CPSY 679: Multicultural Counseling [Sp17]
- CPSY639: Counseling Practicum I [F14, F15, F16, F17,F18] *online*
- CPSY 683: Field Practicum in Schools [Sp15, Sp16, Sp17, Sp18 ] *online*
- CPSY 666: Practicum in Supervision [F14 ]
- CPSY 691: Research [F14, Sp14, F15, Sp15, F16, Sp16, F17, Sp17, F18, Sp18 ]
- CPSY 683: Field Practicum doctoral students [F14, Sp14, F15, Sp15, F16, Sp16, F17, Sp17, F18, Sp18 ]
- CPSY 685: Directed Studies [dissertation proposal development] [Sp15, Sp16, Sp17,Sp18 ]

### Select External Service Activities

**Editorships:**
- Journal of Clinical Psychology (20011 – present)
Biographical Information

Dr. Sara Castro-Olivo, Ph.D., NCSP, LSSP
Tenured Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=sara_castro-olivo

Education
2007 Ph.D. School Psychology University of Oregon
2005 M.S. Special Education University of Oregon
2002 B.A. Psychology California State University, Bakersfield

Professional Experience
2016-present Associate Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2014-2016 Associate Professor, Psychology & Communication Texas A&M University Intl.
2008-2014 Assistant Professor, School Psychology University of California, Riverside
2007-2008 Visiting Assistant Professor, Psychology Our Lady of the Lake University

Areas of Research Specialization
Culturally responsive social-emotional and behavioral interventions; social-emotional resiliency and academic success; cultural adaptations to existing evidence-based programs; Family interventions for culturally and linguistically diverse populations; System-wide implementation of culturally responsive social-emotional and academic services for English language learners. Bilingual assessment of ELLs.

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 12; Student co-authors in bold font.)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/ International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career-Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chair</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

- **PSYC 5301** Introduction to Counseling and Psychotherapy (TAMIU- F14)
- **PSYC 5336** Multicultural Issues in Counseling (TAMIU- F14)
- **PSYC 5327** Child and Adolescence Psychotherapy (TAMIU- Sp15)
- **PSYC 5337** Community Mental Health for Diverse Populations (TAMIU-Su15)
- **PSYC 4308** Theories and Principles of Psychological Testing (TAMIU- Sp14, Sp15)
- **SPSY 642** Behavioral Assessment and Interventions (TAMU, Sp17, Sp18)
- **SPSY 643** Academic Assessment and Interventions (TAMU, F17)
- **EPSY 605** Effects of Culture, Diversity, and Poverty (TAMU F17)
Select External Service Activities

**Associate Editorships:**
Contemporary School Psychology Journal, 2017 - present

**Current Editorial Boards:**
Journal of School Psychology

**Current Federal or International Review Panels:**
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

**National Leadership Positions:**
2017 - present  CYF Immigrant and Refugee Youth Workgroup

2016-present  Advisory Committee Member for CASEL's Collaborate State Initiative
2014-2016  Invited Leadership subcommittee member for APA division 16 (School Psychology)'s Committee for Ethnic Minority Affairs (CEMA).
Biographical Information

Dr. Timothy R. Elliott, Ph.D.
University Distinguished Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service] Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=timothyrelliott

Education

1987 Ph.D. Counseling Psychology University of Missouri
1981 M.S. Rehabilitation Counseling Auburn University
1979 B.S. Elementary and Secondary Freed-Hardeman College Education

Professional Experience

2006-present Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2003-06 Professor, Psychology University of Alabama at Birmingham
1993-2003 Associate Professor, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation University of Alabama at Birmingham
1987-1993 Assistant Professor, Psychology Virginia Commonwealth University

Areas of Research Specialization
Adjustment processes among individuals with disabling health conditions, services for underserved individuals

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$61,428</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 16; Student co-authors in **bold font.**)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career-Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

- CPSY 683 Field Practicum
- CPSY 633 Introduction to Group
- CPSY 632 Career Counseling
- CPSY 635 Social-Counseling Interface
- CPSY 626 Psychopathology
- EPSY 627 Structured Personality Assessment

### Select External Service Activities

**Editorships:**


**Associate Editorships:**


**Current Editorial Boards:**

*Rehabilitation Psychology, Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*
**National Leadership Positions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2017</td>
<td>Appointed Member, Neurological/Behavioral Health Subcommittee, Defense Health Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td>Elected Member, Council of Representatives to the American Psychological Association, Division of Rehabilitation Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>President, Division of Rehabilitation Psychology, American Psychological Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biographical Information

Dr. Florina Erbeli, Ph.D.
Tenured Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=erbeli

Education
2015 Ph.D. Special Education University of Ljubljana
2003 B.A. German & English Language & Literature University of Ljubljana

Professional Experience
2018-present Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2015-2017 Postdoctoral Researcher, Florida Center for Reading Research & Department of Psychology Florida State University

Areas of Research Specialization
Individual differences in reading ability and disability, reading development, predictive factors of reading achievement

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present  \( n = 5; \text{ Student co-authors in bold font.} \)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

- LANG 001: English Language Skills for Pre-Service Teachers [F14]
- LANG 002: Preparations for Cambridge Advanced English Exams (Level C1) [Sp15]
- SPED 630: Early Literacy for Students with Diverse Instructional Needs [F18] *online*
Biographical Information

Dr. Idean Ettekal, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor [50% Research, 40% Teaching, 10% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology - Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.cehd.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=iettekal

Education
2016 Ph.D. Family & Human Development Arizona State University
2011 M.S. Family & Human Development Arizona State University
2006 B.A. Psychology & American Studies University of California, Berkeley

Professional Experience
2017–present Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2016-17 Project Director (Post-Doctoral Position) University at Buffalo, SUNY

Areas of Research Specialization
Children’s Social and Emotional Development; Peer Relationships; Aggression; Bullying

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014–present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014–present</td>
<td>Career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014–present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 10; Student co-authors in bold font.)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Presentations Summary</th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Advising Summary</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Committee Roles</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

- EPSY 689: Social and Emotional Development and Interventions [F18]
- EPSY 689: Interpersonal Relationships [Sp18]
- EPSY 435: Educational Statistics [F17]
Biographical Information

Dr. Jeffrey R. Gagne, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology - Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=jeffgagne

Education
2007 Ph.D. Psychology Boston University
1999 M.A. Psychology Boston University
1996 Ed.M. Counseling Boston University
1995 B.A. Psychology Boston College

Professional Experience
2017-present Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2011-17 Assistant Professor, Psychology University of Texas at Arlington
2007-11 Postdoctoral Trainee, Psychology University of Wisconsin-Madison

Areas of Research Specialization
Temperament, Self-Regulation, Behavioral Assessment, Child Development

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$32,512.35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 11; Student co-authors in bold font.)


**Professional Presentations Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/ International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Doctoral Advising Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)**

EPSY 647: Life Span Development [*F17, F18*]
EPSY 606: Motivation & Learning [*Sp18*]
UT-Arlington:
Psychology 3310: Developmental Psychology [*Sum17, Sum16, Sum15, Sum14*]
Psychology 4410: Advanced Topics in Developmental Psychology [*Sp17, Sp16, Sp14*]
Psychology 3318: Abnormal Psychology [*F16, F15, F14*]

**Select External Service Activities**

**Current Editorial Boards:**
*Frontiers in Personality and Social Psychology; SAGE Open*
Biographical Information

Dr. J. B. Ganz, Ph.D., BCBA-D
Tenured Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology - Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: directory.cehd.tamu.edu/jeniganz

Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. 2002</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Lawrence, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.T. 1995</td>
<td>Trinity University</td>
<td>Elementary Education, Emphasis in Special Education</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. 1994</td>
<td>Trinity University</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Position and Experience</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-present</td>
<td>Professor of Special Education</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>College Station, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-present</td>
<td>Affiliated Faculty, Center on Disability &amp; Development</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>College Station, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2014</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Special Education (with tenure)</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>College Station, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2008</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Special Education (with tenure) (2007-2008), Assistant Professor (2002-2007)</td>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Research Specialization

Development and efficacy of augmentative and alternative communication interventions for individuals with autism spectrum and intellectual disabilities

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$2,439,057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (Selected 2016-18 for space; \( n = 30 \); Student co-authors in **bold font.**)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Presentations Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivered 2014 - 2018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National/International</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited/Keynote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Advising Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduated 2014 - 2018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissertation Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
EPSY 485 Directed Studies [F14,Sp15,F17]
EPSY 691 Research [Sp14,Su14,F14,Sp15,Su15,F15,Sp16,Su16,F16,Sp17,Su17,F18]
SEFB 631 Intensive Practicum in Applied Behavior Analysis [Su17]
SEFB 630 Practicum in Applied Behavior Analysis [Sp14,Fa16,Sp17,F17]
SPED 602 Ethical and Professional Conduct in Special Education and Behavior Analysis [Su14,Su15,Sp16]
*online*
SPED 609 Educating Individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorders [Sp14,Sp15] *online*
SPED 612 Special Education Law [F14,F16,F18]
SPED 626/689 Meta-Analysis in Single-Case Research [Su15]
SPED 685 Directed Studies [Sp14,Su14,F14,Sp15,F15,Sp15,Su16,Sp17,Su17,F17]

Select External Service Activities
Associate Editorships:

Current Editorial Boards:
Remedial and Special Education

Current Federal or International Review Panels:
Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education
Biographical Information

Dr. Carly Blustein Gilson, Ph.D.
Tenure-Track Assistant Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service] Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=Carly.gilson

Education
2017 Ph.D. Special Education Vanderbilt University
2011 M.Ed. Secondary English Education Boston College
2010 B.S. Journalism University of Florida

Professional Experience
2017-present Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University

Areas of Research Specialization
Transition for students with intellectual disability and autism; inclusive postsecondary education; integrated employment

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Private/Other</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014-present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 11; Student co-authors in bold font.)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Students</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invited Keynote</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 – 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-chair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

SPED414: Issues and Methods in Low-Incidence Disabilities [F17, S18, F18]
Biographical Information

Dr. Shanna Hagan-Burke, Ph.D.
Professor & Department Head [100% Administrative Appointment]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.cehd.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=shaganburke

Education
1998     Ph.D.    Special Education    University of Oregon
1994     M.A.    Clinical Teaching: Emotional Handicaps    University of West Florida
1990     B.A.    Special Education- Emotional Handicaps    University of West Florida

Professional Experience
2016-present  Professor & Endowed Chair of Educational Psychology    Texas A&M University
2005-2009  Associate Professor, Educational Psychology    Texas A&M University
2001-2005  Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology    University of Georgia
1999-2001  Assistant Professor (non tenure-track)    University of Oregon

Areas of Research Specialization
Early literacy, Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS), functional analyses of challenging behaviors, relations between academic performance and challenging behaviors

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Private/Other</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Private/Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$5,675,175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,908,370</td>
<td>$473,415</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 15; Student co-authors in bold font.)


**Professional Presentations Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverer 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National/International</strong></td>
<td><strong>Local/Regional Organization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Students</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invited Keynote</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

SPED 685: College Teaching Practicum in Special Education [F2015]
SPED 683: Field Practicum in Special Education [Sp2014, F2015]
SPED 618: Induction to Doctoral Studies in Special Education- Doctoral Seminar [F14, F15]

Select External Service Activities

Editorial Boards:

- **Behavior Modification**: 2014– present (field reviewer)
- **Journal of Special Education**: 2010 – present (reviewer & editorial board member)
- **Remedial and Special Education**: 2009 – present (field reviewer)

Current Federal or International Review Panels:

U.S. Department of Education- Institute of Education Sciences (IES):

- 2017: **Appointed Panel Member** IES Special Education Panel
- 2014 – 2016: **Appointed Panel Member** IES Early Career Development & Mentoring
- 2012, 2014: **Appointed Ad Hoc Reviewer** IES Statistics & Modeling Panel
- 2010 – 2014: **Standing Panel Member** IES Social Behavior to Support Student Learning Outcomes

International Collaborations

- 2015 (July): Invited Scholar, Department of Special Education and Human Sciences, Universität Siegen, Germany
- 2011 (June): Invited Scholar, Department of Special Education & Rehabilitation, Universität zu Köln, Germany
- 2010 (June): Invited Scholar, Department of Special Education & Rehabilitation, Universität zu Köln, Germany (month-long appointment- guest-lectured in multiple undergraduate and graduate courses; led research symposia with faculty and with graduate students, presented collaborative research with German scholars at scholarly conferences)
Biographical Information

Dr. Oi-Man Kwok, Ph.D.
Tenured Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
ORCID: 0000-0002-4617-4562

Education
2005  Ph.D.  Quantitative Psychology  Arizona State University
1998  M.Phil.  Psychology  The Chinese University of Hong Kong
2000  B.Sc.  Psychology  National Taiwan University

Professional Experience
2014-present  Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2015-present  Visiting Professor, Institute of Education  National Chiao Tung University
2010-2014  Associate Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2005-2010  Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University

Areas of Research Specialization
Multi-level models and structural equation models, and the applications of these statistical models to educational data

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$1,495,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (from a total of 40 articles; Student co-authors in bold font with *.)


Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 – 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>National/International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local/Regional</td>
<td>Local/Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Graduated Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
EPSY 636: Techniques of Research [F14,F15]
EPSY 651: Theory of Structural Equation Modeling [Sp14,Sp16,Sp17,F18]
EPSY 652: Hierarchical Linear Modeling [Sp15,Sp16,F16,Sp17]

Select External Service Activities
Current Editorial Boards:
Structural Equation Modeling [ISI 2017 impact factor: 3.531] (2018-)

Current Federal or International Review Panels:
Institute of Education Sciences (Critical Problems of Policy and Practice in Special Education 2020 Panel Member) 2018

National Leadership Positions:
2012-2013 Chair of Multilevel Modeling SIG, American Educational Research Association
Biographical Information

Dr. Rafael Lara-Alecio, Ph.D.
Regents Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology - Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=a-lara

Education
1991 Ph.D. Educational Psychology            University of Utah, Salt Lake City
1984 A.A.S. Business and Data Processing      Utah State College, Orem
1974 M.S. Measurement, Evaluation, & Research Universidad del Valle de Guatemala
1972 B.S. Interdisciplinary Science           Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala

Professional Experience
2015-present Regents Professor Texas A&M University System
2003-present Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
1998-2003 Associate Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
1992-1998 Assistant Professor, Teaching Learning & Culture Texas A&M University
1974-1979 Professor, College of Humanities Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala

Areas of Research Specialization
Dual Language Development and Literacy Acquisition, Hispanic/Latino Parental Involvement, Hispanic/Latino Gifted Identification, Hispanic/Latino Education and International education

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$47,554,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Private/Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$74,397,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,187,465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,090,393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 22; Student co-authors in bold font.)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Committees</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

- BIED 615: Action Research for Bilingual & ESL Programs
- BIED 614: Curriculum Development for English Language
- BIED 616: Spanish for Bilingual and Dual Language Classrooms
- EPSY 682: Seminar in Bilingual Education
- EPSY 689: Practicum in Curriculum Development for Second Language Learners
- EPSY 684: Internship in Bilingual Education
- EPSY 685: Directed Studies in Bilingual Education
- EPSY 691: Research/Dissertation

### Select External Service Activities

**Editorship:** *Research & Development in Dual Language & Literacy Acquisition*

**Current Editorial Boards:** *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, Texas Association for Bilingual Education Journal*
Biographical Information

Dr. Jeffrey Liew, Ph.D.
Tenured Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available:
https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=jeffrey.liew

Education
2005  Ph.D.  Psychology  Arizona State University
2002  M.A.  Psychology  Arizona State University
1995  B.A.  Psychology  University of California at Berkeley

Professional Experience
2015–present  Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2011–15  Associate Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2005–11  Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University

Areas of Research Specialization
Child and adolescent development, emotion and self-regulation

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 26; Student co-authors in bold font.)


Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career-Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

EPSY 602: Educational Psychology [F14, F15, F16, F17, F18] *online*
EPSY 646: Issues in Child and Adolescent Development [Sp14, Sp15, Sp16, Sp17, Sp18] *online*
EPSY 647: Adult Development and Aging [Spr14, F14]

Select External Service Activities

Associate Editorships:
Early Education and Development (2012-present)
Biographical Information

Dr. Wen Luo, Ph.D.
Tenured Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=wluo

Education
2007  Ph.D.  Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2003  M.A.  Applied Linguistics  Shanghai Jiao Tong University
2000  B.S.  English and Finance  Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Professional Experience
2013- present  Associate Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2007-13  Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology  University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee

Areas of Research Specialization
Multi-level modeling, longitudinal data analyses

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present  (n = 20; Student co-authors in bold font.)


Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/ International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career-Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair  Co-chair  Member</td>
<td>Chair  Co-chair  Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Committee Roles</td>
<td>2        1         31</td>
<td>4         1         40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
EPSY 640: Experimental Design in Education I [F14, F15, F16, F17, F18]
EPSY 641: Experimental Design in Education I [Sp14, Sp15, Sp16, Sp17, Sp18]
EPSY 650: Multiple Regression [Sp15, Sp16, Sp17, Sp18, F18 ]
EPSY 643: Multivariate Methods [F16]
EPSY 652: Hierarchical Linear Modeling [Sp14, F14, F15, F17]

Select External Service Activities
Current Editorial Boards:
Journal of School Psychology

National Leadership Positions:
2013-2014 Chair of Multilevel Modeling SIG, American Educational Research Association
2012-2013 Vice-Chair of Multilevel Modeling SIG, American Educational Research Association
Biographical Information

Dr. Kirsten W. Newell, Ph.D.
Pre-tenure Assistant Professor [50% Research, 40% Teaching, 10% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University

Education
2018  Ph.D.  Educational Psychology  University of Minnesota – Twin Cities
2006  Psy.S.  School Psychology  Minnesota State University Moorhead
2005  M.S.  School Psychology  Minnesota State University Moorhead
2003  B.S.  Psychology  University of Minnesota – Twin Cities

Professional Experience
2018–present  Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University

Areas of Research Specialization
Academic assessment of dual language learners, academic assessment within multi-tiered systems of support, educators’ interpretation and use of data

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present  \( n = 2; \text{ Student co-authors in bold font.} \)


Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

SPSY 643: Academic Assessment and Intervention [F18]
SPSY 612: Individual Assessment [Sp19]

Select External Service Activities

Current Editorial Boards:
Assessment for Effective Intervention
Biographical Information

Dr. Lizette Ojeda, Ph.D.
Tenured Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV
Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=lizetteojeda

Education
2009 Ph.D. Counseling Psychology  University of Missouri
2003 B.A. Psychology  University of Houston

Professional Experience
2015-present  Associate Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2009-15  Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology  University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee

Areas of Research Specialization
Career development, mental health, Latino and gender issues

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present  (n = 16; Student co-authors in bold font.)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Presentations Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivered 2014 - 2018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Totals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

- CPSY 664: Counseling Practicum II \([F18]\)
- CPSY 666: Practicum in Counselor Supervision \([F14, F15, F16, F17, F18]\)
- CPSY 602: Group Process \([S16, S18]\)
- CPSY 612: Planning and Organizing Comprehensive Guidance Programs \([F16, F17]\) *online*
- CPSY 630: Foundations of Counseling \([F14, F15, F16]\) *online*
- CPSY 632: Career Counseling \([S15, S17]\)
- EPSY 604: Career Assessment and Placement Services \([Summer14, 15, 16, 17]\) *online*
- CPSY 679: Multicultural Counseling \([S15]\)

Select External Service Activities

Current Editorial Boards:
- Journal of Latina/o Psychology
- Psychology of Men & Masculinity
- Journal of Career Assessment
Biographical Information

Dr. Yolanda Padrón, Ed.D.
Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available:
https://dataportal.education.tamu.edu/Documents/gjN7AfzCSljQz8pytBvPgoY.pdf

Education
1985  Ed.D.  Curriculum and Instruction  University of Houston
1981  M.Ed.  Curriculum and Instruction  University of Houston
1978  B.S.  Elementary Education  University of Houston

Professional Experience
2015-present  Director of Faculty Development  CEHD, Texas A & M University
2006-present  Professor, Bilingual Education  Texas A & M University
1997-2006  Professor, Bilingual Education  University of Houston
2002-2004  Department Chair, Curriculum & Instruction  University of Houston.

Areas of Research Specialization
Bilingual Education, Resiliency, Instruction for ELLs

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Private/Other</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$518,200</td>
<td>$10,557,916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present  \( n = 13; \text{Student co-authors in bold font.} \)


**Professional Presentations Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>With Students</th>
<th>Invited Keynote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivered 2014 - 2018</td>
<td>Career Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Doctoral Advising Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-chair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

202
Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
BIED/EPSY 611: Dual Language Program Methodologies (F14, F15, F16, F17, F18, F19)
EPSY 612: Content Area Instruction for Hispanic Bilingual Programs (Sp 14, Sp 15, SP 16, Sp 18)
EPSY 620: Current Issues in Bilingual Education (F14, F15)
EPSY 632: Research in Bilingual Education (Sp 14, Sp 15)
EPSY 683: Field Practicum (F14, F15, F16, F17, F18, Sp 14, Sp 15, SP 16, Sp 17, Sp 18)
EPSY 684: Professional Internship (Su 14, Su 15)
EPSY 685: Directed Studies (F14, F15, F16, F17, F18, Sp 14, Sp 15, SP 16, Sp 17, Sp 18)
EPSY 691: Research (F14, F15, F16, F17, F18, Sp 14, Sp 15, SP 16, Sp 17, Sp 18, Su 14, Su 15, Su 16, Su 17)

Select External Service Activities
Editorships:


Guest Co-Editor, Teaching and Change, Special Issue on “Issues in Urban Education, Part II” Published by the National Educational Association and Corwin Press.

Co-Editor, Technology and Teacher Education Annual, Research Section

Associate Editorships:

Current Editorial Boards:
Journal of Literacy Research (2014-present),
International Journal of Education and Culture (2012-Present)
Bilingual Research Journal (1995-2016),
International Advisory Board Member, Advances in Teaching and Teacher Education, Y. Lee (Ed.) Sense Publishers (2014-present).
Biographical Information

**Dr. Susan Pedersen, Ph.D.**
Tenured Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology - Texas A&M University
Full CV Available:
https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=spedersen

### Education

2000  Ph.D.  Curriculum and Instruction  University of Texas
1991  M.A.  Teaching, Curriculum, and Learning Environments  Harvard University
1981  B.A.  American Studies  Tulane University

### Professional Experience

2006–present  Associate Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2000-06  Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University

### Areas of Research Specialization

Immersive learning environments; game-based learning

### External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,616,618</td>
<td>124,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present  


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/ International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career-Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

EDTC 602: Educational Technology: Field, Theory, Profession I [F14, F15, F16, S17, S18, F18]
EDTC 621: Graphic Communication and Interface Design I [F15, F17]
EDTC 641: Educational Game Design [S14, F17, F18]
EDTC 651: E-Learning Design and Development [S15, S17, S18]
EDTC 689: Review of Research in Educational Technology [F16]

Select External Service Activities

Current Editorial Boards:
Educational Technology Research and Development, Consulting Editor 2001 – present.
Dr. Cynthia A. Riccio, Ph.D.

Tenured Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
0% Appointment Texas A&M Institute of Neuroscience, Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=criccio

Education

1993 Ph.D. Educational Psychology
University of Georgia
1982 Specialist Diploma School Psychology
University of Hartford
1980 M.S.Ed. School Psychology
University of Hartford
1974 B.A. Psychology
University of Connecticut

Professional Experience

2005- present Professor, Educational Psychology, TAMIN Texas A&M University
2000-2005 Associate Professor. Educational Psychology, FNS Texas A&M University
1997-2000 Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology, Faculty of Neuroscience Texas A&M University
1994-1997 Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology University of Alabama

Areas of Research Specialization
Pediatric neuropsychology, ADHD, learning disabilities, autism spectrum disorder

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$992,473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present  (n = 8; Student co-authors in bold font.)

https://doi.org/10.1177/108705471769822


---

### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Committee Roles</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

- EPSY 618: Neurodevelopmental Disorders in Children and Adolescents [Su15, Su16, Su17] *online* (all)
- EPSY 621: Clinical Neuropsychology [Su14, Su15, Su16 *online*, Su17 *online*, Su18 *online*]
- EPSY 644: Histories of Psychology [Su14] *online*  
- SPSY 611: Legal, Ethical, and Credentialing Issues [Sp14, Su14, F14, Sp15, Su15, F15, Sp16, Su16, F16, Sp17, Su14, F17, Sp18, Su18, F18]  
- SPSY 614: Integrated Assessment [Sp14, Sp15, Sp16, Sp17, Sp18]  
- SPSY 684: Professional Internship [Sp14, Su14, F14, Su18, F18]

### Select External Service Activities

**Associate Editorships:**  
Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment (2006-2014)

**Current Editorial Boards:**  
Journal of School Psychology  
Journal of Attention Disorders  
Applied Neuropsychology
National Leadership Positions:
2017-2020 Treasurer, Division 16 American Psychological Association
2015 Past President, Society for the Study of School Psychology
2014 President, Society for the Study of School Psychology
2013 President Elect, Society for the Study of School Psychology
2013-2015 Treasurer, American Board of School Psychology
2011-2013 Treasurer, Council of Directors of School Psychology Programs
2004-2007 Board Member, Secretary, Trainers in School Psychology
Biographical Information

Dr. Charles R. Ridley, Ph.D.
Tenured Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=ccridley

Education
1978  Ph.D.  Counseling Psychology  University of Minnesota
1971  M.A.  Student Personnel  Ball State University
1970  B.A.  Biblical Literature  Taylor University

Professional Experience
2007-present  Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2000-2007  Associate to Professor, Educational Psychology  Indiana University
1983-2000  Assistant to Associate Professor, Psychology  Fuller Theological Seminary
1979-1980  Assistant Professor, Counseling Psychology  University of Maryland
1977-1979  Assistant Professor, Counseling & Guidance  Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis

Areas of Research Specialization
Multicultural Counseling, Thematic Mapping in Case Conceptualization, Scientist-Practitioner Model

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 — Present  (n = 6; Student co-authors in bold font.)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Presentations Summary</th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/ International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Advising Summary</th>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career-Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair Co-chair Member</td>
<td>Chair Co-chair Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 - 4</td>
<td>40 1 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014–2018)

- CPSY 636: Psychological Consultation to Organizations [F14, F15, F16, F17, F18]
- CPSY 662: Professional Issues/Ethics in Counseling Psychology [Sp16, Sp17, Sp18]
- CPSY 672: Theories of Counseling & Psychotherapy [F14, F15, F16, F17, F18]
- CPSY 683: Field Practicum [Su14, Su15, Su16, Sp17, Su17, Su18]
- EPSY 647: Lifespan Development [Su15, Su16, Su18]
Biographical Information

Dr. Hector Rivera, Ph.D.
Tenured Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University

Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>University of California at Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Applied Educational Research</td>
<td>University of California at Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Psychology/Minor Anthropology</td>
<td>University of California at Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-present</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-13</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>Southern Methodist University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Research Specialization

Developmental Psychology, Bilingual Education, and Research Methods

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Private/Other</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>2,750,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6,266,016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 5; Student co-authors in bold font.)


Tong, F., Luo, W., Irby, B., Lara-Alecio, R., & Rivera, H. (2017). Investigating the impact of professional development on teachers’ instructional time allocation and English learners’ cognitive and


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Presentations Summary</th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Advising Summary</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Committee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

- **BIED 632**  
  Research in Second Language Acquisition [Sp14, Sp15, Sp16, Sp17, Sp18]
- **BIED 620**  
  Current Issues in Bilingual Education [F14, F15, F16, F17, F18]
- **EPSY 689**  
  Methods for Bilingual Research [Sp15, Sp16, Sp17]
- **EPSY 689-601**  
  Advance Methodological Designs for Bilingual Research [Sp14]
- **BIED 685**  
  Directed Studies [Sp16, offered to a group of bilingual graduate students who wanted to work independently in their master and/or dissertation research projects.]
- **BIED 689**  
  Multiple Environments Research-based Practices for the Teaching and Learning of English Learners (F17).
- **BIED 616**  
  Spanish for Bilingual/Dual Lang (Summer 2018)

### Select External Service Activities

- **Editorial Board Member:**

- **Dallas Advisory Committee Member:**
  Hispanic Scholarship Fund, (2016 – present)

### National Leadership Positions:

- 2013- Present  
  Congressional Award Advisory Board Member
Biographical Information

Dr. Leann V. Smith, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor [50% Research, 40% Teaching, 10% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.cehd.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=Lvsmith

Education
2017 Ph.D. Educational Psychology University of Texas at Austin
2015 M.A. Educational Psychology University of Texas at Austin
2011 B.A. Mathematics Texas A&M University

Professional Experience
2018-present Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2017-18 Postdoc, Learning Research and Development Center University of Pittsburgh

Areas of Research Specialization
Cultural assets and social context of Black youth resilience

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 7; Student co-authors in bold font.)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career-Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Committee Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Select External Service Activities

**National Leadership Positions:**
2016-2018 Co-chair of Multicultural Affairs Committee, National Association of School Psychologists
Biographical Information

Dr. Laura Stough, Ph.D.
Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology - Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=wluo

Education
1993 Ph.D. Educational Psychology University of Texas at Austin
1984 M.A. Special Education University of Texas at Austin
1982 B.S. Psychology University of California at Los Angeles

Professional Experience
2016-present Assistant Director, Center on Disability and Development Texas A&M University
2005-present Associate Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University

Areas of Research Specialization
Equitable provision of educational, psychological, and social services for people with disabilities and the psychological and social effects of disaster on individuals with disabilities.

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$72,376</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 12; Student co-authors in bold font.)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivered 2014 - 2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>Career Totals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduated 2014 - 2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>Career Totals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-chair</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

- EPSY 603: Qualitative Methodologies in Educational Research F17, F16, F15
- EPSY 633: Qualitative Research Design and Data Collection F18, S17, F16, F15, S15
- EPSY 637: Grounded Theory Methodologies F18, F17, F16, F15, F14
- EPSY 679: Research on Teacher Effectiveness S13

### Select External Service Activities

**Editorships:**

- **Associate Editorships:**

**Current Editorial Boards:**

- International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction
Current Federal or International Review Panels:
Agency name, agency name, agency name

National Leadership Positions:
Chair, Emergency Preparedness Special Interest Group, Association of University Centers on Disability, 2014-present.
Vice-President, National Training Directors Committee, Association of University Centers on Disability, 2013-2016.
National Training Directors Committee, Association of University Centers on Disability, 2008-present.
Biographical Information

Dr. Christopher G. Thompson, Ph.D.
Tenure-Track Assistant Professor [50% Research, 40% Teaching, 10% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology - Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=Cgthompson

Education
2016 Ph.D. Measurement and Statistics Florida State University
2011 M.S. Measurement and Statistics Florida State University
2009 B.S. Secondary Mathematics Education Florida State University

Professional Experience
2017–present Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2016-2017 Postdoctoral Associate, Measurement and Statistics Florida State University

Areas of Research Specialization
Meta-analysis, Bayesian Data Analysis, Educational Statistics

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present  (n = 6; Student co-authors in bold font.)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>National/International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

EPSY 636: Techniques of Research [Sp18, F18]
EPSY 642: Meta-analysis of Behavioral Research [F17, F18]
EPSY 685: Directed Studies [Sum18]
Dr. Julie L. Thompson, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available:
https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=jlthompson

Education
2014 Ph.D. Special Education University of North Carolina at Charlotte
2011 M.Ed. Special Education University of North Carolina at Charlotte
2005 B.A. Special Education University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Professional Experience
2016-present Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2014-16 Postdoctoral Research Associate, Counseling, Educational Psychology, and Special Education Michigan State University

Areas of Research Specialization
autism spectrum disorder, applied behavior analysis, curriculum design, emergent literacy

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$7,580,547</td>
<td>$450,668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 11; Student co-authors in bold font.)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/ International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-chair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
EPSY 630: Single-Case Research [Sp18]
SPED 618: Induction and Preparation for the Special Education Professoriate [Fa16, Fa17, Fa18]
SEFB 630: Practicum in Applied Behavior Analysis [Fa17, Sp17, Fa17, Sp18]
CEP 894: Practicum in Applied Behavior Analysis [Sp16]
CEP 942: Single-Case Experimental Research Design [Sp15, Fa15, Sp16] *online*
CEP 844: Applied Behavior Analysis 1 [Fa14] *online*
SPED 6272: Program Design and Development for Autism Spectrum Disorders [Sp14] *online*

Select External Service Activities
Current Editorial Board:
Focus on Autism and Developmental Disabilities
Biographical Information

Dr. Fuhui Tong, Ph.D.
Tenured Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.cehd.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=fuhuitong

Education
2006 Ph.D. Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2003 M.A. English Applied Linguistics Shanghai Jiao Tong University
2000 B.S. English and Finance Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Professional Experience
2018- present Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2013-18 Associate Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2007-13 Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University

Areas of Research Specialization
Quantitative research design and methodology in Bilingual/ESL education, program evaluation in educational research with bilingual population, Bilingual education in an international context, second language acquisition

External Funding Activity

| Role       | Federal | State | Private/Other | Career
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014-present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$36,447,694</td>
<td>$1,139,823</td>
<td>$1,059,639</td>
<td>$61,232,509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 — Present \( n = 30; \) Student in bold font.


Huerta, M., Irby, B. J., Lara-Alecio, R., & Tong, F. (2016). Relationship between language and concept science notebook scores of English language learners and/or economically disadvantaged students.
**Professional Presentations Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>National/International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Doctoral Advising Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)**

- EPSY 631: Program Evaluation I \([F15, F16, F17, F18]\) *online*
- BIED 610: Bilingual Assessment and Monitoring \([Sp14, Sp15, Sp16, Sp17]\) *online*
- BIED 617: Evaluation of Programs with Bilingual/language Minority Students K-12 \([F14]\) *online*
- EDAD 690: Educational Statistics I \([Su17]\) *online*
- EDAD 690: Educational Statistics II \([Su15, Su17]\) *online*

**Select External Service Activities**

**Editorships:**

**Current Editorial Boards:**
- Educational Psychology
- International Multilingual Research Journal
- Journal of Bilingual Education Research & Instruction
- Reading and Writing Quarterly
- Sustainability-Section Sustainable Education and Approaches
Biographical Information

Dr. Kimberly J. Vannest, Ph.D.
Tenured Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=kvannest

Education
2000 Ph.D. Curriculum and Instruction Louisiana State University
1994 M.S. Special Education National University
1989 B.S. Business Administration California State University, Chico

Professional Experience
2014-present Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2010-2014 Associate Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2004-2010 Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2001-2002 Clinical Professor, Lect. Educational Psychology Texas A&M University

Areas of Research Specialization
Emotional and Behavioral Disorders
Single-Case Experimental Design

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present  (*n = 16; Student co-authors in bold font.*)


---

**Professional Presentations Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Presentations Summary</th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivered 2014 - 2018</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Totals</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With Students**

Total: 37

With Students: 15

Invited Keynote: 4

**Doctoral Advising Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Advising Summary</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Committee</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
EPSY 630: Single Case Research Doctoral [Sp14, Sp15, Sp16]
EPSY 630: Single Case Research Distance Masters *online* [Sp14, Sp15, Sp16, Sp17]
SPED 642: Emotional Behavioral Disorders [Su14, Su15, Su16, Su17, Su18]

Select External Service Activities
Editorships:
Guest Editor Beyond Behavior (2016)

Associate Editorships:
Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions (Single Issue)

Editorial Boards:
Psychological Assessment
Journal of School Psychology
Behavioral Disorders
Teaching Exceptional Children
Journal of Positive Behavior Intervention and Support
Beyond Behavior
School Psychology Quarterly
Behavior Modification

National Leadership Positions:
2018-2022 V.P. Elect, V.P, President, Past President, Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders
2012-2018 Publications Chair, Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders
Biographical Information

Dr. Steven Woltering, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor [50% Research, 40% Teaching, 10% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology - Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=swolte

Education
2012    Ph.D.    Developmental Neuroscience    University of Toronto
2007    M.A.    Applied Psychology    University of Toronto
2002    M.Sc.    Educational Psychology    Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
1998    B.A.    Teacher Education    Hz University of Applied Sciences

Professional Experience
2014-present    Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology    Texas A&M University
2012-14    Postdoctoral Fellow, Applied Psychology    University of Toronto

Areas of Research Specialization
Neuroscience, psychophysiology, psychopathology, child & adolescent development, self-regulation, intervention.

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 17; Student co-authors in bold font.)


Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
EPSY 673: Learning Theories [S15, F15, S16, S17, S18]
EPSY 673: Learning Theories [F15, F16, F17, F18] *Online*
EPSY 634: Educational Neuroscience [F16, F17, F18]

Select External Service Activities

Current Federal or International Review Panels:
National Science Foundation, USA
National Science Centre, Poland
Biographical Information

Dr. Myeongsun Yoon, Ph.D.
Tenured Associate Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology - Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=myoon

Education
2007 Ph.D. Psychology Arizona State University
2004 M.A. Psychology Arizona State University
2000 B.A. Psychology Seoul National University

Professional Experience
2015-present Associate Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2007-15 Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University

Areas of Research Specialization
Psychometric theory, structural equation modeling, item response theory

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 12; Student co-authors in bold font.)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation Committee Roles</th>
<th>Graduated 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair 2</td>
<td>Co-chair 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

- EPSY 625: Advanced Psychometric Theory [Sp14, Sp16, F16, Sp17, F17, Sp18]
- EPSY 655: Item Response Theory [F14, F15, Sp17]

### Select External Service Activities

- Current Editorial Boards:
  - Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment
Biographical Information

Dr. Dalun Zhang, Ph.D.
Tenured Professor [40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/edit.epl?nid=dalun

Education
1998 Ph.D. Special Education University of New Orleans
1994 M.Ed. Special Education University of New Orleans
1983 B.A. School Education East China Normal University, Shanghai, China

Professional Experience
2012-present Professor, Special Education Texas A&M University
Director, Center on Disability and Development
2005-2012 Associate Professor, Special Education Texas A&M University
1999-2005 Assistant Professor, Special Education Clemson University

Areas of Research Specialization
Transition education and services, self-determination, intellectual and developmental disabilities

External Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>2,769,595</td>
<td>4,064,635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly Publication Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present \((n = 16); \text{Student co-authors in bold font.}\)


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivered 2014 - 2018</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Totals</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Advising Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Co-chair</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 2014 - 2018</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career-Totals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
SPED 619: Critical Research and Practice Issues in Special Education I [F16, F17]
SPED 632: Transition from School to Work [F14]
SPED 623: Self-Determination and Advocacy [Su15]

Select External Service Activities
Editorships:
Co-Guest Editor, Journal of Disability Policy Studies titled “Special Issue on Secondary Analyses of Special Education National Longitudinal Databases” (2010-2011)
Co-Guest Editor (with Audrey Trainor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison) of a Special Issue of Career Development for Exceptional Individuals (200602007)

Associate Editorships:
Remedial and Special Education (2006 – 2013)
Encyclopedia of Special Education (2010-2011)

Current Editorial Boards:
BULLETIN of Special Education (特殊教育研究学刊) [Taiwan] (2012-present)
Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation (2013-present)
Career Development for Exceptional Individuals (20010-present)

Current Federal or International Review Panels:
Administration on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

National Leadership Positions:
2010-2011 President, Division on Career Development and Transition (DCDT), Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)
2015-2018 Chair, Council on Research and Evaluation (CORE), Association of University Centers on Disabilities (AUCD)
2017-2018 Chair, Education Interest Network, American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities
B. Faculty CVs: Faculty other than core
Biographical Information

Glenda Byrns, Ph.D.
Rank [80% Teaching, 10% Service, 10% Research]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University

Education
2007 Ph.D. Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
1976 M.Ed. Speech-Language Pathology Southwest Texas State University
1975 B.S. Speech Pathology and Audiology Southwest Texas State University

Recent Professional Experience
2018-present Clinical Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2012-2017 Clinical Associate Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2007-2011 Clinical Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University

Areas of Expertise
Teacher preparation, Reading Instruction, Instructional Strategies, Language Development

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
Traditional (Face-to-Face) Delivery Format
EDTC 311: Adaptive/Assistive Technology [Sp15]
EPFB 401: Teaching Skills II [F15, Sp16]
SPED 312: Effective Reading Instruction for Students with Diverse Abilities [Sp 14, F14, Sp15, F15, Sp16, F16, Sp17, F17, Sp18, F18]

Web-Based (Online) Delivery Format
SPED 630: Reading [F14, F16, F16] *synchronous
SPED 617: Adolescent Literacy [Sp14, Sp15, Sp16] *synchronous

Student Mentorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>Research/Outreach</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017 - present Associate Department Head for Academic Affairs, Educational Psychology
2015- present Division Chair, Special Education
Scholarly Publication Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Funding Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Awards & Recognition

2018  Association of Former Students University-Level Distinguished Achievement Award for Teaching
2017  Association of Former Students College-Level Distinguished Achievement Award for Teaching
2015  College Nominee for 2015 Association of Former Students University-Level Distinguished Achievement Award for Teaching (Student Nomination)
2014  Extraordinary Service Award, Dean’s Development Council, College of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M University
2014  Diversity Service Team Award, Committee on Diversity Initiatives from the Department of Multicultural Services, Texas A&M University
2010  Howdy Camp 2010 Namesake, Texas A&M University
2009  Student Led Award for Teaching Excellence (SLATE), Texas A&M University
2009  Outstanding Corps Academic Mentor of the Year 2008-2009, Texas A&M University

Select Professional Service Activities

2015 – present  Reading Committee Member, Southerland Aggie Leader Scholarships, Scholarships & Financial Aid, Texas A&M University
2013- present  Faculty Advisor to the Pre-Speech-Language Pathology Student Organization
2013-2015  Co-chair, Education and Trust Building Subcommittee for College of Education and Human Development’s Committee on Diversity Initiatives (CoDI)
Biographical Information

Melissa Fogarty, Ph.D.
Clinical Assistant Professor [80% Teaching, 10% Service, 10% Research]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.cehd.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=presleyshea

Education
2012 Ph.D. Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2006 M.A. Special Education Texas State University
2002 B.S. Applied Learning and Development University of Texas at Austin

Recent Professional Experience
2016-present Clinical Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2013–2016 Assistant Research Scientist, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University

Areas of Expertise
Special Education, Reading interventions, School-based interventions, Fidelity of Implementation

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
Traditional (Face-to-Face) Delivery Format
SPED 471: Classroom Management and Behavioral Interventions [Sp15, F15, Sp16, F16, Sp17, F17, Sp18, F18]
SEFB 425: Student Teaching in Special Education [F18] *included on-site supervision
INST 210: Understanding Special Populations [Sp16, F16, Sp17, F17, Sp18, F18]
SPED 621: Overview of Students with Exceptionalities [Sp17, F17, Sp18, F18]
SPED 683 Field Practicum (Research Competency for M. Mendoza, Graduate Student) [Sp17]

Student Mentorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Teaching</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Publishing</th>
<th>Research/Outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Teaching</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Publishing</th>
<th>Research/Outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 - present Coordinator, Special Education Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program

Scholarly Publication Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 8; Student co-authors in bold font.)

Clemens, N.H, Oslund, E.L., Kwok, O., Fogarty, M., & Simmons, D.C. (accepted for publication). Do word reading skills, text reading fluency, and vocabulary knowledge moderate the effects of a multi-component reading intervention on adolescents’ reading comprehension? *Exceptional Children*.


### Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Career Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External Funding Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Select Professional Service Activities
Scholarship Administrator: Voelkel Scholarship, Sara May Scholarship, Wolf Scholarship, and Charles Butt Scholarships
Committee Member: Council for Educator Preparation Programs
Doctoral Committee Member: Sandy Smith, Jessica Robert
Faculty Advisor for Student Organizations: Student Council for Exceptional Children & Deaf Aggies
Search Committee Chair 2018: Special Education Clinical Assistant Professor
Biographical Information

Fournier, Constance Ph.D.
Rank [80% Teaching, 10% Service, 10% Research]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: Paste link to your full CV from CEHD directory website

Education
1987 Ph.D. Educational Psychology University of Texas at Austin
1980 M.Ed. Education Wayne State University
1975 B.S. Interdisciplinary Studies Wayne State University

Recent Professional Experience
2005-present Clinical Professor Texas A & M University
2002-2005 Associate Clinical Professor Texas A & M University
2000-2002 Senior Lecturer Texas A & M University
1996-2000 Assistant Professor University of Missouri St. Louis

Areas of Expertise
1989 to Current Licensed Psychologist, State of Texas
Special Education; School Psychology (Child, Adolescent, Family and Group therapy); Curriculum Design; Assessment; Instructional Design

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
Traditional (Face-to-Face) Delivery Format
CPSY 676 Family Therapy (Su 2014, 2016.2018)

Web-Based (Online) Delivery Format
CPSY 630 Foundations of Counseling Hybrid synchronous/asynchronous (Su 2014, 2015)

Student Mentorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2012- present Coordinator, Special Education Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program
2012- 2017 College Level Clinical and Instructional faculty review
2011 to 2017 College Level Assessment Team

Scholarly Publication Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st Author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Posters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present *(n = 1; Student co-authors in bold font.)*

Professional Presentations Summary –Peer Reviewed Posters and Presentations


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>National/International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Funding Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Awards & Recognition (since 2014)
2017 Nominated by the College of Education and Human Development for the University Teaching Award
2015 Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists Board Service Award

Select Professional Service Activities (since 2014)
2017 to present Member, advisory board for Texas Department of Health and Human Services on medical transitions for children and youth with chronic physical and mental health conditions
2017 to present Editor, Consortium for Science-Based Information on Children, Youth, and Family for infoaboutkids.org website blogs
2016 to present Reviewer, Training and Education in Professional Psychology
2014 to present Advisory Board Member, Consortium for Science-Based Information on Children, Youth and Family (Consortium of 7 APA divisions)
2011 to Present Children, Youth, and Family Task Force for APA: advising policy decisions, developing avenues for researchers and practitioners to partner for research and advocacy
2014 Ad hoc committee for Texas State Board of Examiners for developing procedures
Biographical Information

Joyce E. Juntune, Ph.D.
Instructional Professor [90% Teaching, 10% Service, 0% Research]
Department of Educational Psychology - Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.education.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=j-juntune

Education
1997 Ph.D. Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
1978 M.S. Curriculum and Instruction St. Cloud State University
1966 B.A. Elementary Education Bethel University

Recent Professional Experience
2017-present Instructional Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2010-2017 Instructional Associate Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
1997-2010 Lecturer, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University

Areas of Expertise
Creativity, gifted education, low SES populations, instruction

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
Traditional (Face-to-Face) Delivery Format
EPSY 320: Child Development for Educators [Sp14, Su14, F14, Sp15, F15, Sp16, F16, Sp17, F17, Sp18, F18]
EPSY 431: Personal Creativity and Giftedness [F14, ]
EPSY 432: Creativity & Creative Problem Solving [Sp15] *asynchronous
EPSY 433: Lateral Thinking [Sp14,F15]
EPSY 646: Issues in Child and Adolescent Development [F14, F15, F16, F17]
EPSY 647: Lifespan Development [F15, F16]
EPSY 648: Intelligence and Creativity [Sp14, Sp15, Sp16, Sp17, Sp18]

Web-Based (Online) Delivery Format
EPSY 320: Child Development for Educators [Su14, F14, Sp15, Su15, F15, Su16, F16, Sp17, Su17, F17, Sp18, Su18, F18] *asynchronous
EPSY 321: Adolescent Development [Su14, Su16, Su17, Su18] *asynchronous
EPSY 431: Personal Creativity & Giftedness [F14, Sp16, Sp17] *asynchronous
EPSY 432: Creativity & Creative Problem Solving [Sp14, Sp16, Sp17] *asynchronous
EPSY 433: Lateral Thinking [Sp14, F15] *asynchronous
EPSY 602: Educational Psychology [Sp15, F15, Sp16, Sp17, Sp18] *asynchronous
EPSY 624: Creative Thinking [F15, F16, F17, F18] *asynchronous
EPSY 645: Creative Genius [Sp16, Sp17, Sp18] *asynchronous
EPSY 673: Learning Theory for Educators [Su16, Su17, Su18] *asynchronous
INST 301: Educational Psychology [Sp14, F14, Sp17] *asynchronous
Student Mentorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College Teaching</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Publishing</th>
<th>Research/Outreach</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- 2017 – present Coordinator, Educational Psychology Master’s Program (Developmental Sciences focus)
- 2012 - present Coordinator, Educational Psychology Master’s Program (Creativiry & Cognition focus)
- 2009- present Coordinator, Creative Studies, undergraduate minor program

Scholarly Publication Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 6; Student co-authors in bold font.)


Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External Funding Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Awards & Recognition

2017  Department Level Teaching Award, Department of Educational Psychology, Texas A&M University.

2014  Association of Former Students (AFS) College Level (College of Education and Human Development), Distinguished Achievement Award in Teaching.

2011  Association of Former Students (AFS) University Level Distinguished Achievement Award in Teaching.

Select Professional Service Activities

2017 – present: Chair of Early Childhood Education Board, Bethel Lutheran Church, Bryan, TX.

2015 – present – Grant reviewer for Ruth Noller Grants for Research on Creativity, Creative Education Foundation, Scituate, MA.

2012 – present: Advisory Board Member for Stepping Stone School (a network of 20 preschool programs in the Austin and Bryan/College Station areas), Austin, TX
Biographical Information

William A. Rae, Ph.D.
Rank [80% Teaching, 10% Service, 10% Research]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: View Document

Education
1975 Ph.D. Counseling Psychology University of Texas at Austin
1970 B.A. Psychology University of California, Berkeley

Recent Professional Experience
2000-present Clinical Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University, College Station
1998-2000 Visiting Asst. Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University, College Station

Areas of Expertise
Provide very brief description or short list of words/phrases

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
Traditional (Face-to-Face) Delivery Format
SPSY 610: Child Psychopathology [F14, F15, F16, F17, F18]
CPSY 683: Field Practicum in Assessment [F14, F15, F16, F17, F18] *includes on site supervision
CPSY 683: Field Practicum in Assessment [Sp14, Sp15, Sp16, Sp17, Sp18] *includes on site supervision
SPSY 683: Field Practicum in Therapy [Su14, Su15, Su16, Su17, Su18] *includes on site supervision
EPSY 682: Preparation for Predoctoral Internship [F14, F15, F16, F17, F18]
SPSY 644: Child Therapy Advanced [Su14, Su15, Su16, Su17, Su18]
EPSY 628: Rorschach with Children [Sp14, Sp15, Sp17]**includes on site supervision

Student Mentorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2000-2018 Director, Counseling and Assessment Clinic, Department of Educational Psychology

Scholarly Publication Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present (n = 2; Student co-authors in bold font.)


Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Funding Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Awards & Recognition
Recipient, Society of Pediatric Psychology, Lee Salk Distinguished Service Award (2000)

Select Professional Service Activities
American Psychological Association, Division 37 - Treasurer (2003-2006)
Association of Psychology Training Clinics - Treasurer (2009-2016)
American Psychological Association, Division 37 - Treasurer (2012-2015)
Biographical Information

Krystal T. Simmons, Ph.D.
Clinical Associate Professor [80% Teaching, 10% Service, 10% Research]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://dataportal.education.tamu.edu/Documents/blUvVbOZ1u8Xjc5ImUlIUS62.pdf

Education
2009    Ph.D.    School Psychology          Texas A&M University
2004    B.A.    Sociology, Magna Cum Laude    Howard University

Recent Professional Experience
2013-present    Clinical Associate Professor, Dept. of Educational Psychology    Texas A&M University
2012-2013        Visiting Assistant Professor, Dept. of Psychology                Texas Southern University

Areas of Expertise
- Crisis intervention and developmental trauma
- Diversity and equity initiatives
- Culturally responsive positive behavioral intervention supports (PBIS) in schools
- Parents’ educational expectations and involvement in schooling
- Early childhood intervention

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

Traditional (Face-to-Face) Delivery Format
SPSY 612: Individual Assessment (adult)-[F14, F15, F16, F18]
SPSY 612: Individual Assessment (child)-[Sp14, Sp15, Sp16]
SPSY 617: Diagnosis of Emotional Disturbance in Children-[F18]
SPSY 614: Crisis Intervention in the Schools- [Su14, Su15]
SPSY 683: School Based Practicum* [Sp14, F14, Sp15, F15, Sp16, F16, Sp17, F17, Sp18, F18]
      *included on-site supervision
SPSY 683: Therapy Practicum [Sp14, F14, Sp15, F15, Sp16, F16]
      *included on-site supervision

Web-Based (Online) Delivery Format
EPSY 689: Histories and Systems of Psychology-[Sp17, Su18]

Student Mentorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scholarly Publication Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present \((n = 1)\)

Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Funding Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Awards & Recognition

- **Oct 2016**: Texas A&M College of Education and Human Development Climate Award
- **Dec 2015**: Legacy Collegiate Middle and High School for Careers in Health and Wellness, Steering Committee Member Recognition
- **2014**: 40/40 Series: Influential Award, Delta Edition-Houston’s Next Generation of Leaders
- **2013**: Award of Honor: Faculty Poster Presentation – Effects of Parent Behaviors on the School Readiness of Children in Head Start. Texas Southern University Annual Research Week
- **2008**: Who’s Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities (Graduate)
- **2008**: Montgomery Prize (Texas A&M University) - Awarded to graduate student who displays excellence in leadership in the community
- **2005**: Kappa Delta Pi International Honor Society in Education, Texas A&M University
- **2004-2007**: Texas A&M University Diversity Fellowship, awarded to graduate students with stellar academic accomplishments and interests in contributing to the diversity of the university and practice. Award total: $100,000
- **2004**: Phi Beta Kappa National Honor Society, Howard University

Select Professional Service Activities

- **2018**: Texas A&M University, Department of Educational Psychology, Ombudsperson
- **2018**: Department of Educational Psychology Search Committee Co-chair for Director of Counseling and Assessment Clinic Director, Clinical Faculty position
- **2018**: National Child Traumatic Stress Network- Psychological First Aid for Schools certified PFA-S Trainer
- **2017-2018:** Texas A&M University, College of Education and Human Development, Global Education Committee
- **2016-2018:** Texas A&M University, Department of Educational Psychology Awards Committee
- **2017:** Texas A&M University, College of Education and Human Development, State Employee Charitable Campaign, Educational Psychology Unit Coordinator
- **2016-2017:** Texas A&M University, Department of Educational Psychology Climate Committee, School Psychology Representative
- **2015-2017:** Texas A&M University, College of Education and Human Development Committee on Diversity Initiatives (CoDI), member
- **2015-2016:** Texas A&M University, Department of Educational Psychology Climate Committee, Co-chair and School Psychology Representative
- **2015:** Texas A&M University, Department of Educational Psychology Strategic Planning Committee, School Psychology Program Representative
- **2014-2015:** Texas A&M University, Department of Educational Psychology Climate Committee, member
- **2014-present:** National Association of School Psychologists certified PREPaRE Trainer: Workshops 1 and 2
Biographical Information

Noelle Wall Sweany, Ph.D.
Rank [80% Teaching, 10% Service, 10% Research]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://dataportal.education.tamu.edu/Documents/C7pD7TJs6cBD1eo5ukuMV5.pdf

Education
1999 Ph.D. Educational Psychology University of Texas at Austin
1994 B.A. Computer Science University of North Texas

Recent Professional Experience
2014–present Clinical Associate Professor, Educational Psychology Texas A&M University
2013-2014 Clinical Assistant Professor, Learning Technologies University of Texas at Austin
2007-2014 Graduate Adjunct Professor, Instructional & Performance Technology Boise State University
2002-2004 Assistant Professor, Instructional Design & Technology Ithaca College
2000-2002 Assistant Professor, Communication Arts University of the Incarnate Word

Areas of Expertise
Online teaching and learning, instructional design, mobile learning, emerging technologies

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
Web-Based (Online) Delivery Format
EDTC 608: Online Course Design [F16, Sp18] *asynchronous
EDTC 613: Integrating Technology in Learning Environments [F14, F15, F17, Su16] *asynchronous
EDTC 642: Designing for Mobile Learning [Sp15, Sp16, F17] *asynchronous
EDTC 645: Emerging Technologies I [F14, F15, F16, Sp18, F18] *asynchronous
EDTC 646: Emerging Technologies II [Sp15, Sp16, ] *asynchronous
EDTC 654: Instructional Design [Sp15, Sp16, F16, Sp17, F17, Sp18, F18 ] *asynchronous
EDTC 655: Instructional Design II [Sp17, Fa18] *asynchronous

Student Mentorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016- present Coordinator, Educational Technology Distance Education Master’s Program
Scholarly Publication Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st Author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

w/ student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National/ International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
<th>National/ International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National/ International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Invited Keynote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National/ International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Awards & Recognition

2018 Outstanding Teaching Award, Department of Educational Psychology, Texas A&M

2017 Named Exemplary Distance Educator, Texas A&M

2017-2018 Recognized by TAMU Veteran Resource & Support Center for outstanding support of recent student veteran graduate

Select Professional Service Activities

2018 Founding Member of the School of Innovation’s faculty advisory board, Texas A&M

2018 Member, Academic and Professional Track Promotion Committee, College of Education, Texas A&M

2018 Teaching and Transformational Learning Technologies Committee, LMS Selection Sub-Committee, Texas A&M

2017-2018 Distance Education Committee, College of Education, Texas A&M

2016-2018 Reviewer for the Annual Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT): Divisions of Distance Learning & Emerging Technologies
Biographical Information

Miranda F. Walichowski, Ph.D.
Rank [80% Teaching, 10% Service, 10% Research]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available: https://directory.cehd.tamu.edu/view.epl?nid=m-walichowski

Education
2009  Ph.D.  Educational Psychology       Texas A&M University
2002  M.A.  Educational Psychology        Texas A&M University
1997  B.S.  Maritime Business Administration  Texas A&M University

Recent Professional Experience
2015-present  Clinical Associate Professor, Educational Psychology       Texas A&M University
2010-2015  Clinical Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology       Texas A&M University

Areas of Expertise
Teacher Preparation, Teacher Efficacy, Instructional Coaching, Coaching in Education, Team Coaching in Schools

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)
Traditional (Face-to-Face) Delivery Format
BEFB 425: Student Teaching in Bilingual Education [FSp13, FSp14, FSp15, FSp16, FSp 17]
*included on-site supervision
BEFB 472: Bilingual and Dual Language Methodologies [F13, F14, F15, F16, F17, F18]
BEFB 474: Biliteracy for Bilingual and Dual Language Classrooms [F13, F14, F15, F16, F17, F18]
BEFB 482: Teachers as Effective Communicators [FSp16, F17, F18]
EPSY 485: Directed Studies [F16, F17]
EPSY 683: Field Practicum [F17]

Web-Based (Online) Delivery Format
BEFB 426: Effective Instruction of Hispanic Students [FSp13, FSp14, FSp15, FSp16, FSp17, FSp18]
**synchronous
EPSY 689: Foundations in Professional Coaching [Sum18]
**synchronous

Student Mentorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2010 - present  Coordinator, Bilingual Education Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program

2017  Chair, Texas Education Agency and Education Testing Center (ETS) Visit to Examine Bilingual Education Program’s Practices in Spanish Academic Language Development (1 of 10 sites), (April 25, 2017)

2017 – present  Chair, Workplace Wellness Subcommittee for the Educational Psychology Department Climate Committee (2017 – Present)

2016 – present  Chair (appointed 2018) & Member (2016-2018), Department of Educational Psychology Climate Committee

Scholarly Publication Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Author</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Presentations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delivered 2014 - 2018</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National/International</td>
<td>Local/Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Awards & Recognition

2017  Recipient of the Educational Psychology Undergraduate Student Mentoring Award.


Select Professional Service Activities

Representative, National Conference on Race and Ethnicity (NCORE), Fort Worth, Texas (May 30 – June 3, 2017)

Member, Academic Civil Rights Investigation Committee (ACRIC), involved in investigation and resolution of complaints against faculty members for illegal discrimination, sexual harassment, or related retaliation charges, Texas A&M University (Fall 2016 – Present)

Member, Office of the VP and Associate Provost for Diversity, Committee to survey non-matriculating Hispanic students, Texas A&M University (Academic Year 2013 - present)

Program Representative to the Chancellor’s Summit on Teacher Education, Texas A&M System, Austin, TX (September 30 - October 2, 2012)
Member of the University Council on Teacher Education, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX (2010 - present)

Program Representative to the Chancellor’s Summit on Teacher Education, Texas A&M System, Austin, TX (October 3-5, 2010)

Consultant to the Career and Technical Education Special Populations Training and Education Resource Center, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX (2009 – 2010)

Service in Professional Societies & Entities

Conference proposal reviewer for Texas Association of Bilingual Educators (TABE), October 2017 State Conference

Item Reviewer of the Bilingual Target Language Proficiency Test (BTLPT) for the Education Testing Service (ETS), (December 2014)

Proposal reviewer for the National Association of Bilingual Educators (NABE), February 2008 National Conference (Fall 2008)

Service in Community

Member of the Districtwide Educational Improvement Council (DEIC) for College Station Independent School District. (August 2015, 3-year appointment)

Developer and Facilitator of Succeeders Program, Program to Coach a Small Group of High School Students on soft-skills, study-skills, and self-regulated learning (Fall 2012 – Fall 2013)

Developer and Content Author of MiraNous, Website and Blog to Serve Educators and Parents (English and Spanish), www.miranous.com (Fall 2011 – present)

Media Coverage

“Bryan-College Stations schools pushing bilingual learning.” The Eagle Newspaper (November 2, 2014)
Biographical Information

Robert "Jay" Woodward, Ph.D.
Clinical Associate Professor [80% Teaching, 10% Service, 10% Research]
Department of Educational Psychology- Texas A&M University
Full CV Available:

Education
2004 Ph.D. Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
1999 M.S. Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
1997 B.A. Psychology  Texas A&M University

Recent Professional Experience
2017-present Clinical Associate Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2011-2017 Clinical Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University
2007-2011 Lecturer, Educational Psychology  Texas A&M University

Areas of Expertise
Creativity and Cognition, Gifted and Talented Education, Child and Adolescent Development, Cultural Diversity and Appreciation, Global Education

Courses Taught Within Past 5 Years (2014-2018)

Traditional (Face-to-Face) Delivery Format
EPSY 321: Adolescent Development  [FSp14, FSp15, Fsp16, FSp17, FSp18]
EPSY 430: Creativity Theories and Research  [F14, F15, F16, F17, F18]
EPSY 459: Field Practicum: Educating Gifted, Talented, & Highly Creative  [Su14, Su15, Su16, Su17, Su18]
* On site supervision
EPSY 602: Educational Psychology  [FSp18]
EPSY 622: Measurement and Evaluation  [F14]
INST 301: Educational Psychology  [F14, Sp14, F15, Sp15, F16, Sp16, F17, Sp17, F18]

Web-Based (Online) Delivery Format
EPSY 622: Measurement and Evaluation  [Sp14]

Student Mentorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-present</th>
<th>Career Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2018 - present Chair, Learning Sciences Division, Department of Educational Psychology
2014 - present Coordinator, Child Professional Services Degree Concentration Program, Department of Educational Psychology
**Scholarly Publication Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Career Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles: 2014 – Present  (n = 3; Student co-authors in **bold font**.)


**Professional Presentations Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National/International</th>
<th>Local/Regional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Keynote</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Awards & Recognition**

2017  Association of Former Students Distinguished Achievement Award – Individual Student Relations

2016  CEHD Golden Apple “Outstanding Educator” Award

2016  Department of Educational Psychology Outstanding Teaching Award

2010  Association of Former Students Distinguished Achievement Award – Teaching (College Level)

2010  Association of Former Students Distinguished Achievement Award – Extension, Outreach, Continuing Education, and Professional Development

**Select Professional Service Activities**

2004 - present  **Director**, Youth Adventure Program, Texas A&M University
C. Institutional Profile
March 15, 2018

TO: External Program Reviewers and Program Accreditors

FROM: Michael T. Stephenson
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Strategic Initiatives

RE: Information required for USDOE Accrediting Bodies

Texas A&M University is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges to award baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degrees. Consistent with comprehensive standard 3.13.1, the following provides the institution’s official position on its purpose, governance, programs, degrees, diplomas, certificates, personnel, finances, and constituencies and is published in official university documents as noted.

Purpose

Classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a Research Doctoral University (Highest Research Activity), Texas A&M embraces its mission of the advancement of knowledge and human achievement in all its dimensions. The research mission is a key to advancing economic development in both public and private sectors. Integration of research with teaching prepares students to compete in a knowledge-based society and to continue developing their own creativity, learning, and skills beyond graduation.

The institution’s official mission statement, published both on the institution’s web page as well as in its annual university catalog, is:

Texas A&M University (Texas A&M) is dedicated to the discovery, development, communication and application of knowledge in a wide range of academic and professional fields. Its mission of providing the highest quality undergraduate and graduate programs is inseparable from its mission of developing new understandings through research and creativity. It prepares students to assume roles in leadership, responsibility and service to society. Texas A&M assumes as its historic trust the maintenance of freedom of inquiry and an intellectual environment nurturing the human mind and spirit. It welcomes and seeks to serve persons of all racial, ethnic and geographic groups, women and men alike, as it addresses the needs of an increasingly diverse population and a global economy. In the twenty-first century, Texas A&M University seeks to assume a place of preeminence among public universities while respecting its history and traditions.

Governance

The governance of the institution was described in the 2012 certification of compliance submitted to SACSCOC.
Texas A&M University at College Station, the flagship institution of the Texas A&M University System, has branch campuses located in Galveston, Texas and Doha, Qatar. A ten-member Board of Regents, appointed by the Governor, directs the Texas A&M System. The appointment of each Regent follows Texas Education Code (TEC, Chapter 85, Section 21).

TEC outlines the duties and responsibilities of the Board of Regents. These responsibilities are also defined in System Policy 02.01 Board of Regents and TEC 51.352. The Board elects two officers: Chair and Vice Chair. There are four standing committees: Audit, Academic & Student Affairs, Finance, and Buildings & Physical Plant. Special committees may be appointed by the Chair with Board approval.

At Texas A&M University the President is the chief executive officer; the President is not the presiding officer of the Board of Regents. The President reports to the state-appointed Board of Regents through the Chancellor of the Texas A&M University System. System Policy 2.05 Presidents of System Member Universities defines the duties of the President. The appointment of the President follows conditions set forth in System Policy 01.03 Appointing Power and Terms and Conditions of Employment, section 2.2.

**Personnel**

The institution is led by the President and members of his cabinet:

- Michael K. Young, President
- Carol A. Fierke, Provost and Executive Vice President, Chief Academic Officer
- Jerry R. Strawser, Executive Vice President for Finance and Operations and Chief Financial Officer
- Michael Benedik, Vice Provost and Chief International Officer
- M. Dee Childs, Vice President for Information Technology and CIO
- Michael G. O’Quinn, Vice President for Government Relations
- Col Michael E. Fossum, Vice President and COO, TAMU-Galveston
- Barbara A. Abercrombie, Vice President for HR & Organizational Effectiveness
- Robin Means Coleman, Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity
- Mark Barteau, Vice President for Research
- Carrie L. Byington, Senior Vice President TAMU Health Science Center, Dean of the College of Medicine, and Vice Chancellor for Health Services
- Daniel J. Pugh, Sr., Vice President for Student Affairs
- Joseph P. Pettibon, II, Vice President of Enrollment and Academic Services
- Gen Joe E. Ramirez, Jr. Commandant, Corps of Cadets
- Amy B. Smith, Senior Vice President and Chief Marketing and Communications Officer
- Scott Woodward, Director of Athletics
- R. C. Slocum, Special Advisor to the President
- David Batson, Sr. Associate Athletic Director, Athletic Compliance
- Shane Hinkley, Vice President of Brand Development
- Andrew P. Morris, VP of Entrepreneurship & Economic Development, Dean of the I-School

**Programs, Degrees, Diplomas, and Certificates**

See the Institutional Summary submitted to SACSCOC

**Finances**

See the Financial Profile 2017 submitted to SACSCOC
INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY FORM
PREPARED FOR COMMISSION REVIEWS

GENERAL INFORMATION

Name of Institution  Texas A&M University

Name, Title, Phone number, and email address of Accreditation Liaison
Michael T. Stephenson
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Strategic Initiatives
979.845.4016
mstephenson@tamu.edu

Name, Title, Phone number, and email address of Technical Support person for the
Compliance Certification
Alicia M. Dorsey
Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness
979.862.2918
amdorsey@tamu.edu

IMPORTANT:

Accreditation Activity (check one):

☒ Submitted at the time of Reaffirmation Orientation
☐ Submitted with Compliance Certification for Reaffirmation
☐ Submitted with Materials for an On-Site Reaffirmation Review
☐ Submitted with Compliance Certification for Fifth-Year Interim Report
☐ Submitted with Compliance Certification for Initial Candidacy/Accreditation Review
☐ Submitted with Merger/Consolidations/Acquisitions
☐ Submitted with Application for Level Change

Submission date of this completed document:  September 29, 2015
1. Level of offerings (Check all that apply)

☐ Diploma or certificate program(s) requiring less than one year beyond Grade 12
☐ Diploma or certificate program(s) of at least two but fewer than four years of work beyond Grade 12
☐ Associate degree program(s) requiring a minimum of 60 semester hours or the equivalent designed for transfer to a baccalaureate institution
☐ Associate degree program(s) requiring a minimum of 60 semester hours or the equivalent not designed for transfer
☒ Four or five-year baccalaureate degree program(s) requiring a minimum of 120 semester hours or the equivalent
☒ Professional degree program(s)
☒ Master's degree program(s)
☒ Work beyond the master's level but not at the doctoral level (such as Specialist in Education)
☒ Doctoral degree program(s)
☐ Other (Specify) _____

2. Types of Undergraduate Programs (Check all that apply)

☐ Occupational certificate or diploma program(s)
☐ Occupational degree program(s)
☐ Two-year programs designed for transfer to a baccalaureate institution
☒ Liberal Arts and General
☒ Teacher Preparatory
☒ Professional
☐ Other (Specify) _____

GOVERNANCE CONTROL

Check the appropriate governance control for the institution:

☐ Private (check one)

☐ Independent, not-for-profit

Name of corporation OR
Name of religious affiliation and control: _____

☐ Independent, for-profit *

If publicly traded, name of parent company: _____
☐ Public state *(check one)

☐ Not part of a state system, institution has own independent board

☒ Part of a state system, system board serves as governing board

☐ Part of a state system, system board is super governing board, local governing board has delegated authority

☐ Part of a state system, institution has own independent board

* If an institution is part of a state system or a corporate structure, a description of the system operation must be submitted as part of the Compliance Certification for the decennial review. See Commission policy “Reaffirmation of Accreditation and Subsequent Reports” for additional direction.

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION FOR REVIEWERS

Directions:
Please address the following and attach the information to this form.

1. History and Characteristics
Provide a brief history of the institution, a description of its current mission, an indication of its geographic service area, and a description of the composition of the student population. Include a description of any unusual or distinctive features of the institution and a description of the admissions policies (open, selective, etc.). If appropriate, indicate those institutions that are considered peers. Please limit this section to one-half page.

2. List of Degrees
List all degrees currently offered (A. S., B.A., B.S., M.A., Ph.D., for examples) and the majors or concentrations within those degrees, as well as all certificates and diplomas. For each credential offered, indicate the number of graduates in the academic year previous to submitting this report. Indicate term dates.

3. Off-Campus Instructional Locations and Branch Campuses
List all locations where 50% or more credit hours toward a degree, diploma, or certificate can be obtained primarily through traditional classroom instruction. Report those locations in accord with the Commission’s definitions and the directions as specified below.

Off-campus instructional sites—a site located geographically apart from the main campus at which the institution offers 50% or more of its credit hours for a diploma, certificate, or degree. This includes high schools where courses are offered as part of dual enrollment. For each site, provide the information below. The list should include only those sites reported and approved by SACSCOC. Listing unapproved sites below does not constitute reporting them to SACSCOC. In such cases when an institution has initiated an off-campus instructional site as described above without prior approval by SACSCOC, a prospectus for approval should be submitted immediately to SACSCOC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Site</th>
<th>Physical Address (street, city, state, country) Do not include PO Boxes.</th>
<th>Date Approved by SACSCOC</th>
<th>Date Implemented by the institution</th>
<th>Educational programs offered (specific degrees, certificates, diplomas) with 50% or more credits hours offered at each site</th>
<th>Is the site currently active? (At any time during the past 5 years, have students been enrolled and courses offered? If not, indicate the date of most recent activity.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Institutions with off-campus instructional sites** at which the institution offers **25-49%** credit hours for a diploma, certificate, or degree—including high schools where courses are offered as dual enrollment—are required to notify SACSCOC in advance of initiating the site. For each site, provide the information below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Site</th>
<th>Physical Address (street, city, state, country) Do not include PO Boxes.</th>
<th>Date Notified SACSCOC by SACSCOC</th>
<th>Date Implemented by the institution</th>
<th>Educational programs offered (specific degrees, certificates, diplomas) with 25-49% credit hours offered at each site</th>
<th>Is the campus currently active? (At any time during the past 5 years, have students been enrolled and courses offered? If not, indicate the date of most recent activity.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Branch campus**—an instructional site located geographically apart and independent of the main campus of the institution. A location is independent of the main campus if the location is (1) permanent in nature, (2) offers courses in educational programs leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential, (3) has its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization, and (4) has its own budgetary and hiring authority. The list should include only those branch campuses reported and approved by SACSCOC. Listing unapproved branch campuses below does not constitute reporting them to SACSCOC. A prospectus for an unapproved branch campuses should be submitted immediately to SACSCOC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Branch Campus</th>
<th>Physical Address (street, city, state, country) Do not include PO Boxes.</th>
<th>Date Approved by SACSCOC</th>
<th>Date Implemented by the institution</th>
<th>Educational programs (specific degrees, certificates, diplomas) with 50% or more credits hours offered at the branch campus</th>
<th>Is the campus currently active? (At any time during the past 5 years, have students been enrolled and courses offered? If not, indicate the date of most recent activity.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**4. Distance and Correspondence Education**
Provide an initial date of approval for your institution to offer distance education. Provide a list of credit-bearing educational programs (degrees, certificates, and diplomas) where 50% or more of the credit hours are delivered through distance education modes. For each educational program, indicate whether the program is delivered using synchronous or asynchronous technology, or both. For each educational program that uses distance education technology to deliver the program at a specific site (e.g., a synchronous program using interactive videoconferencing), indicate the program offered at each location where students receive the transmitted program. Please limit this description to one page, if possible.

5. Accreditation

(1) List all agencies that currently accredit the institution and any of its programs and indicate the date of the last review by each.

(2) If SACS Commission on Colleges is not your primary accreditor for access to USDOE Title IV funding, identify which accrediting agency serves that purpose.

(3) List any USDOE recognized agency (national and programmatic) that has terminated the institution’s accreditation (include the date, reason, and copy of the letter of termination) or list any agency from which the institution has voluntarily withdrawn (include copy of letter to agency from institution).

(4) Describe any sanctions applied or negative actions taken by any USDOE-recognized accrediting agency (national, programmatic, SACSCOC) during the two years previous to the submission of this report. Include a copy of the letter from the USDOE to the institution.

6. Relationship to the U.S. Department of Education
Indicate any limitations, suspensions, or termination by the U.S. Department of Education in regard to student financial aid or other financial aid programs during the previous three years. Report if on reimbursement or any other exceptional status in regard to federal or state financial aid.

Document History
Adopted: September 2004
Revised: March 2011
Revised: January 2014
1. History and Characteristics

Provide a brief history of the institution, a description of its current mission, an indication of its geographic service area, and a description of the composition of the student population. Include a description of any unusual or distinctive features of the institution and a description of the admissions policies (open, selective, etc.). If appropriate, indicate those institutions that are considered peers. Please limit this section to one-half page.

**History.** Texas A&M University was established in 1871 as the state’s first public institution of higher education and opened for classes in 1876. We are now one of a select few institutions in the nation to hold land grant, sea grant (1971) and space grant (1989) designations. We are also one of few universities to host a presidential library; the George Bush Presidential Library and Museum opened in 1997. A mandatory military component was a part of the land grant designation until 1965 and today we are one of only three institutions with a full-time corps of cadets, leading to commissions in all branches of service. We have two branch campuses, one in Galveston, Texas, (established in 1962, officially merged with Texas A&M in 1991) and one in Doha, Qatar (established in 2003). In 2001 we were admitted to the Association of American Universities (AAU) and in 2004 to Phi Beta Kappa. We are classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a Research University (very high research activity).

**Mission.** Texas A&M University is dedicated to the discovery, development, communication, and application of knowledge in a wide range of academic and professional fields. Its mission of providing the highest quality undergraduate and graduate programs is inseparable from its mission of developing new understandings through research and creativity. It prepares students to assume roles in leadership, responsibility and service to society. Texas A&M assumes as its historic trust the maintenance of freedom of inquiry and an intellectual environment nurturing the human mind and spirit. It welcomes and seeks to serve persons of all racial, ethnic and geographic groups as it addresses the needs of an increasingly diverse population and a global economy. In the 21st century, Texas A&M University seeks to assume a place of preeminence among public universities while respecting its history and traditions.

**Enrollment Profile.**
77.42% Undergraduate, 18.41% Graduate, 4.02% Professional, and 0.14% Post-Doc Certificate

**Undergraduate Students:**
93.58% Texas Residents, 3.96% non-Texas Residents, 2.46% non-Texas, non-US Residents;
62.41% White, 3.11% Black, 22.33% Hispanic, 6.21% Asian

**Graduate Students:**
45.09% Texas Residents, 16.57% non-Texas Residents, 38.34% non-Texas, non-US Residents
Admissions Process. Selective. Automatic admission for Texas resident applicants in the top 10% of their high school graduating class; automatic admission for applicants who rank in the top 25% of their high school graduating class and achieve a combined (old) SAT math and SAT critical reading score of at least 1300 with a test score of at least 600 in each component, or combined (newly redesigned) SAT math and SAT evidence based reading and writing (EBRW) score of at least 1360 with a test score of at least 620 in Math and 660 in EBRW, or 30 composite on the ACT with a 27 in the math and English components; review of all other applicants based on academic potential, distinguishing characteristics, exceptional circumstances and personal achievements.

**Peer Institutions.** Georgia Institute of Technology, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, Purdue University, University of California–Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, San Diego, University of Florida, University of Illinois – Champaign/Urbana, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, University of Texas – Austin, and University of Wisconsin – Madison.
2. List of Degrees

List all degrees currently offered (A. S., B.A., B.S., M.A., Ph.D., for examples) and the majors or concentrations within those degrees, as well as all certificates and diplomas. For each credential offered, indicate the number of graduates in the academic year previous to submitting this report. Indicate term dates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATION &amp; JOURNALISM</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>MAGR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL LEADERSHIP &amp; DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL LEADERSHIP EDUCATION &amp; COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL LEADERSHIP EDUCATION &amp; COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL LEADERSHIP EDUCATION &amp; COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRONOMY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>AGRONOMY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE</td>
<td>ANIMAL BREEDING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Life Sciences</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>ANIMAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>ANIMAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>MAGR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>ANIMAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>ANIMAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>ANIMAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>BIOCHEMISTRY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>BIOCHEMISTRY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>BIOCHEMISTRY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>BIOENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>BIOLOGICAL AND AGRIC ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>BIOLOGICAL AND AGRIC ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>BIOLOGICAL AND AGRIC ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>BIOLOGICAL AND AGRIC ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>ECOLOGICAL RESTORATION</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>Ecosystem Science &amp; Mgmt</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>Ecosystem Science &amp; Mgmt</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>FOOD SCI &amp; TCHN-FOOD SCI</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>FOOD SCI &amp; TCHN-INDUSTRY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>FORENSIC &amp; INVESTIGATIVE SCIENCES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>FORESTORY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>GENETICS</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>HORTICULTURE</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>HORTICULTURE</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>HORTICULTURE</td>
<td>MAGR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>HORTICULTURE</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>HORTICULTURE</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>NATURAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>MNRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>NUTRITIONAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>PHYSIOLOGY OF REPRODUCTION</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>PHYSIOLOGY OF REPRODUCTION</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>PLANT &amp; ENVIRONMENTAL SOIL SCIENCE</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE</td>
<td>PLANT BREEDING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>PLANT BREEDING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLANT PATHOLOGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLANT PATHOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POULTRY SCIENCE</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POULTRY SCIENCE</td>
<td>MAGR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POULTRY SCIENCE</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>POULTRY SCIENCE-INDUSTRY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>RANGLND ECL &amp; MGT-RANCH MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>RANGLND ECL &amp; MGT-RANGELAND RESOURCES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>REC, PARK &amp; TOURISM SCI-COM REC &amp; PRKS ADMIN</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>REC, PARK &amp; TOURISM SCI-PARKS &amp; CONSERVATION</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>REC, PARK &amp; TOURISM SCI-TOURISM MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>REC, PARK &amp; TOURISM SCI-YOUTH DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>RECREATION, PARK &amp; TOURISM SCI</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>RECREATION, PARK &amp; TOURISM SCI</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>RENEWABLE NATURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>SOIL SCIENCE</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES</td>
<td>SOIL SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPATIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TURFGRASS SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILDLIFE &amp; FISHERIES SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILDLIFE &amp; FISHERIES SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILDLIFE &amp; FISHERIES SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILDLIFE SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WL &amp; FS SCI-VERTEBRATE ZOOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WL &amp; FS SCI-WILDLIFE ECOLOGY &amp; CONSERVATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUILDING CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN ARCHITECTURAL STUDIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAND &amp; PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>URBAN &amp; REGIONAL PLANNING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>URBAN &amp; REGIONAL PLANNING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>URBAN &amp; REGIONAL SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VISUALIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>VISUALIZATION</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>VISUALIZATION</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT &amp; PUBLIC SERVICE</td>
<td>HOMELAND SECURITY CERTIFICATE</td>
<td>CER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT &amp; PUBLIC SERVICE</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS</td>
<td>MIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT &amp; PUBLIC SERVICE</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS CERTIFICATE</td>
<td>CER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT &amp; PUBLIC SERVICE</td>
<td>NON-PROFIT MANAGEMENT CERTIFICATE</td>
<td>CER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT &amp; PUBLIC SERVICE</td>
<td>PUBLIC SERVICE AND ADMINISTRATION MPSA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>ACCOUNTING BBA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>ACCOUNTING MS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION MBA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PHD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>BUSINESS HONORS BBA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>EXECUTIVE MBA MBA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>FINANCE BBA</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>FINANCE MS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT MFM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>LAND ECONOMICS &amp; REAL ESTATE MRE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT BBA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT MS</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS BBA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS MS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>MARKETING BBA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>MARKETING MS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL MBA MBA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>BBA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>ADVANCED EDUCATION IN GENERAL DENTISTRY</td>
<td>CER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>DENTAL HYGIENE</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>ENDODONTICS</td>
<td>CER</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>MAXILLOFACIAL SURGERY</td>
<td>CER</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>ORAL AND MAXILLOFACIAL PATHOLOGY</td>
<td>CER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>ORAL BIOLOGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>ORTHODONTICS</td>
<td>CER</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>PEDIATRIC DENTISTRY</td>
<td>CER</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>PERIODONTICS</td>
<td>CER</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>PROSTHODONTICS</td>
<td>CER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>ATHLETIC TRAINING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>BILINGUAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>COMMUNITY HEALTH</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>CURRICULUM &amp; INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>CURRICULUM &amp; INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>CURRICULUM &amp; INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>CURRICULUM &amp; INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>EDUC HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>EDUC HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>HEALTH EDUCATION</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>HEALTH EDUCATION</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>KINESIOLOGY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>KINESIOLOGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>KINESIOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>SPECIAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>SPORTS MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>SPORTS MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>AEROSPACE ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>AEROSPACE ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>AEROSPACE ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>AEROSPACE ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>CHEMICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>CHEMICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>CHEMICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>CHEMICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>CIVIL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>CIVIL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG R</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>CIVIL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>CIVIL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>COMPUTER ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG R</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>COMPUTER ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>COMPUTER ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>COMPUTER ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>COMPUTER ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>COMPUTER ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>COMPUTER ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>COMPUTER ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>COMPUTER SCIENCE</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>COMPUTER SCIENCE</td>
<td>MCS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>COMPUTER SCIENCE</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>COMPUTER SCIENCE</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG R</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>DENG R</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>ENGINEERING SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>ENGR TCHN-MANUFACTURING &amp; MCHNCL ENGR</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>HEALTH PHYSICS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td>MID</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG R</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MATERIALS SCIENCE &amp; ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG R</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MATERIALS SCIENCE &amp; ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MATERIALS SCIENCE &amp; ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MECHANICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MECHANICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG R</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MECHANICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MECHANICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>NUCLEAR ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>NUCLEAR ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG R</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>NUCLEAR ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>NUCLEAR ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>OCEAN ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>OCEAN ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG R</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>OCEAN ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>OCEAN ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PETROLEUM ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PETROLEUM ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PETROLEUM ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PETROLEUM ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>RADIOLOGICAL HEALTH ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>SAFETY ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCE</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATIONAL STUDIES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>GEOLOGY</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>GEOLOGY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>GEOLOGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>GEOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>GEOPHYSICS</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>GEOPHYSICS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>GEOPHYSICS</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>MGSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>METEOROLOGY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>OCEANOGRAPHY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>OCEANOGRAPHY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOSCIENCES</td>
<td>SPATIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>ANTHROPOLOGY</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>ANTHROPOLOGY</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>ANTHROPOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>CLASSICS</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>HISPANIC STUDIES</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>HISTORY</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>HISTORY</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>HISTORY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL STUDIES</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>MODERN LANGUAGES</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE STUDIES</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>POLITICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>POLITICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>POLITICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>POLITICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>SPANISH</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>TELECOMMUNICATION MEDIA STUDIES</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>TELECOMMUNICATION MEDIA STUDIES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>THEATER ARTS</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>WOMEN'S AND GENDER STUDIES</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICINE</td>
<td>EDUCATION FOR HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICINE</td>
<td>MEDICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICINE</td>
<td>MEDICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICINE</td>
<td>MEDICINE</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>FAMILY NURSE PRACTITIONER</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>BSN</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>NURSING EDUCATION</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHARMACY</td>
<td>PHARMACY</td>
<td>PHAR MD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH</td>
<td>BOI STATISTICS</td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH</td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH</td>
<td>EPIDEMIOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH</td>
<td>DRPH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH</td>
<td>HEALTH POLICY AND MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH</td>
<td>HEALTH PROMOTION AND COMMUNITY HEALTH SCIENCES</td>
<td>DRPH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH</td>
<td>HEALTH PROMOTION AND COMMUNITY HEALTH SCIENCES</td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH</td>
<td>HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH</td>
<td>OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH</td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>ANALYTICS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>APPLIED MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>APPLIED PHYSICS</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>BIOLOGY</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>BIOLOGY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>BIOLOGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>BIOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>CHEMISTRY</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>CHEMISTRY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>CHEMISTRY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>CHEMISTRY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>MOLECULAR &amp; CELL BIOLOGY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>PHYSICS</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>PHYSICS</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>PHYSICS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>PHYSICS</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>ZOOLOGY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU AT GALVESTON</td>
<td>MARINE BIOLOGY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU AT GALVESTON</td>
<td>MARINE ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU AT GALVESTON</td>
<td>MARINE FISHERIES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU AT GALVESTON</td>
<td>MARINE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>MMRM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU AT GALVESTON</td>
<td>MARINE SCIENCES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU AT GALVESTON</td>
<td>MARINE TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU AT GALVESTON</td>
<td>MARITIME ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU AT GALVESTON</td>
<td>MARITIME ADMINISTRATION &amp; LOGISTICS</td>
<td>MMAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU AT GALVESTON</td>
<td>MARITIME STUDIES</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU AT GALVESTON</td>
<td>OCEAN AND COASTAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU AT GALVESTON</td>
<td>OFFSHORE &amp; COASTAL SYSTEMS ENGINEERING</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS A&amp;M SCHOOL OF LAW</td>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY INTERDISCIPLINARY</td>
<td>AGRIBUSINESS</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY INTERDISCIPLINARY</td>
<td>AGRIBUSINESS</td>
<td>MAB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY INTERDISCIPLINARY</td>
<td>BIOTECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>MBIOT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY INTERDISCIPLINARY</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY INTERDISCIPLINARY</td>
<td>FOOD SCIENCE &amp; TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY INTERDISCIPLINARY</td>
<td>FOOD SCIENCE &amp; TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>GENETICS MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>GENETICS PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>MARINE BIOLOGY MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>MARINE BIOLOGY PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>MOLECULAR &amp; ENVIRONMENTAL PLANT SCIENCE MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>MOLECULAR &amp; ENVIRONMENTAL PLANT SCIENCE PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>NEUROSCIENCE MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>NEUROSCIENCE PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>NUTRITION MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>NUTRITION PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>TOXICOLOGY MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>TOXICOLOGY PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY STUDIES - AGRICULTURE BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY STUDIES - ARCHITECTURE BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY STUDIES - BUSINESS ADMIN BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY STUDIES - EDUCATION BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY STUDIES - GALVESTON BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY STUDIES - GEOSCIENCES BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY INTERDISCIPLINARY</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY STUDIES - LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATER MANAGEMENT AND HYDRO SCI</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATER MANAGEMENT AND HYDRO SCI</td>
<td>MWM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATER MANAGEMENT AND HYDRO SCI</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERINARY MEDICINE &amp; BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCIENCE &amp; TECHNOLOGY JOURNALISM</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VETERINARY MEDICINE</td>
<td>DVM</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VETERINARY PATHOBIOLOGY</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VETERINARY PUBLIC HEALTH - EPIDEMIOLOGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Off-Campus Instructional Locations and Branch Campuses

List all locations where 50% or more credit hours toward a degree, diploma, or certificate can be obtained primarily through traditional classroom instruction. Report those locations in accord with the Commission’s definitions and the directions as specified below.

**Off-campus instructional sites**—a site located geographically apart from the main campus at which the institution offers 50% or more of its credit hours for a diploma, certificate, or degree. This includes high schools where courses are offered as part of dual enrollment. For each site, provide the information below. The list should include only those sites reported and approved by SACSCOC. Listing unapproved sites below does not constitute reporting them to SACSCOC. In such cases when an institution has initiated an off-campus instructional site as described above without prior approval by SACSCOC, a prospectus for approval should be submitted immediately to SACSCOC.

**Off-Campus Instructional Locations – 50% or more.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Site</th>
<th>Physical Address (street, city, state, country) Do not include PO Boxes.</th>
<th>Date Approved by SACSCOC</th>
<th>Date Implemented by the institution</th>
<th>Educational programs offered (specific degrees, certificates, diplomas) with 50% or more credits hours offered at each site</th>
<th>Is the site currently active? (At any time during the past 5 years, have students been enrolled and courses offered? If not, indicate the date of most recent activity.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M Health Science Center</td>
<td>8441 State Highway 47 Clinical Building 1, Suite 3100 Bryan, TX 77807</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>EDUCATION FOR HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS MEDICAL SCIENCES MD MEDICAL SCIENCES MS MEDICAL SCIENCES PHD MEDICINE MD NURSING BSN NURSING EDUCATION MSN PHARMACY PHMD FAMILY NURSE PRACTITIONER MSN</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>842 West Sam Houston Parkway North, Suite 200 Houston, Texas 77024-3920</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>ANALYTICS BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION MBA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Dentistry</td>
<td>3302 Gaston Ave. Dallas, TX 75246</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>ADVANCED EDUCATION IN GENERAL DENTISTRY DENTAL HYGIENE BS DENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH Certific ate DENTISTRY DDS ENDOodontics CTGFA MAXILLOFACIAL SURGERY CTGFA ORAL AND MAXILLOFACIAL PATHOLOGY CTGFA ORAL AND MAXILLOFACIAL CTGFA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Site</td>
<td>Physical Address</td>
<td>Date Approved by SACSCOC</td>
<td>Date Implemented by the institution</td>
<td>Educational programs offered (specific degrees, certificates, diplomas) with 50% or more credits hours offered at each site</td>
<td>Is the site currently active? (At any time during the past 5 years, have students been enrolled and courses offered? If not, indicate the date of most recent activity.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Biosciences and Technology</td>
<td>2121 W. Holcombe Blvd. Houston, TX 77030</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>HEALTH ADMINISTRATION MHA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDICINE MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangel College of Pharmacy</td>
<td>1010 W. Avenue B. Kingsville, TX 78363</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>PHARMACY PHMD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Medicine - Temple</td>
<td>2401 S. 31st Street Temple, TX 76508</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MEDICINE MD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Learning Resource Center</td>
<td>Health Professions Building 3950 North A. W. Grimes Blvd. Round Rock, TX 78665</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>MEDICINE MD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NURSING BSN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Public Health - McAllen Teaching Site</td>
<td>2101 South McColl Road McAllen, TX 78503</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>HEALTH POLICY AND MANAGEMENT MPH</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HEALTH PROMOTION AND COMMUNITY HEALTH SCIENCES MPH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NURSING BSN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University School of Law</td>
<td>1515 Commerce St Fort Worth, TX 76102</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>HEALTH CARE LAW JM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ML</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY MJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JURISPRUDENCE MJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAW JD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAWS ML</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Methodist Hospital</td>
<td>6670 Bertner Avenue, R2-216 Houston, TX 77030</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>MEDICINE MD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University Medical Center</td>
<td>3500 Gaston Avenue Dallas, TX 75246</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>MEDICINE MD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Off-Campus Instructional Locations – 25%-49%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Site (Indicate if site is currently active or inactive. If inactive, date of last course offerings and date of projected reopening)</th>
<th>Physical Address (street, city, state, country) Do not include PO Boxes.</th>
<th>Date Notified SACSCOC</th>
<th>Date Implemented by the institution</th>
<th>Educational programs offered (specific degrees, certificates, diplomas) with 25-49% credit hours offered at each site</th>
<th>Is the site currently active? (At any time during the past 5 years, have students been enrolled and courses offered? If not, indicate the date of most recent activity.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of State Health Services</td>
<td>1100 West 49th Austin, TX. 78756</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>HEALTH POLICY &amp; MANAGEMENT - MPH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Branch Campuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Branch Campus</th>
<th>Physical Address (street, city, state, country) Do not include PO Boxes.</th>
<th>Date Approved by SACSCOC</th>
<th>Date Implemented by the institution</th>
<th>Educational programs (specific degrees, certificates, diplomas) with 50% or more credits hours offered at the branch campus</th>
<th>Is the campus currently active? (At any time during the past 5 years, have students been enrolled and courses offered? If not, indicate the date of most recent activity.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University at Galveston</td>
<td>200 Seawolf Pkwy. Galveston, TX 77553</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>MARINE BIOLOGY BS OFFSHORE &amp; COASTAL SYSTEMS ENGINEER BS MARINE BIOLOGY MS MARINE BIOLOGY PHD MARINE ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY BS MARINE FISHERIES BS MARINE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT MMR MARINE SCIENCES BS MARINE TRANSPORTATION BS MARITIME ADMINISTRATION BS MARITIME ADMINISTRATION &amp; LOGISTICS MML MARITIME STUDIES BA OCEAN AND COASTAL RESOURCES BS OCEAN ENGINEERING BS UNIVERSITY STUDIES – BS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Distance and Correspondence Education

Provide an initial date of approval for your institution to offer distance education. Provide a list of credit-bearing educational programs (degrees, certificates, and diplomas) where 50% or more of the credit hours are delivered through distance education modes. For each educational program, indicate whether the program is delivered using synchronous or asynchronous technology, or both. For each educational program that uses distance education technology to deliver the program at a specific site (e.g., a synchronous program using interactive videoconferencing), indicate the program offered at each location where students receive the transmitted program. Please limit this description to one page, if possible.

**Initial Approval in February 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Bearing Degree Programs</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Synchronous/Asynchronous/Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AEROSPACE ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>MAGR</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>Synchronous course offered worldwide via PC or LMS Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYTICS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILINGUAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILINGUAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGICAL AND AGRI ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG</td>
<td>Synchronous course offered worldwide via PC or LMS Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRICULUM &amp; INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRICULUM &amp; INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION FOR HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>Synchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>course offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>worldwide via PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or LMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIDEMIOLOGY</td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY NURSE PRACTITIONER</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>Bryan, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH EDUCATION</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td>MID</td>
<td>College Station, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>LLM</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JURISPRUDENCE</td>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITIME ADMINISTRATION &amp; LOGISTICS</td>
<td>MMAL</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATHEMATICS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECHANICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>MNRD</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>BSN</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING EDUCATION</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>Bryan, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETROLEUM ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MENG</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANT BREEDING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANT BREEDING</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POULTRY SCIENCE</td>
<td>MAGR</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SERVICE AND ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>MPSA</td>
<td>College Station, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION &amp; RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>MRRD</td>
<td>College Station, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY ENGINEERING</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>Synchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Synchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPORTS MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILDLIFE SCIENCE</td>
<td>MWSC</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILITARY LAND SUSTAINABILITY</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>College Station, TX; Houston, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE E-LEARNING DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLIED BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION FOR HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY SUSTAINABILITY ENGINEERING</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORENSIC HEALTH CARE</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMELAND SECURITY</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL DATA ANALYTICS</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>College Station, TX; Livermore, CA; Sandia, NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>College Station, TX; Houston, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>McAllen, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULATORY SCIENCE IN FOOD SYSTEMS</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY ENGINEERING</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLIED STATISTICS</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Council for</th>
<th>The pharmacy professional degree program</th>
<th>Last Review: April 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Program Description</td>
<td>Last Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy Education</td>
<td>The B.S. and M.S. curriculum in construction science</td>
<td>Last Review: 2011 (B.S.) and 2012 (M.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Psychological Association</td>
<td>The clinical psychology program in the Department of Psychology and the counseling psychology and school psychology program in the Department of Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Last Review: April/May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Veterinary Medical Association Council on Education</td>
<td>The veterinary medicine degree program</td>
<td>Last Review: 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)</td>
<td>The business baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral programs in Mays Business School</td>
<td>Last Review: Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education</td>
<td>The dietetic track in the nutritional sciences curriculum and the dietetic internship program</td>
<td>Last review: January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (caATe)</td>
<td>Athletic Training (College of Education)</td>
<td>Last Review: 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education</td>
<td>The Master of Health Administration</td>
<td>Last Review: Fall 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education and the Texas Board of Nursing</td>
<td>The nursing degree programs</td>
<td>Last Review: July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA)</td>
<td>The degree programs in dentistry and dental hygiene and the certificate programs in the ten advanced dental graduate education programs</td>
<td>Last Review: August 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on English Language Program Accreditation (CEA)</td>
<td>The English Language Institute</td>
<td>Last review: 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing Accreditation Commission of ABET</td>
<td>The computer science program</td>
<td>Last review: 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar of the American Bar Association</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University School of Law</td>
<td>Last review: 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Education for Public Health</td>
<td>The School of Public Health degree programs</td>
<td>Last Review: April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Accreditation Commission of ABET</td>
<td>Undergraduate programs in aerospace, biological and agricultural, biomedical, chemical, civil, computer, electrical, industrial, mechanical, nuclear,</td>
<td>Last Review: 2010-2011 (College Station) and 2015 (Qatar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrediting Agency</td>
<td>Program/Curriculum Description</td>
<td>Last Review Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Accreditation Commission of ABET</td>
<td>Maritime systems engineering (Offshore and Coastal Systems Engineering) – TAMU Galveston</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission of ABET</td>
<td>The electronic systems engineering technology program, the manufacturing and mechanical engineering technology program,</td>
<td>2013-2014 (College Station) and 2015 (Qatar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission of ABET</td>
<td>Marine engineering technology – TAMU Galveston</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science Education Programs Accreditation Commission (FEPAC)</td>
<td>The forensics and investigative sciences program</td>
<td>Last Site Visit: October 2011 (Accreditation dates: 1/2012-1/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Food Technologists</td>
<td>The food science and technology curriculum</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board</td>
<td>The curriculum in landscape architecture</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison Committee on Medical Education</td>
<td>The medical education degree program</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Architectural Accrediting Board</td>
<td>The curriculum in architecture</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration</td>
<td>The Master of Public Service and Administration degree in the Bush School of Government and Public Service</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Recreation and Park Association</td>
<td>The curriculum in recreation, park and tourism sciences</td>
<td>June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Accreditation Board</td>
<td>The Master of Urban Planning curriculum</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Range Management</td>
<td>The curriculum in rangeland ecology and management</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of American Foresters</td>
<td>The curriculum in forestry</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Educator Certification Texas Education Agency</td>
<td>Programs in professional education and degrees conferred by Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) If SACS Commission on Colleges is not your primary accreditor for access to USDOE Title IV funding, identify which accrediting agency serves that purpose.

   Not applicable.

(3) List any USDOE recognized agency (national and programmatic) that has terminated the institution's accreditation (include the date, reason, and copy of the letter of termination) or list any agency from which the institution has voluntarily withdrawn (include copy of letter to agency from institution).
None.

(4) Describe any sanctions applied or negative actions taken by any USDOE-recognized accrediting agency (national, programmatic, SACSCOC) during the two years previous to the submission of this report. Include a copy of the letter from the USDOE to the institution.

None.

6. Relationship to the U.S. Department of Education.

Texas A&M University does not have any limitations or suspensions, nor have we been terminated by the U.S. Department of Education in regard to student financial aid or other financial aid programs during the previous three years. We are not on reimbursement nor do we have any other exceptional status in regard to federal or state financial aid.
## Financial Profile 2017

**Texas A&M University, College Station, TX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue/Expense Category</th>
<th>Amount (in USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total All Revenues &amp; Other Additions (IPEDS Part B, line 25)</td>
<td>$3,448,016,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction (IPEDS Part C line 01, Column 1)</td>
<td>$669,772,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research (IPEDS Part C line 02, Column 1)</td>
<td>$745,169,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service (IPEDS Part C line 03, Column 1)</td>
<td>$251,228,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support (IPEDS Part C line 05, Column 1)</td>
<td>$301,091,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services (IPEDS Part C line 06, Column 1)</td>
<td>$99,426,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support (IPEDS Part C line 07, Column 1)</td>
<td>$114,397,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships &amp; Fellowships, excluding discounts &amp; allowances (IPEDS Part C line 10, Column 1)</td>
<td>$95,452,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises (IPEDS Part C line 11, Column 1)</td>
<td>$226,444,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Services (IPEDS Part C line 12, Column 1)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Operations (IPEDS Part C line 13, Column 1)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses &amp; Deductions (IPEDS Part C line 14, Column 1)</td>
<td>$333,851,618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Indicators (From Audited FY 2016 Financial Statements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Amount (in USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>$5,868,331,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td>$676,361,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unrestricted Net Assets</td>
<td>$4,023,541,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable/Temporarily Restricted Net Assets</td>
<td>$189,683,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonexpendable/Permanently Restricted Net Assets</td>
<td>$978,745,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$2,135,725,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees, Net</td>
<td>$563,324,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Debt</td>
<td>$84,318,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Debt</td>
<td>$1,355,011,877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Signatures of Verification

We certify that the information provided in the Financial Profile and Indicators is correct.

**Signature**

[Chief Executive Officer]

[Chief Financial Officer]

[Respondent (if other than CEO or CFO)]

---

Please Mail Signed Profile Form To:

SACSCOC
Attn: Profiles
1866 Southern Lane
Decatur, GA 30033

Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 72801
MEMORANDUM

TO: Vice Presidents
Directors Reporting to the President

SUBJECT: Delegation of Authority

July 25, 2018

To ensure that operations are unaffected when I am out of the office for extended periods of time, I hereby issue delegation of authority to the following individuals in the order they are listed. They are authorized to act on matters regarding Texas A&M University, Texas A&M University at Galveston, Texas A&M University at Qatar, Texas A&M University Health Science Center and Texas A&M University School of Law. This delegation shall be effective as of the date of execution and shall remain in effect until revoked.

1. Carol A. Fierke, Provost and Executive Vice President
2. Jerry R. Strawser, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer
3. Michael G. O’Quinn, Vice President for Government Relations and Strategic Initiatives
4. Amy B. Smith, Senior Vice President, Chief Marketing and Communications Officer
5. Daniel J. Pugh, Sr., Vice President for Student Affairs
6. Barbara Abercrombie, Vice President for Human Resources and Organizational Effectiveness
7. M. Dee Childs, Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer

Tracy Cullen will know how to contact me if necessary.

Michael K. Young

cc: Mr. John Sharp
In an effort to maintain some of the historical information documented for earlier APRs, the following excerpts (mostly verbatim) come from older self-studies the department prepared.

From the 2011 APR: UNIVERSITY HISTORY ARCHIVE

Texas A&M was the first public university proposed and approved by the State of Texas. In 1876 Reconstruction had just been relinquished by the United States. Maps of Texas showed West Texas as Indian Territory. The "faculty" of Texas A&M College consisted of one mathematician and one. Faculty member designated to teach agricultural chemistry and scientific agriculture. Science as a discipline and education in the classical form at the new land-grant institution were disapproved of by the governor and state legislators, whose concept of the land-grant college was limited to teaching practical applications and job skills. Science and mathematics existed merely to supply instruction to applied fields. This was a new concept to higher education; so new that when the president of the college, Thomas Gathright, and the faculty were unable to meet these objectives, they were relieved of their duties - after only three years of service. Gradually, the College developed a more comprehensive curriculum over the rest of the century. It remained a military school in character for almost a century.

Texas A&M was a college until the 1960s, and as such, it had "schools" rather than colleges. In 1924, it's School of Arts and Sciences was established with four distinct subject areas: liberal arts; business administration; preparation for teaching; and science. Chemistry and physics were actually within departments in the School of Engineering. After World War II more students sought training in the science and engineering. This effort was aided by the success of the Texas A&M Research Foundation, established by President Gibb Gilchrist in 1944. The Texas A&M System was established in 1948, and University designation given in 1963. The system currently includes 11 universities, 7 state agencies, and the Health Science Center with a medical school and other units. Information about the System is available at http://www.tamus.edu/.

In 2003 Dr. Robert Gates, TAMU President, implemented an ambitious expansion of the number of faculty at the University in a targeted process, termed the Reinvestment Program. The intent was to add approximately 2000 new faculty to the University to reduce average class size and increase research prominence of the University through superior faculty additions. This program took place over a 4 year period, but with extensions, failures of searches, and other time-consuming activities, extended almost to 2010 in some colleges. Dr. Gates resigned in December 2006 to assume the position of Secretary of Defense of the United States. With the installation of a new president, Dr. Elsa Murano, in 2008, and her subsequent removal just 18 months later, the program no longer had significant political or administrative support. In 2010 a new president, Dr. R. Bowen Loftin, was installed.

For much of the 2004-2010 period there was a series of gaps in the TAMU administrative team, with an interim Provost position for several years, a similar situation with the Vice President for Research, and various other university level positions in flux. These voids in key leadership positions had a paralyzing effect on desired changes for much of this time. The results of these long-term inconsistencies had a significant negative impact on both research grant submissions and administrative support for programs in EPSY. Although modest improvements were noted, poor support at the university level continued to be problematic for faculty submitting proposals and managing ongoing grants. Other areas problematic to faculty in EPSY during this timeframe included financial limitations in recruitment and graduate student support without the capability to waive tuition due to State law and recent intrusions by external political entities into characterization of faculty productivity solely by student evaluations.
Recent History of TAMU 2011-2018

Currently, Texas A&M is one of the largest single campus universities in size, with over 64,000 students as of Fall 2018, is a member of the Association of American Universities, is one of the largest annual external funding, and is known for its rich traditions and remarkable history. No other university in the U.S. has had a greater change in the last four decades; from a 6,000 member military school to major Tier I research institution. It is one the first four designated Land, Sea, and Space Grant institutions. A bit more is at http://www.tamu.edu/about/facts/history.html.

For the last decade, the overall mission of TAMU has been oriented in operation around Vision 2020.

Department History Archive

From the 2004 APR

The Department of Educational Psychology is one of the five original Departments in the College of Education at Texas A&M University, which was established with the approval of the Regents of Texas A&M University and the Texas Coordinating Board of Higher Education in 1969. Today doctoral programs in the Department of Educational Psychology consist of four distinct administrative units: Counseling Psychology (CPSY), Educational Psychology Foundations (EPF), School Psychology (SPSY), and Special and Bilingual Education (SABE). M.Ed. and M.S. degrees are available in Educational Psychology and M.ED. is also awarded in Educational Technology.

EPSY Department Heads

Christopher Borman  1979-1984
Michael J. Ash   1984-1992
Bruce Thompson  1992-1994
Patricia Alexander (Interim)  1994-1995
Victor L. Wilson (Interim)  2003

Counseling Psychology (CPSY)

From the early 1970's a professional psychology program in CPSY prepared graduate students as psychologists who became employed in the College and University counseling centers, Veteran's Medical Centers, mental health centers, private practice, and the like. The program was accredited by the American Psychological Association in 1978 and has maintained its accreditation ever since. The CPSY faculty also administers a master's program in Educational Psychology that prepares counselors who serve in schools at both the elementary and secondary level.

The doctoral program in CPSY is one of two professional training programs that are supported financially by the mission of the Department of EPSY as part of the College of Education and Human Development.

Since its inception, the Counseling Psychology program has emphasized the integration of science and practice. However, an increased emphasis has been placed on research and research teams, student presentations at professional meetings, and student submissions for publication since the mid 1970s. The CPSY program has emphasized issues related to diversity since the late 1980s. Until 2001, both post-baccalaureate and post-masters students are admitted to the CPSY doctoral program.

Educational Psychology Foundations (EPF)

The Educational Psychology Foundations (EPF) program, then referred to as Psychological Foundations of Education, was first identified as an area of specialization for doctoral study in 1973. The program was described as preparing “specialists in the educational applications of human learning and development as well as in measurement and research methodology” (1973-1974 TAMU
Graduate Catalog, p. 119). Subspecialties suggestive of the current structure of EPF (i.e., “gifted and talented education; human learning and development; planning, research, and evaluation...”) first appeared in the 1981-82 TAMU Graduate Catalog (p. 168).

In 1993, the philosophy and structure of doctoral study in EPF was outlined in a program statement developed by Drs. Ernest Goetz and Dr. Robert Hall. It echoed the descriptions of doctoral study in Educational Psychology when the Department was originally established in 1969 by declaring that EPF doctoral programs were “necessarily interdisciplinary, drawing on expertise in psychology and in other Departments within the College of Education and across the campus (e.g., computer science, linguistics, sociology).” The intent was for “students to build a program of study that provides a firm conceptual foundation and working knowledge of research, measurement, and statistical concepts and techniques while addressing the following four themes: (1) learner characteristics, (2) learning processes, (3) learning outcomes, (4) learning environments.” In helping students develop individualized degree plans built on a common core that addressed the themes identified above, it listed five “illustrative examples of the areas of specialization that a student might follow.” These were Human Development, Intelligence and Creativity, Learning and Instruction, Learning and Technology (a cooperative effort with Educational Technology faculty in the then Educational Curriculum and Instruction Department), and Research, measurement, and Statistics. Since the College reorganization of 1999, the areas of specialization have been revised to the current Intelligence, Creativity, and Giftedness; Learning, Development, and Instruction; Learning and Technology (now Education Technology); and Research Measurement, and Statistics.

The developers of EPF were Dr. William Nash, who joined the Department in 1972, Dr. Michael AS, who came the following year, and Dr. Donald G. Barker (retired), who was hired in 1959 for the Counseling Psychology program but taught numerous research, measurement, and statistics classes. Dr. Walter F. Stenning, currently in Educational Administration and Human Resource Development, also contributed in the area of research, measurement and statistics. Expansion of program faculty began in 1979 when Drs. Enest Goetz and Victor Wilson joined Department, and continued with the additions of Drs. Ames McNamara (from Educational Administration) and Robert Hall in 1982.

Reorganization of the College brought Drs. Gonzalo Garcia, Jr. (currently in Educational Administration and Human Resources Development) and Jerome T. Kapes (retired) in 1986 from Interdisciplinary Education. Dr. Bruce Thompson was hired in 1990, and Drs. Patricia A. Alexander (now at the University of Maryland) and Stephanie Knight moved from Educational Curriculum and Instruction into EPF in 1992. The most recent reorganization of the College brought in Drs. Caile Cannella, Lauren Cifuentes, Karen Murphy, Ronald Zellner from EDCI, and Lloyd J. Korhonen (currently in Education Administration and Human Resources Development) in 2000. From this history, it might be noted that although some outstanding faculty have joined the program from other programs and Departments, the last external hire for the original EPF programs took place more than a decade ago. Further, in the areas of Intelligence, Creativity, and Giftedness; Learning Development, and Instruction; and Research, Measurement, and Statistics, there has been a net loss of tenure-track faculty.

Special and Bilingual Education (SABE)

The third administrative unity in the Department is Special and Bilingual Education (SABE). Special Education has been a focus of the Department through its existence. In 1977 the Texas Education Agency approved the Texas A&M Special Education teacher training preparation program and today all specializations within Special Education are NCATE approved.

With the enrollment of women at Texas A&M University and the concomitant growth of the field of Education, specializations began to emerge. According to Dr. Lannes Hope, one of the first professors in the College, Special Education as a discipline began in 1969, with courses taught by one staff member. In the early 1970s, emphasis in the teaching of children with disabilities grew
nationally; so did the program at TAMU. In 1977 the Texas Education Agency approved the training program and additional faculty members were hired to fill this need in 1977.

Special Education faculty members have consistently been successful in securing external funding to support their programs. This trend began in 1977 and continues today. Initial grants from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) sought to infuse special education strategies into existing education courses, resulting in the EPSY 301 Module approach. These Department of Education resources coupled with Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education funds provided support for students to study at Texas A&M while becoming leaders in the field of Special Education, as well as Employment of Transition from School to Work programs. During the 1980s, the special education faculty developed a six-year model teacher-training program, which resulted in a master's degree in Educational Psychology. The merging of the Special Education faculty and some Career Development Education faculty occurred in the early 1990s providing more instructional support for a growing Special Education program.

In 1987, the Bilingual and English as a Second Language (ESL) education program was initiated in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and was placed within the reading area. In 1991, it became a stand-alone program with Curriculum & Instruction since bilingual education encompasses all four language skills (reading, writing, speaking and listening) and other academic areas in two languages and not just reading. Bilingual/ESL remained in the renamed Department, Department of Teaching Learning, and Culture until 2000.

As it became evident that the demographics in the State of Texas were changing and that Spanish speakers, as well as other "minority" populations were growing, bilingual and multicultural programs were developed. These, too, were supported well by federal funding sources. Initially this program was housed in the Curriculum and Instruction Department; however, it became evident that the coupling of Bilingual education and Special Education was advantageous for both programs to thrive. In 2000 the program was approved to move to the Department of Educational Psychology. The rationale for this move was that EPSY Department has more faculties with areas of expertise specifically in bilingual education and research. Today, the newly names Special and Bilingual Education (SABE) program has established a reputation of attracting great numbers of students, external funding support for our programs, an state and national recognition for research, service, and teaching. ESL education remained in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture; however, the two programs continue to work jointly n preparing teachers for Texas' diverse student needs. Thus far, the program has graduated over 21 doctoral students and over 300 masters students. Almost 850 pre-service and in-service teachers have completed their certification in bilingual/ESL Education.

With the rapid increase in English Language Learner (ELLs), the State Board of Educator Certification in Texas (SBEC, 1999) has recognized the Bilingual/ESL teacher shortages as a critical factor. Over 0% of vacant positions remain unfilled (over 3,000 positions), and 40% of tears are less than fully certified (Texas A&M University Regent's Report, 2002). The highest concentration of ELLs and therefore teacher shortage is found in urban and suburban areas of Texas (Lara-Alecio et al., 2003). Special Education has also been recognized as a shortage area and the Regents Initiative at Texas A&M University is directed at alleviating this shortage.

The SABE program has been extremely successful gathering external resources for supporting new teacher candidates and graduate students in bilingual, ESL, and special education. Currently external funding secured by the SABE faculty is above 10 million dollars for the 2003-2004 fiscal year. This multi-year funding covers such areas as bilingual education, including a training grants for bilingual educators, as well as research in the field of bilingual education, a Family Support Network for parents of children with special need, transition services, reading and special education, a Special Populations Career and Technology Resource Center, a doctoral training grant in special education and a master's training grant preparing educators for students with low-incidence disabilities.

School Psychology (SPSY)
The School Psychology Program at TAMU started when Dr. Lenore Boyd joined the faculty in 1974. Dr. Boyd had been a practicing school psychologist in Texas for several years and she put together a small course of study designed to qualify master's level students for certification as school psychologists.

In the next several years, interest in the program grew, as did the Special Education program in the Department. Because School Psychology and Special Education are related activities, interest in a doctoral program in school psychology developed. In the fall of 1981 the Department hired Dr. Cecil Reynolds and set for him the task of building a doctoral program in School Psychology that could be accredited by the American Psychological Association. In 1984 Dr. Jan Hughes joined the faculty and founded and directed the Department's Counseling and Assessment Clinic.

In 1986, the American Psychological Association accredited the School Psychology program at Texas A&M University. Since then several faculty have come and gone, and several successful accreditation have occurred. Currently the program enjoys being ranked in the top five school psychology programs in the country, is recognized as a leader in diversity in School Psychology, and has been designated as a signature program by the College of Education and Human Development and the President's Office at TAMU. The current faculty are among the best in the nation and program graduate perform important leadership roles in academia, public schools and other clinical settings.

For over 12 consecutive years during the time the federal funding was available, the program has had the Doctoral Bilingual Fellowship program. This federally funded program allowed doctoral students in the program to have their tuition paid, and provided full-time students with a monthly stipend. The doctoral fellowship program also provided some monies for travel and books. This bilingual fellowship program at Texas A&M was the largest in the nation and former fellows are now serving in state and national leadership capacities such as Associate Deans, State Directors of Migrant Programs, Bilingual School District Directors, and of course faculty in Colleges of Education across Texas and the nation and areas with high concentrations of ELLs.

History of Clinics, Centers, Institutes & Libraries

The Counseling and Assessment Clinic (CAC)

Training in child and adolescent assessment (e.g., testing and diagnosis) and intervention (e.g., consultation and psychotherapy) within many of the training programs in the Department requires instruction in direct and indirect health service delivery models. Students begin early in the programs to practice competencies in assessment and diagnosis, consultation, individual psychotherapy, group psychotherapy, and family therapy. This training is best obtained with frequent practice and intensive supervision. Throughout the programs, students practice competencies in assessment and interventions learned in class in the Counseling and Assessment Clinic (CAC), the psychological services and training facility operated under the administration of the Department of Educational Psychology.

The majority of referrals for services in the CAC are received from local school districts, medical and mental health services providers, the Bryan/College station Community Health center, Mental Health and Mental Retardation of Brazos Valleys, United Way Information and Referral Service, and the Juvenile Justice System. In addition, the CAC obtains referrals from the Student Counseling Service and Student Support Services of Texas A&M University. A contract is maintained with the Brazos Valley Community Action Agency to provide services to indigent and low-income clients in the Brazos Valley. Clients served include children (ages 1 and up), adolescents, College students, adults, couples, and families with concerns such as child physical or sexual abuse, child and adolescent behavior disorders, depression, anxiety disorders, domestic violence, relationship difficulties, learning problems, adult child abuse survivor issues, parenting difficulties, and career
issues. Some services are provided in the CAC, while others are performed in community agencies and schools.

The Counseling and Assessment Clinic has been serving the residents of Central Texas for assessment and treatment of psychological disorders since 1984. For 16 years, the CAC was housed exclusively in Harrington Tower on the Texas A&M campus in College Station. In October 2000, the CAC moved all counseling functions into the Bryan/College Station Community Health Center in Bryan. The Community Health Center is an off-campus, community-based facility that was an initiative of two municipalities (College Station and Bryan) and several community social service agencies. This Federally-qualified Community Health Center provides a variety of services to low-income families (children, adolescents, and adults) including family practice, prenatal care, pediatrics, dentistry, health education, and genetic counseling. The CAC-Community Health Center provides the psychological counseling and assessment component within this multi-specialty health center. The doctoral students in the Counseling and School Psychology programs as well as students in School Counseling provide psychological services at the CAC-Community Health Center. In the same way, the CAC-Harrington Assessment Center, the on-campus branch of the CAC, provides specialized assessment services (e.g., neuropsychological testing, learning disability assessments, ADHD assessment) to Texas A&M Students and residents in the community. Both locations of the CAC provide specialized assessment services (e.g., neuropsychological testing, learning disability assessment, ADHD assessment) to Texas A&M students and residents in the community. Both locations of the CAC provide students with assessment and counseling/psychotherapy experiences that are intensely supervised by the School Psychology and Counseling Psychology faculties (i.e., live supervision or videotaping).

The CAC-Community Health Center (CAC-CHC) is located in Bryan at the Bryan/College Station Community Health Center. The CAC-CHC consists of five individual counseling/assessment rooms and one family therapy/group counseling room. The CAC-CHC is open Monday through Thursday evenings in addition to daytime hours. All counseling/therapy rooms are equipped with video recording equipment to be used in supervision and/or research activities. Two of the rooms (one counseling and the family therapy/group counseling room) have direct observation capabilities through one-way mirrors and intensive supervision capabilities through “bug-in-the-ear” technology. The other rooms may be viewed by remote television monitoring for live supervision. Play therapy materials are located in an adjacent area. All rooms and the waiting area are carpeted, appropriately furnished, well lit, soundproofed, and centrally heated and air-conditioned. Free parking is available to clients of the CAC-Community Health Center located adjacent to the regional bus terminal. The CAC-Harrington Assessment Center is located on the Texas A&M campus in College Station in Harrington Hall, the building housing several Departments in the College of Education and Human Development. The CAC-Harrington consists of three individual assessment rooms and is open several evenings a week in addition to daytime hours. All assessment rooms have video-recording equipment to be used for supervision. All rooms and the waiting area are carpeted, appropriately furnished, well lit, soundproofed, and centrally heated and air-conditioned. Free parking is available to clients of the CAC-CHC. Both CAC locations have updated sound systems, color cameras, and VCRs. Each CAC location has several monitors; portable monitors and VCRs on rolling carts provide support for instructional activities.

Support staff for CAC activities include a 50% FTE Clinic Director, full-time graduate student Service Coordinator/Assistant who performs screenings, assigns cases, and provides assessment and therapy services to some clients, a 50% time graduate student/Test Librarian who maintains the Test Library, and a 100% FTE Receptionist. All support staff in the CAC are dedicated to facilitating the training experiences for the student in the School and Counseling Psychology training programs.

In the CAC-Harrington Assessment Center, a complete testing materials library is maintained by a Test Librarian who ensures the tests are available and in good condition. New materials are purchased on a regular basis to keep current with assessment technology. These materials are loaned to students and faculty involved in teaching/learning activities in the Educational Psychology Department. Students may obtain test protocols for use in practica free of charge. A listing of tests
and assessment materials is available in a database that is also used to track student use of library materials. The reception area of the CAC-Harrington has a computer used by the Receptionist to track client activity. In addition, computers are available for student use in scoring and administering psychological tests to clients. The CAC-Harrington also has a test form scanner and software for generating computer interpretations of several popular personality, career, and intellectual measures. In addition to assessment materials, the CAC maintains a small library of relevant, books, videotapes, psychoeducational materials, and reference materials available for use by students and faculty. Both CAC locations are funded through a combination of client fees, state and local Department funds.

**Cognition & Instructional Technologies Laboratories (CITL)**

**Mission:** The mission of the CITL laboratories is to conduct research on technology-mediated instruction, via the application of cognitive technologies designed on the basis of learning and assessment science, and to assist faculty with designing and implementing technology-mediated learning environments.

**Genesis:** The genesis of CITL grew from collaborative faculty initiatives spanning a period of nearly fifteen years arising from the Cognition Science Group (CSG) meetings held in the mid 1980s at Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas. Dr. Robert Hall and Dr. Steve Smith provided CSG leadership. The actual formation of CITL as an interdisciplinary laboratory began to take shape when Dr. Robert Hall and Dr. Mike Pilant, members of CSG, were connected with Andrew Stricker on a U.S. Air Force software development project. Beginning in 1996, Stricker, as a senior associate for Booz-Allen & Hamilton, Inc., wrote the technical proposal to the U.S. Air Force to build an intelligent tutoring system (ITS) for the F-16 fighter aircraft. The proposal resulted in the award of a $24 million dollar contract for the project. As project technical leader, Stricker organized a team involving members from Westinghouse, Asymetrix Corporation, Hughes Aircraft, Booz-Allen & Hamilton, Inc., Deneb Robotics, and SCG members from Texas A&M University to assist him in the construction of the system.

With the departure of Dr. Stricker to Vanderbilt University as a Vice President, the CITL’s scope has dramatically decreased and its future is uncertain.

**Educational Research and Evaluation Laboratory (EREL)**

The Educational Research and Evaluation Laboratory (EREL) was begun in 1983 by Dr. Victor Wilson as the Research Assistance Laboratory (RAL). The intent of the RAL was to 1) to provide research support to graduate students and faculty in EPSY, and on a case by case basis resource-available basis to other members of the University community; and 2) to provide a mechanism to train Research, Measurement, and Statistics graduate students as consultants and to give them varied research analysis experiences. This was based on the Educational Research and Evaluation Laboratory at the University of Colorado, which successfully trained a large number of educational research methodologists in the 1970s. A single graduate student supported by the EPSY Department staffed the RAL initially. Over the next seven years the RAL moved into a suite of offices on the EPSY Department floor, added graduate students supported by the Department (2 students) and the College of Education (2 students) and added computer terminals connected to the mainframe computer on campus. In addition, several evaluation projects were conducted through contracts sought by Dr. Wilson. In the late 1980s several larger evaluation projects were obtained that supported additional graduate students.

In 1990 the RAL was named a College support unit and moved to a different suite of offices on another floor. Soon after the RAL was re-oriented as a technical support vehicle for grants and projects and a new director named. Dr. Wilson resigned from the activity in 1992. The EPSY Department in 1995 determined a need for an entity like the RAL, since the RAL no longer functioned as a research support unit for faculty or students. The RAL acronym was dropped and it subsequently was reconfigured as a technology support unit for the College of Education.
The new unit was named the Educational Research and Evaluation Laboratory. New offices were provided on the main EPSY floor and were equipped with networked PCs. The lab was staffed with two graduate students supported by the Department. A request was made to the new Dean for College support of the EREL make it a College-wide entity with the original focus. The Dean of the College agreed and provided support for two graduate students. After two years the support money for the graduate students was converted into support money for a post-doctoral PhD research scientist, Dr. Lisa O’Dell, at a 50% funding level, with the understanding that grants and contracts would be secured to support Dr. O’Dell beyond that funding. The support was time-limited, ending in 2003.

The EREL also began seeking outside contracts for evaluation and research work. A series of projects resulted, with the funds used to support additional graduate students. By 1999 as many as seven students were supported. This was dependent on contracts, has varied in size, and is now at three students, all currently supported by the Department of Educational Psychology through Instructional Enhancement Fees as well as Department operating monies.

The current mission statement and function of the EREL are presented in the extracted given below from EREL informational materials:

The Educational Research and Evaluation Laboratory (EREL) in the Department of Educational Psychology at Texas A&M University, supports research, development, and evaluation activities of the students and faculty in the College of Education and of their clients and constituencies (e.g., Texas ISDs). Consultation and services provided include:

- problem identification, conceptualization, and refinement;
- research and evaluation planning;
- research design;
- instrument development;
- data collection, coding, and analysis; and
- interpretation, reporting, and dissemination of results.

The EREL is staffed by Director Dr. Ernest Goetz, Associate Directors Drs. Robert Hall and Lisa O’Dell, and three doctoral graduate assistants. An Advisory Board, which includes Drs. Gerald Kulm, Curtis D. Robert Professor of Mathematics Education, Yvonna Lincoln, Ruth Harrington Chair of Educational Leadership and Distinguished Professor of Higher Education, Cynthia Riccio, Associate Professor of Educational Psychology and University Research Fellow, and Dr. Victor Wilson, Professor of Educational Psychology and of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, Director of Cognition and Instructional Technologies Laboratory, and founder of the EREL, provides additional expertise.

The EREL suite, located in 718 EDCT, includes office spaces for its staff and an open-access computer lab equipped with eight Dell Pentium® 4 systems operating at 1.7GHz or higher with 512 MB RAM, 40 GB hard drives, and DVD/CD-RW, 1001250 MB Zip, and 3.5 inch floppy drives. Users can access software such as SPSS, SAS, Lisrel, AMOS, EQS, Atlas.ti, Filemaker, APA Style Helper, Endnote, Dreamweaver MX, Adobe Acrobat and Pa9emaker, and Microsoft Office 2000. In addition, the EREL has 15 laptop computers, including 8 similarly equipped Dell Intel Pentium® 4 Processor 2.0GHz systems, and other equipment (e.g., camcorders, computer projectors) that can be checked out by Educational Psychology students and faculty to support their research and instructional activities.

Institute for the Gifted and Talented

The Institute for the Gifted and Talented was established in 1980, through TAMU System Board of Regents authorization, for the following purposes: (1) to devise and operate summer programs that provide unique educational opportunities for high ability adolescents; (2) to provide professional development opportunities for educators who teach, administer, and counsel in school programs for gifted and talented students or are in preparation to do so, and (3) to conduct research on factors that enhance or inhibit the development of intellectual and creative abilities.

Programs for Adolescents: Summer enrichment experiences over the years have occurred primarily through Galveston Island Adventure (GIA) for gifted and talented teenagers and the Youth
Adventure Program (YAP) for gifted and talented teenagers on the College Station campus. GIA was initiated in the summer of 1980 on the campus of Texas A&M University at Galveston (TAMUG) as a two week educational experience in a general field of study through "hands-on" activities to explore what professional do in related careers. Students resided in dorms and late afternoon and evening recreation and social activities complemented the educational adventure to allow students to experience "College life." During the first year, concurrent study programs were operated in Architecture, Creative Writing, and Marine Biology, and 55 teenagers attended. In subsequent years, additional study programs were added to GIA (e.g., Archaeology, Computers and Robotics, Medicine, Psychology, Space Science, and Veterinary Medicine), and a total of three sessions evolved with approximately 300 teenagers attending each summer. During the mid-1980's, the Institute was turning down a number of students wishing to attending the Marine Biology section and encouraged TAMUG to develop Sea Camp, which now enrolls more than 700 young people in multiple sessions each summer. In 1994, GIA was turned over to TAMUG to allow the Institute to develop the Youth Adventure Program (YAP) on the College Station campus. TAMUG set up a Talented And Gifted (TAG) office and continues to operate the former GIA summer program as TAG.

In 1995, the Institute initiated the YAP in College Station with the same educational format as GIA, but in a one-week residential session instead of two. Currently, YAP offers study programs in Architecture, Computer Design, Journalism, Criminology, Law, Medicine, Music, Psychology, Television Communication, Theater Performance and Veterinary Medicine. Students enroll in one course only per week of attendance and reside in dorms and also experience late afternoon and evening recreation and social events. YAP enrollment has grown from 65 the first year in a single one-week session to 300 in 2003 in four one-week sessions with four course selections taught by University faculty in each.

To enable the Institute to provide funds annually for 10-12 economically disadvantaged youngsters with talent potential, an endowment fund of $100,000 was established by Mr. and Mrs. Tom Read of Houston. Other students pay fees, which generate approximately $200,000 per year to operate the program.

Professional development: Professional development opportunities for educators and those in preparation occur in two ways. They can either enroll for a three credit University course entitled "Practicum in Educating the Gifted & Talented" and assist with the operation of YAP or they can attend one or more in a series of week long/30 contact hour workshops conducted during the summer in a program entitled "Innovation & Creativity in Education" (ICE). Practicum participants live in the dorm with YAP students and assist faculty with instruction, as well as assist with recreation and dorm supervision. Mr. and Mrs. Tom Hogan of Crane, TX have established a $10,000 endowment to annually support the participation of school teachers in the practicum. The ICE program occurs separately each summer and participants enroll in workshops that include topics such as Nature and Needs of the Gifted & Talented, Social and Emotional Development of the Gifted and Talented, Educational Planning for the Gifted & Talented, Teaching Creative Thinking Strategies, etc. Participants pay fees, although many receive support from school districts that employ them.

Research: Research is a normal endeavor of faculty associated with the Institute and has been supported by approximately $615,000 in grants from the U.S. Department of Education, resulting in the publication of numerous research journal articles and occasional book chapters and monographs. Approximately 30 Ph.D. students have also completed dissertations as part of the Institute's research mission. Some have directly collected data through the Institute's summer programs, while others were influenced in the selection of their research topics by their practicum experiences.
Family Support Network

The Family Support Network (FSN) is a non-profit resource center, funded by the Texas Council on Developmental Disabilities that serves the seven county Brazos Valley area. The goal of the FSN is to enable families who have children with disabilities to get the information, support and skills needed to make informed decisions about their lives and those of their children, especially those decisions regarding special education.

Special Populations Career and Technology Center

The Special Populations Career and Technology Information Center at Texas A & M University offers technical assistance and resources on a loan basis to assist Texas educators, support staff, community agencies, employers, and family members in the education of students with special needs to become productive and independent citizens. The Center has been operating since 1977. The Center houses over 4,000 items all related to providing career and technology education for students with special needs.

Material and Services Provided:
1. Materials for use with students--workbooks, textbooks, videos, and more.
2. Materials that teachers can use to enhance their instructional skills--textbooks, handbooks, curriculum guides, and general information books.
3. Materials that administrators and directors can use to create, implement, and evaluate programs-policy manuals, reviews of legislation, program descriptions, reports of research, projects, and staff development materials.
4. Materials for counselors, school psychologists, diagnosticians, parents, employers, and community agencies who have either participated in program planning, provided services, or employed students with special needs.
5. Materials for family members and students to promote understanding, self-determination, and awareness.

From the 2011 APR

After a failed search in the 2002-03 Academic Year, Dr. Victor Wilson was appointed interim Department Head in July 2003 through June 2004. A search during the 2003-04 Academic Year resulted in the appointment of Dr. Michael Benz, Professor of Special Education and formerly at the University of Oregon in a similar position, as Head for a 4-year term. Dr. Benz requested at the end of his term not to be reappointed and to return to the faculty role, having served continuously in administrative posts for 12 years. The Dean of CEHD required an internal candidate search for a new Head, and Dr. Victor Wilson was selected and appointed in July, 2008, for a 4-year term. An interim 2-year evaluation by the faculty, staff, and students in EPSY produced a favorable recommendation for continuation through the term. An end-of-term evaluation will be conducted in the spring of 2012 related to possible reappointment for a second 4-year term. In general TAMU and the College have required mandatory limitation of 8 years for Dean and Head positions.

For the Reinvestment Program, three major areas were targeted in the College of Education and Human Development, two of which were largely centered in the Department. These focused on children, youth and family and on special needs and diverse populations. In the first year of implementation the Department had 9 new positions allocated to it, with a further 8 to be allocated in the succeeding two years. The special education program was greatly expanded to a current membership of 11 tenured or tenure-track faculty, and four clinical faculty (a clinical professor is a nontenured but continuing appointment position that evolved in the late 1990s to focus on instructional activities). At that time planning was conducted to implement a separate undergraduate special education degree under the university's interdisciplinary degree process. This followed earlier mandates that the university not offer any undergraduate degrees in education per se, and that all education certification-focused students obtain a degree in a specific field of study.
With the extensive requirements for teacher certification, however, a practical compromise was developed for elementary and pre-high school certification (pre-school through grade 8) under the umbrella of interdisciplinary studies. The special education B.A. degree was approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board upon application by the university in 2008.

The Bilingual Education program also expanded from a single faculty member to its current size of four tenured or tenure-track faculty and one clinical faculty member. In a process like that for SPED, the undergraduate degree program was developed and approved in 2008. The Educational Psychology Foundations program, renamed two years ago as Learning Sciences, increased its faculty membership by four tenure-track faculty as well as two lecturers not part of the Reinvestment program, between 2004 and 2008. Several senior faculty members retired in 2008, however, and were not replaced as lines were all retained at the College level for review and assignment or to meet demands of a 10% permanent budget reduction demanded by the University in 2010 for the 2011-12 Academic Year and beyond.

The School Psychology (SPSY) and Counseling Psychology (CPSY) programs, although not reviewed as part of this document, experienced changes as senior faculty retired and new faculty were hired. In particular, SPSY gained several faculty initially as part of the reinvestment program, only to lose several to moves and retirements. CPSY experienced a similar change. These have had implications for teaching and mentoring students, as well as inter-program cooperation and interactions. These will be discussed in more detail later.

The total number of faculty consisting of tenured or tenure track professors and PhD level clinical faculty reached 47 by the fall of 2009. In June 2010 the University required a budget reduction for all departments of 10%, to take effect beginning with the 2011 Academic Year starting in September 2011. It ultimately reduced faculty size, between the loss of two faculty due to resignations and four due to retirements, to 42 as of Spring 2011, of which 36 are tenured or tenuretrack.

The losses have differentially affected programs, which will be discussed under the program descriptions. No new positions are currently targeted to any Department programs for the 2011-12 academic year by the College administration.

Changes in programs during the 2004-2011 period included introduction of separate undergraduate programs in bilingual education and special education that were previously only certification options for undergraduates in the Teaching, Learning and Culture Department of the College; introduction of master's degree programs in bilingual education and special education as separate degree listings, previously master's degrees in educational psychology; and abeyance in admissions to the School Counseling master's degree program due to lack of faculty with expertise and interest in maintaining the program and abeyance in admissions to the Educational Technology master's programs due to faculty loss. It is possible both master's programs will be re-developed in the future, as formal termination of programs makes it very difficult to gain approval to develop related degree programs from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

Rankings The department was ranked 14th by U.S.News and World Report in 2012 among departments of educational psychology. While all understand the limitations of such rankings, it does reflect a significant improvement in the department from a small, teaching-oriented department in the 1970s to a large, robust department. The special education program was ranked 17th in a related evaluation. The School Psychology program has consistently been ranked in the top 5 programs nationally for at least a decade. No other programs have been identified by outside ranking groups.
### E. Course Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEFB 425: Student Teaching in Hispanic Bilingual Education</td>
<td>Observation and participation in Hispanic bilingual education classroom activity; supervised student teaching in accredited school. Must be taken on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFB 426: Effective Instruction of Hispanic Students of Diverse Abilities</td>
<td>Field-based application of effective instructional strategies for teaching Hispanic bilingual students of diverse abilities. Must be taken on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFB 470: Bilingual Assessment and Monitoring</td>
<td>Assessment of language ability for second language learners; assessment instruments in bilingual/ESL programs; scoring and evaluation of second language assessment instruments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFB 472: Bilingual and Dual Language Methodologies</td>
<td>Use of theory and effective teaching practice in promoting student’s development of strong social and academic skills; relationship of culture to language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFB 474: Biliteracy for Bilingual and Dual Language Classrooms</td>
<td>Social and linguistic characteristics of second language learners influencing literacy skills; reading and literature instruction for second language learners; reading and writing process across the curriculum for second language learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFB 476: Content Area Instruction for Bilingual Programs</td>
<td>Use of theory and various approaches for integrating English as a second language; learning strategies relating to how plans, procedures and units engage language teachers, students and learning environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFB 482: Seminar in Teachers as Effective Communicators</td>
<td>Effective communication techniques for working with learners, colleagues, administrators and stakeholders; professional and social linguistic protocols for bilingual education teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 610: Hispanic Bilingual Assessment and Monitoring Students</td>
<td>Assessing language ability; language assessment; evaluating and scoring different types of assessments; guided field based experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 611: Dual Language Program Methodologies</td>
<td>Use of theory and effective teaching practice in promoting students’ development of strong social and academic skills; relationship of culture to language; guided field experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 612: Content Area Instruction for Hispanic Bilingual Programs</td>
<td>Theories and approaches for integrating English as second language; learning strategies on how plan, procedures and units engage language teachers, students, and learning environment; guided filed experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 613: Spanish/English Biliteracy</td>
<td>Social-linguistic characteristics of second language learners acquiring literacy skills; reading and literature instruction for second language learners; reading and writing process across the curriculum for Hispanic second language learners; guided field experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 614: Bilingual Education Curriculum Development</td>
<td>Analysis of past and current trends in curriculum development in bilingual education; guided field experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 615: Teacher Action Research in Bilingual Education</td>
<td>Philosophy of teacher action research in bilingual education settings using qualitative methods with educational issues related to English language learners; provide guided practice in data collection, analysis, and presentation of action research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 616: Spanish for Bilingual and Dual Language Programs</td>
<td>Understanding of dual language programs; literacy instruction through Spanish: socio-linguistic perspectives on literacy competence and effective instructional practices; guided field experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 617</td>
<td>Evaluation of Programs with Bilingual and Language Minority Students K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 618</td>
<td>Early Language and Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 619</td>
<td>Second Language Acquisition in Pre-K-12; Advanced Theory and Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 620</td>
<td>Current Issues in Bilingual Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 621</td>
<td>Methods for Bilingual Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 632</td>
<td>Research in Second Language Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 682</td>
<td>Seminar in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 683</td>
<td>Field Practicum in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 684</td>
<td>Professional Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 685</td>
<td>Directed Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 689</td>
<td>Special Topics In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 690</td>
<td>Theory of Educational Psychology Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIED 691</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 600</td>
<td>Counseling Theories for School Counselors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 601</td>
<td>Multicultural Counseling in Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development of children and adolescents and impact their educational trajectories; development and appreciation of cultural and ethnic differences among individuals, groups and families to enhance school counseling service delivery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 602</td>
<td>School Counseling Theories and Techniques</td>
<td>Broad view of counseling theories and techniques using a microskills approach; modules include topics pertinent to the school counseling field; opportunities to observe and practice counseling techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 603</td>
<td>School Counseling Group Interventions</td>
<td>Development of group counseling interventions for children and adolescents in school settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 612</td>
<td>Planning and Organizing Comprehensive Guidance Programs</td>
<td>Purposes and functions of a guidance program; components of a comprehensive guidance program; systems approach to implementing a comprehensive guidance program for elementary and secondary students and adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 626</td>
<td>Psychopathology</td>
<td>Causes, course, outcomes and treatment of abnormal and maladaptive behavior; degrees of variation possible from normal adaptive behavior; biological, developmental, social, cultural and psychological perspective on abnormal behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 630</td>
<td>Foundations of School Counseling</td>
<td>Philosophical, psychological, and sociological concepts fundamental to counseling in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 631</td>
<td>Techniques of Counseling</td>
<td>Methods and procedures descriptive of the counseling process; dynamics of counselor-counselee relationship; interviewing techniques; use of test results in counseling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 632</td>
<td>Career Counseling</td>
<td>Theories of career development; sources, classification and analysis of educational, occupational and social information including occupational trends, post-secondary programs and financial planning; use of occupational-educational information, appropriate psychological measures and computerized guidance systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 633</td>
<td>Introduction to Group Process</td>
<td>Principles, procedures and processes of group approaches to assisting individuals in their personal growth and development in education, public and mental health settings; participation as member of a personal growth required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 634</td>
<td>Group Counseling and Psychotherapy</td>
<td>Major contemporary approaches to group counseling and psychotherapy in mental and public health settings; experiential learning in a simulated group process; integration of theory and practical applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 635</td>
<td>Social Counseling Psychology Interface</td>
<td>Provides a foundation in theory and research at the interface of social and counseling psychology; fundamentals of social psychology theories, methodologies and perspectives; understanding the relevance to counseling psychology practice; focus on social and cognitive theories, concepts, and processes rather than specific psychological disorders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 636</td>
<td>Psychological Consultation to Organizations</td>
<td>Focuses on organizations as the target of analysis, intervention, and change; established social science concepts and principles; consideration of concepts, intervention strategies, and skills that extend beyond those used in counseling and psychotherapy; highlights consultation as a mode of change agency; considerable attention given to putting theory into practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 637</td>
<td>Latino Psychology</td>
<td>Examination of psychological research and literature related to Latino experience in the U.S. via readings, media and class discussion; introduction to various Latino groups with the primary focus on individuals of Mexican descent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 639</td>
<td>Counseling Practicum I</td>
<td>Supervised experience in individual counseling; cases engaged in the counseling laboratory on campus; off-campus counseling in schools and various public and mental health settings also assigned at supervisor's discretion. May be taken for credit 2 times as content varies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 662</td>
<td>Professional Issues in Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>Legal, ethical, economic and practical issues that impact the training, credentialing, placement and marketing of counseling psychologists and their services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 664</td>
<td>Counseling Practicum II</td>
<td>Supervised experience in individual and group counseling requiring advanced technical skills; continuing counseling relationships with various, selected subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 666</td>
<td>Practicum in Counselor Supervision</td>
<td>Supervised experience in directing counseling and guidance activities of students involved in practicum and field experiences; intended for individuals preparing to become counselor educators or supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 671</td>
<td>Dying and Bereavement</td>
<td>Exposure to experiences of others on the topic of dying and loss both through readings and through class presentations and discussions; offers new ways to think about death in general, as well as one's own death and those of one's loved ones; provides mental health provider a foundation in concepts/process of death, loss and bereavement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 672</td>
<td>Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy</td>
<td>Comprehensive and intensive study of major theoretical positions in counseling and psychotherapy; implications for research and practice in public and mental health settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 673</td>
<td>Advanced Psychotherapeutic Skills</td>
<td>Didactic/experiential course, designed for students in professional psychology programs; variety of psychotherapeutic interventions in short and long term counseling with adults in public and mental health settings; ways to access affective process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 676</td>
<td>Family Counseling and Psychotherapy</td>
<td>Basic concepts and techniques in marriage and family counseling in public and mental health settings; marital communication and growth relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 677</td>
<td>Practicum in Clinical Geropsychology</td>
<td>Practicum in theory and strategies for providing mental health services to the elderly; training and supervision of individual counseling and community mental health approaches in a variety of settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 678</td>
<td>Couples Therapy</td>
<td>Theory and practice of marital therapy emphasizing systems and communication approaches; effective strategies and techniques for use in public and mental health settings; therapy with specific marital problems and obstacles to effective therapy. Repeatable to 6 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 679</td>
<td>Multicultural Counseling</td>
<td>Effective communication skills in cross-cultural counseling or helping relationships in public and mental health settings; integration of theoretical knowledge with experiential learning; psychosocial factors and lifestyles of cultural groups; effect on counseling relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 683</td>
<td>Field Practicum</td>
<td>Supervised experience in professional public and mental health settings in counseling psychology; wide range of practical experiences and activities that are closely supervised by departmental faculty. May be taken up to 30 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 684</td>
<td>Professional Internship</td>
<td>Limited to advanced doctoral students; faculty supervised experience in approved professional public and mental health employment settings; application for September assignments must be approved the previous October. May be repeated up to 9 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 685</td>
<td>Directed Studies</td>
<td>Directed individual study of selected problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 688</td>
<td>Research Proposal Development</td>
<td>This seminar models the processes of developing and defending research proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 689</td>
<td>Special Topics in Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>Selected topic in an identified area of counseling psychology. May be repeated for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 690</td>
<td>Theory of Counseling Psychology Research</td>
<td>Theory and design of research problems and experiments in counseling psychology; communication of research proposals and results; evaluation of current research of faculty and students and review of current literature. May be repeated for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSY 691</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research for thesis or dissertation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 345</td>
<td>Microcomputer Awareness for Educators</td>
<td>Focus on both teacher and student utilization; overview of computer operations and instructional integration of word processor, database, spread sheet, and graphics utilities; telecommunications and Internet functions and resources accessed and developed; includes the design, development, and evaluation of instructional materials and integration of MultiMedia and HyperText resources and techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 489</td>
<td>Special Topics in Educational Technology</td>
<td>Selected topics in an identified area of educational technology. May be repeated for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 602</td>
<td>Educational Technology: Field, Theory and Profession</td>
<td>Introduction to the field of educational technology, including media, instructional design, theory and research; exploration of the history and future direction of the field; careers in educational technology through interaction with professionals currently working in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 608</td>
<td>Online Course Design</td>
<td>Application of systematic instructional design principles to the development of online instruction within a learning management system; experience designing and facilitating both asynchronous and synchronous e-learning environments according to evidence-based practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 613</td>
<td>Integrating Technology in Learning Environments</td>
<td>Develops a broad understanding of what is involved in designing technology rich environments to support active learning; examines the integration of human learning theories with instructional design and development practices in the selection, preparation, evaluation, and ethics of instructional technology implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 621</td>
<td>Graphic Communication and Interface Design</td>
<td>Effective communication using visual channel humans use to process information; application of research findings and design principles to the effective design of graphical displays to communicate functionality and structure; critical analysis of the interfaces of everyday objects and e-learning resources;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
includes flawed interfaces, elegant design solutions, user-centered design and usability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 631:</td>
<td>Educational Video</td>
<td>Design and development of educational videos using choice of video edition program; experience the entire process of developing educational videos, from concept to finished project; emphasis on instructional message design, treatment, and storyboarding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 641:</td>
<td>Educational Game Design</td>
<td>Formal and dramatic elements of successful non-educational games for principles of effective game design; application principles to the critique of existing educational games; examination commercial games originally designed for entertainment and their use to address educational objectives; games through the lens of multiple theories of learning and motivation, including situated cognition, flow, and systems theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 642:</td>
<td>Designing for Mobile Learning</td>
<td>Introduction to basics of designing educational applications for mobile devices; emphasis on instructional, visual and human-computer interaction design principles; hands-on design and development work combined with a theoretical approach to designing learning experiences; previous programming experiences not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 645:</td>
<td>Emerging Technologies for Learning I</td>
<td>Evaluation of emerging trends and technologies and their impact on learning and performance; emphasis on technologies currently being adopted in organizations and driving changes in education; hands-on activities examining multiple technologies and identifying best practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 646:</td>
<td>Emerging Technologies for Learning II</td>
<td>Critical examinations of trends and technologies expected to have an impact on learning and performance over the next five years; educational futurist predictions; key factors to consider in adoption/integration decisions; theoretical and technological underpinnings; hands-on activities field of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 651:</td>
<td>E-Learning Design and Development</td>
<td>Design and development of stand-alone instructional programs for independent learning; consideration of research-based principles for the design of these programs, including guidelines for design decisions related to rich media, navigation, learner/program control, practice, interactivity and feedback; application of these principles to design and develop a program on a topic of choice; use of Adobe Captivate and image editing software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 654:</td>
<td>Instructional Design: Techniques in Educational Technology</td>
<td>Introduces systems approach to instructional design with focus on the functions of systems models in planning, developing and evaluating instruction; use of instructional development models which systematically assure proper instructional design; participants will develop instructional products individually and in groups; a strong theoretical foundation utilized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 655:</td>
<td>Instructional Design II</td>
<td>Preparation for leadership in instructional design through exploration of project management, needs assessment, goal analyses, rapid prototyping, problem-based learning, case-based learning, design of learning objects, ID for international</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 656</td>
<td>Computer Graphics: Educational Applications and Production Techniques</td>
<td>Computer graphics production used in the development of educational materials; acquired skills and knowledges applied to the student's interest area with respect to theoretical and research issues relating to the effective instructional use of print and computer-based instructional materials; techniques include digitizing, image-processing and animation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 660</td>
<td>Interactive Video/Multimedia: Production and Utilization</td>
<td>Principles and techniques of interactive video/multimedia design and production; practical applications of media (video, digitized video and audio) production techniques and instructional control programs utilizing authoring software; produce materials for interactive instructional programs involving features such as CD-ROM video and audio, simulations, interactive digital movies, web-based delivery, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 662</td>
<td>Computer Utilization in Educational Research and Practice</td>
<td>Use of computers for application in educational and research settings; activities include student/subject monitoring, hardware use and design, automatic data collection; data storage, retrieval, transmission and analysis; web-based research formats are included; projects will relate to major area of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 664</td>
<td>Management of Instructional Telecommunication Systems</td>
<td>Management of Instructional Telecommunication Systems. Analysis of instructional telecommunications needs associated with educational and training programs; analysis, design, development, implementation and evaluation of computer-based management systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 668</td>
<td>Applications of Telecommunications in Education</td>
<td>Instructional applications of telecommunications; analysis of characteristics of varied systems, both dedicated and public networks, and design of appropriate strategies and methods using those systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 683</td>
<td>Practicum in Educational Technology</td>
<td>Supervised experience in applied area of educational technology; student will plan and develop an integrative product relating to educational technology theory, practice and equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 684</td>
<td>Professional Internship</td>
<td>Supervised experiences in performing professional functions appropriate to career goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 685</td>
<td>Directed Studies</td>
<td>Directed individual study of selected problems in instructional technology not within thesis research and not covered by any other course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 689</td>
<td>Special Topics in...Educational Technology</td>
<td>Selected topics in an identified area of educational technology. May be repeated for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTC 691</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research for thesis or dissertation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPFB 210</td>
<td>Family Involvement and Empowerment</td>
<td>Field-based course that provides information and skills necessary to work with diverse families; addresses need for positive school-family collaboration and characteristics of families throughout the life cycle, the collaboration of educators with families through the special education process, and the provision of family services through community agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPFB 301</td>
<td>Teaching Skills I</td>
<td>Study and development of skills focusing on collaboration, instruction, classroom management and professionalism in P-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPFB 401:</td>
<td>Teaching Skills II</td>
<td>Study and development of skills focusing on individual P-12 students' needs with emphasis on delivering complete lessons from a written plan to include Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) and Individualized Educational Program (IEP) objectives, incorporating modifications appropriately, setting behavioral expectations, and using questioning strategies for high level thinking; field experience in two special education settings. Must be taken on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPFB 484:</td>
<td>Field Experiences</td>
<td>University-supervised experience in a professional employment setting related to specializations in guidance and special education. May be repeated for credit up to 6 hours. Must be taken on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 291:</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research conducted under the direction of faculty member in educational psychology. May be repeated 2 times for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 320:</td>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>Growth and development of the normal child from infancy to adolescence; implications of children's cognitive, language and psychosocial development for success in academic and social interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 321:</td>
<td>Adolescent Development</td>
<td>Characteristics of adolescent growth and development emphasizing behavior within secondary school setting; influences of prior development; home, family and community; peer group, as these affect school adjustment and success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 430:</td>
<td>Creativity Theories and Research</td>
<td>Theoretical base of creativity and the research methodologies used to study creativity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 431:</td>
<td>Personal Creativity and Giftedness</td>
<td>Personal giftedness and creativity and its innerrelativity with development, relationships, and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 432:</td>
<td>Creativity and Creative Problem Solving</td>
<td>Creativity research; historical background and application of the framework and tools of the Parnes/Osborn Creative Problem Solving Process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 433:</td>
<td>Lateral Thinking</td>
<td>Edward deBono's theories and approach to creativity known as lateral thinking which is used throughout the world to increase creative thinking in individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 459:</td>
<td>Practicum in Educating the Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>Theory and strategies for instruction and guidance of the gifted and talented through a supervised experience in a laboratory setting with gifted and talented children and/or adolescents. May be taken two times for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 484:</td>
<td>Field Experiences</td>
<td>University-supervised experience in a professional employment setting related to specializations in guidance and special education. May be repeated to 6 hours total.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 485:</td>
<td>Directed Studies</td>
<td>Research problems and readings in areas selected to supplement existing offerings; individual reports, oral and written, required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 489:</td>
<td>Special Topics in...Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Selected topics in an identified area of educational psychology. May be repeated for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 491:</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research conducted under the direction of faculty member in educational psychology. May be repeated 2 times for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 602</td>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Cognitive analysis of academic skills and tests; current cognitive views of learning, memory, problem solving and development of skill and expertise; effects of aptitude, motivation and task environment on academic performance. Implications for assessment and instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 603</td>
<td>Qualitative Methodologies in Educational Research</td>
<td>Survey of qualitative research methodologies commonly used in educational research; purposes, epistemologies, data collection and analyses that distinguish different qualitative approaches to educational research; ethical and procedural challenges of collecting qualitative data in educational settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 604</td>
<td>Career Counseling in Schools</td>
<td>Understanding the culturally competent career counseling theory, assessment and skills as applied to the diverse populations in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 605</td>
<td>Effects of Culture, Diversity, and Poverty on Children and Youth</td>
<td>Understanding of how the intersecting nature of culture, diversity, and poverty impact adjustment outcomes in children and youth; comprehension of our own belief systems; exploration of disparities in education and mental health across ethnically, culturally and social economically diverse groups; strategies for alleviating educational and mental health disparities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 606</td>
<td>Motivation and Emotion for Optimal Learning and Performance</td>
<td>Role of motivation and emotion in human learning and performance; major theories and empirical research relevant to motivation and emotional impacts of learning, performance, or functioning in a variety of situations, contexts, and cultures; content applied across multiple disciplines including education, counseling or therapeutic outcomes, achievement performance in school, art, music and sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 618</td>
<td>Neurodevelopment and Genetic Disorders in Children</td>
<td>Comprehensive coverage of a broad array of neurodevelopment and genetic disorders in children; emphasis on cognitive and emotional sequelae of these disorders and their relationship to medical, psychological, and educational interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 619</td>
<td>Nature and Needs of the Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>Psychological characteristics of the gifted and talented; introduction to identification techniques, educational programs, instructional approaches and special problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 621</td>
<td>Clinical Neuropsychology</td>
<td>Surveys brain-behavior relationships with an emphasis on understanding the brain as an interdependent, systemic network; administer and score the Halstead-Reitan Neuropsychological Test Battery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 622</td>
<td>Measurement and Evaluation in Education</td>
<td>Principles of psychological testing applied to education; uses and critical evaluation of achievement and aptitude, interest, and personality tests and performance in educational settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 623</td>
<td>Social and Emotional Development of the Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>Theoretical models and patterns of social and emotional development among the gifted and talented through adolescence; implications and strategies for educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 624</td>
<td>Creative Thinking</td>
<td>Development of personal creativity across fields of endeavor; analysis of creative potential, including psychometric assessment; experience of methods for stimulating creative processing and productivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 625</td>
<td>Advanced Psychometric Theory</td>
<td>Psychometric theory, planning, construction, analysis, and evaluation of written and performance tests; item analysis,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 626: At-Risk Hispanic Families and Their Young Children</td>
<td>Provides educational practitioners and related personnel with the conceptual and theoretical foundations for understanding the nature and impact of exposure to childhood risks on literacy, physical and mental health development of Hispanic families and their young children within developmental framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 627: Structured Personality Assessment in Counseling</td>
<td>Personality evaluation using structured assessment instruments; variety of self-report personality inventories; the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 628: The Rorschach Technique with Children and Adolescents</td>
<td>Analysis of the Rorschach Technique; basic issues in projective assessment, scoring, interpreting and analyzing the Rorschach, with an emphasis on its clinical use with children and adolescents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 629: Educational Planning for the Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>Theoretical issues confronting educators involved in program development for gifted and talented children and adolescents; analysis of educational perspectives and instructional implications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 630: Single-Case Experimental Design</td>
<td>Teaches measurement, design, implementation, and analysis skills to conduct research with single-subject design; review and summarize the quality of single-case literature, plan and implement AB designs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 631: Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Learning of key evaluation skills such as establishing focus with client, posing evaluation questions, data collection techniques, designing for internal validity, data aggregation; scenario practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 633: Qualitative Research Design and Data Collection</td>
<td>Introduction to qualitative designs used to answer educational, psychological, or social research questions; historical foundations, epistemologies and essential elements of prevalent qualitative research designs; methods of collecting qualitative data including interviews, naturalistic observation, participant-observation, and stimulated recall procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 634: Educational Neuroscience</td>
<td>Human learning form a biological perspective; fundamentals of genetics, neuroscience and the principles used to better understand the conditions in which brains develop and function optimally; biological substrates of emotions and motivation, as well as executive functions (e.g. working memory, attentional control) and skills related to language and mathematics; neuroscience and application to atypical learners; emotional, learning and other disorders that make learning and succeeding in educational contexts more challenging.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 635: Educational Statistics</td>
<td>Introduction to the theory and application of statistical methods in behavioral science research with emphasis on classroom applications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 636: Techniques of Research</td>
<td>Fundamental concepts and tools of research applied to psychological and educational problems; rationale of research, analysis of problems, library skills, sampling, appraisal instruments, statistical description and inference, writing the research report and representative research designs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Course Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 637</td>
<td>Qualitative Grounded Theory Methodologies</td>
<td>Methods of collecting qualitative data to answer educational or psychological questions using Grounded Theory methodologies; analysis and interpretation of data using Grounded Theory methodologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 640</td>
<td>Experimental Design in Education I</td>
<td>Preparation in experimental research design in educational studies; application of statistical methods in these designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 641</td>
<td>Experimental Design in Education II</td>
<td>Preparation in research design in educational studies; application of statistical methods in these designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 642</td>
<td>Meta-Analysis of Behavioral Research</td>
<td>Principles and use of quantitative techniques for research integration in education and other behavioral disciplines; computer-based and branching literature searches, coding protocols, theory of effect size estimation, analysis and reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 643</td>
<td>Applied Multivariate Methods</td>
<td>This seminar presents various techniques for applied multivariate modeling of phenomena in educational psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 644</td>
<td>Histories of Psychology</td>
<td>Comprehensive understanding of the histories, including theoretical foundations, pivotal contributions and contributors, within the field of psychology that have led to current conceptualizations and applied, professional practice of psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 645</td>
<td>Creative Genius</td>
<td>Analysis of patterns of development among highly creative individuals; required dramatic presentation on the life and accomplishments of a selected individual through the use of the soliloquy stage technique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 646</td>
<td>Issues in Child and Adolescent Development</td>
<td>Theoretical orientations, issues, research strategies and empirical findings of developmental psychology relevant to education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 647</td>
<td>Lifespan Development</td>
<td>Issues and models of studying lifespan development; research and theory of lifespan development; comprehensive and current foundation of lifespan development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 648</td>
<td>Intelligence and Creativity</td>
<td>Considers theory, research, methodologies and issues related to the definition, identification and assessment of intelligence, and assessment of intelligence and creativity; addresses theories of intelligence and creativity; methodologies and issues related to assessment of both; relationship between them; and frameworks for fostering creativity; considers implications/applications of theory and research on effective teaching practices for creativity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 649</td>
<td>Introduction to Survey Research</td>
<td>Introduction to the primary concepts of survey design including current knowledge about sources of error in surveys, sampling, instrumentation, field-testing, survey operations, nonresponse bias analysis and correction, and primary and secondary analysis of survey data; no prior experience in survey methods is expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 650</td>
<td>Multiple Regression and Other Linear Models in Education Research</td>
<td>Overview of basic and advanced topics in regression analysis; equal emphasis on developing procedural knowledge, statistical theory, research designs, and practical issues and methods using statistics in empirical research; basis of linear regression models and logistic regression models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 652:</td>
<td>Theory of Hierarchical Linear Models</td>
<td>Introduction to the theory and application of hierarchical linear models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 653:</td>
<td>Advanced Structural Equation Modeling</td>
<td>Advanced topics of structural equation models; includes exploratory factor analysis under the structural equation modeling framework, testing factorial invariance, structural equation models with categorical observed variables, multilevel structural equation models, latent growth models, and growth mixture models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 654:</td>
<td>Longitudinal Data Analysis</td>
<td>Review of traditional approaches to longitudinal data analysis (e.g., MANOVA); consideration of newer approaches including multilevel modeling (MLM) and latent growth modeling (LGM) and their advantages in analyzing longitudinal data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 655:</td>
<td>Item Response Theory</td>
<td>Advanced measurement topics in item response models; theoretical foundations and practical applications of IRT models; dichotomous and polytomous IRT models including Rasch model (IPL model), 2-PL model, 3-PL model, rating scale model, partial credit model, and graded response model; analysis based on each model illustrated using BILOG-MG, PARSCALE, and M-plus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 656:</td>
<td>Survey Instrument Development</td>
<td>Experiences in developing instruments to measure cognition, attitude or behavior; issues and practices relating to construct specification, instrument design and administration; emphasis on analysis and summary of validity study data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 659:</td>
<td>Practicum in Educating the Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>Theory and strategies for instruction and guidance of the gifted and talented through a supervised experience in a laboratory setting with gifted and talented children and/or adolescents. May be taken three times for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 660:</td>
<td>Single Case Experimental Design Research Methodology</td>
<td>Teaches critical evaluation of single-case experimental design; development of logic models, socially significant research questions, and complex research designs; advanced topics in design, rigor, replication, reliability, validity and measurement in single-case experimental designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 671:</td>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships and Children's Academic Outcomes</td>
<td>Exploration of the role of children's interpersonal relationships on their school engagement and academic performance; emphasis on parent-child, peer and teacher-student relationships across the formal schooling years (K-12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 673:</td>
<td>Learning Theories</td>
<td>Comprehensive study of classical and current learning theories; their significance to modern education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 679:</td>
<td>Research on Teacher Effectiveness</td>
<td>Considers theory, research and methodologies related to the definition and identification of effective teaching practices; practice, implications and applications of theory and research in educational psychology on effective teaching practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 682:</td>
<td>Seminar in EPSY</td>
<td>Knowledge, skills and attitudes in special education, counseling, psychological foundations of education and school psychology. Specific topics are announced for each seminar offered. May be taken more than once but not to exceed 6 hours of credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 683:</td>
<td>Field Practicum in</td>
<td>Supervised experience in professional employment settings in educational psychology. Wide range of practical experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and activities as listed below that are closely supervised by departmental faculty. Repeatable to 15 hours total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 684:</td>
<td>Professional Internship</td>
<td>Limited to advanced doctoral students; University-directed experience in a professional employment setting; full-time participation and responsibility in experiences related to career specializations in counseling or school psychology. Repeatable to 9 hours total.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 685:</td>
<td>Directed Studies</td>
<td>Directed individual study of selected problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 688 / CPSY 688</td>
<td>Research Proposal Development</td>
<td>This seminar models the processes of developing and defending research proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 689:</td>
<td>Special Topics in</td>
<td>Selected topics in an identified area of educational psychology. May be repeated for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 690:</td>
<td>Theory of Educational Psychology Research</td>
<td>Theory and design of research problems and experiments in various subfields of educational psychology; communication of research proposals and results; evaluation of current research of faculty and students and review of current literature. May be repeated for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 691:</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research for thesis or dissertation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 210:</td>
<td>Understanding Special Populations</td>
<td>Referral, assessment and categorization of special populations including physical, cognitive and affective characteristics; cultural, ethnic, economic and linguistic differences; giftedness; special education and compensatory programs; awareness of legislative history that results in rights for special populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 301:</td>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Application of psychology to problems of teaching. Nature and operation of principles of learning, transfer of training; nature, measurement and significance of individual differences; conditions influencing efficiency of learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEFB 420:</td>
<td>Education and Employment Issues in Secondary</td>
<td>Field-based course involving psychological, social, physical and cognitive development of secondary-age students; career assessment; programmatic options within educational and employment settings; transition models from school to adult settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEFB 425:</td>
<td>Student Teaching in Special Education</td>
<td>Observation and participation in an accredited special education classroom; techniques of teaching special education and appropriate instructional strategies for students with exceptionalities. Must be taken on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEFB 430:</td>
<td>Practicum in Applied Behavior Analysis</td>
<td>University-supervised experience related to specializations in special education and behavior analysis. May be taken 8 times for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEFB 431:</td>
<td>Intensive Practicum in Applied Behavior Analysis</td>
<td>University-supervised intensive experience related to specializations in special education and behavior analysis. May be taken 8 times for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEFB 618:</td>
<td>Applied Behavior Management in the Classroom</td>
<td>Field-based course related to effective management of challenging behavior problems in the classroom using proactive classroom strategies, effective instruction and planned behavior interventions; discussion and applications of methods for observing, assessing and analyzing challenging behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEFB 630: Practicum in Applied Behavior Analysis</td>
<td>University-supervised experience related to specializations in special education and behavior analysis. May be taken eight times for credit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEFB 631: Intensive Practicum in Applied Behavior Analysis</td>
<td>University-supervised intensive experience related to specializations in special education and behavior analysis. May be taken eight times for credit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEFB 684: Internship in Special Education</td>
<td>University-directed experience in a professional employment setting; full-time teaching and responsibility in a classroom with students with disabilities. May be taken 4 times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 291: Research</td>
<td>Research conducted under the direction of faculty member in special education. May be repeated 2 times for credit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 302: Instructional Design for Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>Familiarizes pre-service teachers with research associated with effective teaching; designing and implementing of instruction for students including those with mild to moderate disabilities; designing and managing environments and materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 310: Instructional Strategies for Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>Research-based strategies and techniques in teaching students who are at-risk academically or students with disabilities in a variety of general and special education settings; addresses teaching of academics, teacher strategies for engagement and incorporating the use of technology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 311: Assessment of Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>Instruction in formal and informal assessment techniques used with students with disabilities, including progress monitoring; development of Individualized Educational Program plans and the IEP process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 312: Effective Reading Instruction for Students with Diverse Abilities</td>
<td>Information and competencies in research-based reading instruction for students who have disabilities, are struggling readers, and are bilingual/multilingual; includes reading assessment, dyslexia and effective instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary and comprehension, Response to Intervention (RTI) strategies, and data driven decision-making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 314: Effective Mathematics Strategies for Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>Information and competencies through instruction in effective mathematics instruction for students P-12 with academic learning problems and/or disabilities; effective instruction design and teaching techniques, implementation of research-based methods relevant for active authentic learning; considers state and national standards related to teaching and learning mathematics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 414: Methods and Issues in Low-Incidence Disabilities</td>
<td>Overview of learning and behavioral characteristics of individuals with low-incidence disabilities such as intellectual disability, autism, physical disabilities, traumatic brain injury, sensory impairments, and multiple disabilities; research-based practices in assessment and education and designing educational environments that facilitate active participation, self-advocacy and independence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 442: Teaching Students with Emotional Disturbances and Behavior Disorders</td>
<td>Research-based techniques and materials used in the instruction of students who have emotional and behavioral disorders across a variety of classroom and other educational environments; includes identification and assessment issues, placements, family involvement, and historical and legal issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 471:</td>
<td>Classroom Management and Behavioral Interventions</td>
<td>Effective management of classrooms; includes research-based models of classroom discipline, proactive strategies that prevent misbehavior, interventions that decrease problem behaviors, and management systems appropriate for students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 491:</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research conducted under the direction of faculty member in special education. May be repeated 2 times for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 601:</td>
<td>Assessment in School Settings</td>
<td>Formal and informal assessment; state assessment and alternatives; techniques used with students with disabilities; using data to make educational decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 602:</td>
<td>Ethics and Professional Conduct in Special Education and Applied Behavior Analysis</td>
<td>Focus on ethical and professional conduct required for special educators and behavior analysts; information required for certified behavior analysts; ethics required by the Behavior Analyst Certification Board; highly relevant for those working with children or adults with disabilities in any capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 603:</td>
<td>Foundations of Special Education</td>
<td>Build a knowledge base to understand the historical and conceptual foundations of special education; familiarization with special education literature; overview of current issues and trends impacting special education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 609:</td>
<td>Educating Individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorders</td>
<td>Study of the incidence, prevalence, and characteristics of individuals with autism spectrum disorders, particularly for teachers, counselors, and related fields; research and best practices in assessment, treatment, and education; includes treatment of social, communication, academic, and behavior deficits with emphasis on behavior analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 610:</td>
<td>Special Education and the Family</td>
<td>Overview of issues in special education interpreted within the context of the family; relationships among the school, the families, and the community; impact of relationships on service provisions; field experiences working with families with special needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 611:</td>
<td>Multicultural Special Education</td>
<td>Multicultural perspectives in special education; foundations of multicultural special education; cultural responsive teaching; methods for teaching culturally and linguistically diverse learners in special education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 612:</td>
<td>Special Education Law and Policy</td>
<td>Legal development of the discipline of special education; current requirements for providing free and appropriate education to students with disabilities; assessment and performance of research with legal information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 614:</td>
<td>Issues in Moderate and Severe Disabilities</td>
<td>Psychological, social, physical and cognitive aspects of moderate to severe disabilities; service delivery systems; biomedical issues community programming; transition programming; adult service program; programs for the elderly; all in relation to individuals with moderate to severe disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 615:</td>
<td>Special Education Assessment: Technical and Legal Aspects</td>
<td>Teaches skills to critically examine assessment tools and procedures in special education; technical and legal issues in pre-referral evaluation, eligibility assessment, IEP writing and program evaluation; emphasizes test validity and test sensitivity to growth; mastery of knowledge base and realistic scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 617</td>
<td>Adolescent Literacy for Students with Diverse Instructional Needs</td>
<td>Research-based strategies to teach reading and writing to 4th through 12th grade students with disabilities and other diverse instructional needs; emphasis on current issues, assessment, motivation, intervention, and content area issues and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 618</td>
<td>Induction and Preparation for the Special Education Professoriate</td>
<td>Orientation to full-time doctoral studies; understanding historical and contemporary issues in the field of special education; familiarization with special education literature and systematic reviews of research literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 619</td>
<td>Critical Research and Practice Issues in Special Education</td>
<td>Examination of the historical, conceptual/theoretical and empirical basis of special education research and practice; understanding special education as a field and specific areas for in-depth knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 620</td>
<td>Bilingual Special Education</td>
<td>Topics concerning bilingual special education including history of the field, language acquisition, learning disabilities and language differences, assessment, policy development, individualized education plans, instructional strategies and parental involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 621</td>
<td>Overview of Exceptional Students</td>
<td>Overview of historical foundations for special education practice; definitions of disabilities, relevant educational characteristics of students with disabilities; assessment procedures associated with the identification of students' disabilities; intervention procedures related to education of students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 623</td>
<td>Self-Determination and Advocacy</td>
<td>Conceptualization and theoretical framework of self-determination for students with disabilities; the role of self-determination in improving student outcomes; and best practices in promoting self-determination among students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 624</td>
<td>Professional Development in Research</td>
<td>Development and refinement of skills needed to be productive scholars with particular focus on disseminating research through manuscript preparation and conference presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 626</td>
<td>Meta-Analysis in Single-case Research</td>
<td>Steps of conducting a meta-analysis of single-case research studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 628</td>
<td>Consultation in Special Education</td>
<td>Rationale, strategies, procedures and resources for providing consultation as systematic problem-solving to school procedures, and resources for improving services for children with disabilities, and those who are at-risk of school failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 630</td>
<td>Early Literacy for Students with Diverse Instructional Needs</td>
<td>Research-based strategies to teach beginning reading and writing to pre-K through 4th grade students with disabilities and other diverse instructional needs; emphasis on current issues, assessment, prevention and intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 632</td>
<td>Transition Education and Services for Individuals with Disabilities</td>
<td>Current issues and practices related to the transition of students from school to adulthood; foundations of life-long transitions; assessment of post-school goals and identification of effective transition services to promote employment, postsecondary education, and community living; partnerships with parents and service providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 641</td>
<td>Low-Incidence Instruction for Individuals with Significant Support Needs</td>
<td>Examination of how particular types of low-incidence disabilities; including mental retardation, autism, physical disabilities, traumatic brain injury, deafness, blindness, multiple disabilities, and other health impairments, affect academic and job performance. Current methods for teaching individuals with low-incidence disabilities, including an overview of Adaptive/Assistive Technology (AT) solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 642</td>
<td>Prevention, Support, and Intervention for Students with Emotional and Behavior Problems</td>
<td>Effective management of challenging and severe behavior problems in education, clinic and community settings using prevention, targeted programming and individual interventions; includes methods for observing, assessing and analyzing challenging and severe behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 683</td>
<td>Field Practicum</td>
<td>Faculty supervised experience in professional practice settings in Special Education. May be repeated for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 684</td>
<td>Professional Internship</td>
<td>Supervised experience in professional functions appropriate to career goals in special education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 685</td>
<td>Directed Studies</td>
<td>Directed individual study of selected problems in special education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 689</td>
<td>Special Topics in...</td>
<td>Selected topics in an identified area of special education. May be repeated for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 699</td>
<td>Advanced Applied Behavior Analysis</td>
<td>Rigorous repertoire of knowledge and skill in behavior analysis; comprehensive and contemporary description of applied behavior analysis; application of principles and paradigms of theoretical and experimental aspects of behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 610</td>
<td>Child Psychopathology</td>
<td>Major forms of psychopathology and behavioral disorders in children and adolescents; concepts of child psychological disorders; application of multiple theoretical models; understanding of the development context in which these orders exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 611</td>
<td>Introduction to School Psychology: Legal, Ethical and Credentialing Issues in School Psychology</td>
<td>History of professional psychology with emphasis on school psychology; legal, ethical and credentialing issues in psychology; scholarly writing; models of providing clinical child and special educational services. May be taken up to three times for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 612</td>
<td>Individual Assessment of Children's Intelligence</td>
<td>Individual Assessment of Children's Intelligence. Educational and clinical applications of individual assessment; diagnostic measures of intelligence, achievement, language and perception; videotaping of student test administration is required for purposes of supervision and self-evaluation. Limited to 12 students per semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 613</td>
<td>Crisis Intervention in the Schools</td>
<td>Fundamentals of school-based crisis intervention; emphasis on personal and situational crises, and the development and implementation of crisis intervention and prevention plans within the school setting; differing models of crisis intervention, models of coping with crisis and critical incidents, and the efficacy of crisis intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 614</td>
<td>Integrated Assessment Practicum</td>
<td>Student test administration competencies and a minimum of 150 hours of supervised experience in administration, analysis and reporting of individual diagnostic instruments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 615</td>
<td>Preschool Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment of infants and young children (birth to 5 years of age); requires extension of the diagnostic skills gained in other courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
coursework to applications for early intervention and child find with younger children; measures/methods will include norm-referenced, criterion referenced, and play-based/observational methods used in the assessment of infants and young children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 617</td>
<td>Emotional Disturbance in Children</td>
<td>Diagnostic procedures and techniques in personality assessment and identification of emotionally disturbed children and youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 620</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Seminar in Prevention Science</td>
<td>Contemporary research programs that represent the interdisciplinary field of prevention science; strengths and limitations of diverse theoretical and conceptual bases of research in prevention science; application of research findings to issues related to the prevention of mental, emotional, and physical health problems and the promotion of well-being. May be taken 3 times for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 627</td>
<td>Culturally Responsive Interventions: Models for Making Cultural Adaptations to Interventions</td>
<td>Introduction to literature that demonstrates the need to adapt evidence-based interventions for use with culturally and linguistically diverse populations; different models for making cultural adaptations; identification ways to ensure fidelity and integrity of interventions even after cultural adaptations are made; adaptations for populations with diverse home culture, language, race, sexual orientation, developmental abilities or SES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 628</td>
<td>Consultation: Theory and Techniques</td>
<td>History and theory of various models of consultation including mental health, behavioral and organizational development; skills and techniques necessary for effective consultation; relevant research issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 638</td>
<td>Systems Consultation and Prevention Science</td>
<td>Theory, research and practice in prevention science with an emphasis on individuals from birth to age 21; understanding and application of theories and methods of prevention science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 641</td>
<td>Child Therapy for School Behavior Problems</td>
<td>Selected therapy approaches for treating childhood behavior disorders that interfere with children's interpersonal and intrapersonal adjustment and school learning; play therapy, behavior therapy, cognitive therapies; case studies; observation of therapy cases in public and/or mental health settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 642</td>
<td>Behavioral Assessment and Intervention</td>
<td>Overview of contemporary behavior theory and applied behavior analysis; overview of behavioral assessment strategies with an emphasis on the systematic observations of behavior and interviews; and contemporary behavior therapy approaches for use with educators, children, and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 643</td>
<td>Academic Assessment and Intervention</td>
<td>Developing effective and appropriate interventions for school-based academic concerns; collecting and interpreting data from informal academic assessments and observations for intervention development and evaluation; using curriculum-based assessments for monitoring student's academic programs and teacher decision making; understanding effective instructional strategies and their application to academic interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 644:</td>
<td>Child Therapy: Advanced Theory and Techniques</td>
<td>Supervised experiences in public and mental health settings in the application of psychotherapy techniques with children, adolescents and families; interviewing techniques; process of therapy; advanced theoretical foundations; case management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 645:</td>
<td>Social and Emotional Development and Intervention</td>
<td>Theories of how children develop in the areas of social and emotional learning, recent empirical findings in the area of social and emotional development; preventive and remedial interventions for social and emotional difficulties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 657:</td>
<td>Bilingual Psychoeducational Assessment</td>
<td>Theory of second language acquisition; discrete point and descriptive approach to language assessment; achievement assessment; cognitive assessment and practical and cultural factors when assessing bilingual children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 682:</td>
<td>School-Based Externship</td>
<td>Application of knowledge and skills obtained through coursework including assessment for intervention; direct interventions such as counseling and behavior management; indirect services such as consultation, in-service, program evaluation; includes a variety of school psychologist activities with children with and without disabilities of all ages; activities occur under the supervision of field and university supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 683:</td>
<td>Field Experience/Externship in School Psychology</td>
<td>Faculty supervised experience in professional employment public and mental settings in school psychology. May be taken up to 30 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 684:</td>
<td>Professional Internship</td>
<td>Limited to advanced doctoral students; faculty supervised experience in approved professional employment settings. Applications for September assignments must be approved the previous October. May be repeated up to 9 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 685:</td>
<td>Directed Studies</td>
<td>Directed individual study of selected problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 689:</td>
<td>Special Topics in...</td>
<td>Selected topics in an identified area of school psychology. May be repeated for credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 691:</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research for thesis or dissertation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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F. Additional Student Resources
Established in 2007, the Byrne Student Success Center provides students with the tools and resources they need to be academically and personally successful. The center is an entity of the College of Education & Human Development and operates under the direction of Kelley O’Neal, M.Ed.

**WHAT WE DO**

**SERVICES**

- Individualized Student Success Counseling
- Career support
- Strategic referrals to free campus resources
- Providing opportunities for co-curricular involvement and leadership development

**ACTIVITIES**

- The First-Generation Network
- Assisting with CEHD learning Communities
- Overseeing the Undergraduate Student Council (USC) and the Freshmen Leaders in Education and Human Development Program (FLED)

**STATISTICS**

Graduation & Retention Rate: 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4-year Graduation Rate</th>
<th>6-year Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage*
Center for Teaching Excellence
Retrieved from: https://cte.tamu.edu/

The Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE), in the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost, supports the educational mission of Texas A&M University (TAMU) through evidence-based professional development opportunities promoting proven and innovative instructional approaches aligned with faculty and student success. The CTE carries out its mission through workshops, consolation services, graduate student support, program (re)design, teaching resources, and events. The graduate student support includes:

Academy for Future Faculty Teaching Certificate Program
The Academy for Future Faculty Teaching Certificate Program (AFF) provides professional development for graduate students and post-docs in preparation for a career in higher education. AFF offers a two-semester program anchored by faculty mentorship and featuring weekly seminars and workshops. AFF events are free and open to everyone in the Texas A&M University academic community. Participants may choose to attend a few events or enough to complete requirements for the Academy for Future Faculty Fellow certificate. New fellows are recognized at our annual banquet in April.

Teaching Assistant Institute (TAI)
The Teaching Assistant Institute (TAI), hosted by the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies and the Center for Teaching Excellence, is a one day face-to-face course with additional online modules designed to prepare graduate students for college classroom teaching. TAI is offered every year at the beginning of the fall and spring semesters and is required for new TAs who serve as recitation leaders, laboratory instructors, and/or full responsibility lecturers.

Graduate Teaching Consultant Program
The Graduate Teaching Consultant Program (GTC) supports the professional development in teaching of graduate students, and includes opportunities that support enhanced teaching experience, as outlined in the Model of Graduate Student Professional Development in Teaching. GTCs are graduate students exhibiting pedagogical skills and knowledge within their disciplines. GTCs, under the supervision of the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE), serve as instructional coaches and peer mentors to TAs across campus. GTCs are available to conduct classroom observations upon request.

English Language Proficiency Program
The English Language Proficiency Program (ELP) is a linguistic service provided to international instructors (and prospective instructors) who wish to improve their spoken English skills. The ELP supports Texas A&M University's commitment to excellence in teaching and learning by encouraging effective oral communication among professors and teaching assistants.

College Classroom Teaching
Gain College Teaching Experience and Earn a Nationally-Recognized CITRL Practitioner Certificate! College Classroom Teaching: Integration of Research, Teaching and Learning Meets select Fridays from 3-5 p.m. in the spring semester earning 1 credit hour. Want to learn more about teaching in a classroom? Looking for experienced mentors to help you get started on your future educational career? TAMU CIRTL, CTE and OGAPS are pleased to offer the College Classroom Teaching course to Texas A&M graduate students! All disciplines welcome! The College Classroom Teaching course will provide doctoral level students with the unique opportunity to discuss relevant teaching techniques with other graduate students and experienced faculty from multiple disciplines and design and implement a course module with a faculty mentor in an undergraduate classroom.
University Writing Center
Retrieved from: https://writingcenter.tamu.edu/

ABOUT US
The University Writing Center supports writing and public speaking for graduate and undergraduate students across the university, with particular emphasis on supporting W and C courses. Our priorities are as follows:

- To help graduate and undergraduate students practice the habits of mature composers of written and oral communication.
- To provide resources for faculty and Graduate Assistant Teachers for integrating best writing and oral communication pedagogy into courses across the disciplines and in the core curriculum.

As a unit of Undergraduate Studies, the University Writing Center shares a mission to “help undergraduates reach their full academic potential, enrich their educational program with deep and purposeful learning experiences, and gain the skills needed to continue professional development throughout their lives” and further shares the mission of Texas A&M University by contributing to student success, retention, and timely graduation and by improving access and support for students from diverse geographical, socio-economic, and ethnic backgrounds.

We acknowledge and celebrate language diversity and growth. We provide an environment in which students’ learning differences are respected and addressed, and where students are encouraged to explore their diverse voices. We embrace the university’s diversity initiatives and continually assess our progress to maintain accountability to and recognition of our unique Aggie community.
### G. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Academic Years Outcome are Data Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS INST - Bilingual Education</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS INST - Special Education</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS USEH - Child Professional Services</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd/MS Bilingual Education</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd Educational Technology</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS/MEd EPSY - Learning Sciences</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd EPSY - School Counseling</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd/MS Special Education</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD EPSY- Bilingual Education Specialization</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD EPSY - Learning Sciences Specialization</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD School Psychology</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD EPSY - Special Education Specialization</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Certificate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in Applied Behavioral Analysis</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in Prevention Science</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome Data Reported for Undergraduate Degrees Administered by Department of Educational Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Degree Programs</th>
<th>Academic Years Outcome Data are Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS INST - Bilingual Education</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS INST - Special Education</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS USEH - Child Professional Services</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2013-2014 Outcome data are combined for the Bilingual Education and Special Education programs and reflected as one report.
Mission / Purpose

The bilingual undergraduate education program is committed to serving culturally and linguistically diverse students across Texas, the United States, and around the world. The mission of the Hispanic Bilingual Education Undergraduate Program is to prepare students to be highly qualified teachers. Field-experiences, coursework, and other academic requirements are designed to further prepare students to, as educators, meet the educational needs of the increasing culturally and linguistically diverse student populations and their families. The program offers a variety of courses in language and literacy acquisition (L1 and L2), culture, pedagogy, assessment, foundations of bilingualism, latest technology, and more.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Depth of Knowledge
Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate that they have mastered required content knowledge and skills required of a highly certified, entry-level educator by applying knowledge from core-curriculum, disciplined-based courses, and field-based experiences.

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures

M 1: Bilingual Supplemental Certification Exam
The direct measure being used is the Licensure Exam: Bilingual Education Supplemental (164) which is taken during student's senior methods semester. Graduates of the BIED program will show mastery of content knowledge and skills required to be a highly certified, entry-level teachers in the state of Texas, by passing the Bilingual Supplemental (164) exam within 1 year of sitting for the first test. This exam is one of the four TExES exams required to become a bilingual certified teacher in the state of Texas. This particular exam does not measure language proficiency. This exam attempts to measure the knowledge base that a teacher-to-be has, in alignment with the Texas Educator Standards. It seems that, ironically, this exam poses more a challenge for our students than the generalist exam. And because this bilingual supplemental correlates directly to the population our students will be working with (and the content that is taught in the program) using this target seems to be a good indicator of student success.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
70% of graduates of the BIED program will show mastery of content knowledge and skills required to be a highly certified, entry-level teachers in the state of Texas, by passing the Bilingual Supplemental Exam (164) within 1 year of sitting for the first test. This exam is taken during the first semester of Senior Methods. We are setting the requirement of 70% pass rate because this is a new exam for our students. Previously our students took the Bilingual Generalist EC-6 which has been phased-out.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Due to system changes with the Texas Education Agency, we are unable to access cert passage rates before the 2017-2018 assessment cycle closes. Therefore, we will not be reporting data this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% (15/15) of students passed the bilingual education supplemental exam and 100% of students (15/15) pasted the bilingual education supplemental exam in Spanish. Therefore this target was met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
At this time, the pass rate for this exam is not available. For TEA the assessment cycle does not close until August 1st. However, as an indicator, these findings for the previous cycle were 92% pass rate for the Bilingual Supplemental.

Because this is a transition year, it seems that most students (for the fall 2014) opted to take the 3 exams that will be replaced by the new 4 exams. In other words, our students had the opportunity to just take the Bilingual Generalist, instead of the Generalist and the Bilingual Supplemental. All opted for the familiar and having to pay for one less exam. The spring 2015 cohort has tested under the new format: Generalist and the Bilingual Supplemental, however those scores have not come in.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
For 90% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist with a 240, we can't report at this time, as the data are
not in. The data will be available Summer 2014.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
A few students are retaking their exams. They have until August to show that they have passed. Data are not complete at this time.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Update Finding
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
I anticipate that 90% of students will have passed the Bilingual Generalist by August.

Update Needed when Data are In
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
In August these data will be reported as that is when the certification officer is able to pull these from TEA.

M 2: Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study
These papers will be evaluated by a college committee solely for the purpose of assessing whether the students was able to provide effective written communication. Because this is a capstone and the writing committee convenes in early spring, we will need to either form our own committee among the bilingual faculty or report scores for the previous year.

Communication skills demonstrated as evidenced by scoring a 34 out of 40 on the Single Case Intervention Capstone Rubric's writing and communication sections (Disciplinary Conventions, Professional Communication, and Control of Syntax and Mechanics).

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Connected Documents
Single Case Intervention Capstone Guidelines
Single Case Study Intervention Rubric

Target: 90% of students will score a 120/140 on the Single Case Intervention Rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Partially Met
Outcome was partially met.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
50% of the students scored a 120 or above therefore the target was not met. The mean score was 107 for students.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This project was changed for this year because of two reasons. The student teachers had completed a research project to present at a conference (either as part of the UG Honors Research Program or on their own). Because these were time-consuming endeavors we allowed them to count towards this capstone. These projects demonstrated the same skills we sought to measure in the capstone. Also, this year, we implemented a new pilot for coaching student teachers. And given the new program, we had to make room in the curriculum to test new things. Because the students had conducted a large research-based project, we deemed this as something that could be substituted this year.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Reinstate this for Fall 2016
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This project will be reinstated in the fall of 2016 as a long term capstone, as we move to having all students prepare a proposa...

Curricular Improvements to Midpoint and Single Case Capstone Project
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
We will continue with current practice in our program in order to support student progress in terms of the Learning Outcomes r...

SLO 2: Communication Skills (Capstone - Written)
Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate effective written communication skills as evidenced by scoring satisfactorily (10 or 15) on the CEHD Writing Assessment rubric when applied to assess the Single-Case Intervention Capstone Project.

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Communicate effectively

Related Measures

M 2: Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study
These papers will be evaluated by a college committee solely for the purpose of assessing whether the students was able to provide effective written communication. Because this is a capstone and the writing committee convenes in early spring, we will need to either form our own committee among the bilingual faculty or report scores for the previous year.

Communication skills demonstrated as evidenced by scoring a 34 out of 40 on the Single Case Intervention Capstone Rubric's writing and communication sections (Disciplinary Conventions, Professional Communication, and Control of Syntax and Mechanics).

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge
Target:
90% of students will score a 34 out of 40 on the Single Case Intervention Rubric writing related sections.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
According to data, 0% of students scored at least at 34 out of 40 on Single Case Intervention Rubric, related to communication. The mean score was 28. Therefore this target was not met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This project was changed for this year because of two reasons. The student teachers had completed a research project to present at a conference (either as part of the UG Honors Research Program or on their own). Because these were time-consuming endeavors we allowed them to count towards this capstone. These projects demonstrated the same skills we sought to measure in the capstone. Also, this year, we implemented a new pilot for coaching student teachers. And given the new program, we had to make room in the curriculum to test new things. Because the students had conducted a large research-based project, we deemed this as something that could be substituted this year.

Only two students were evaluated during the fall 2014 semester. These students scored a 10. And the current student teachers will submit this project during the week of graduation.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Results indicate that 100% of Special Education and Bilingual Education students scored 2 or above. Thus, the target was met.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Results indicate that 100% of Special Education students scored 2 or above. Thus, the target was met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Reinstate
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
As mentioned earlier this will be reinstated under an UG Honors Research project. For those students not accepted into that, will...

SLO 3: Critical Thinking (Case-Study)
Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate that they have increased their critically thinking/problem-solving skills by showing improvement in a Case Study Analysis. This Case Study provides a scenario about academic and behavior problems that a teacher is comforted with in her/his classroom. The students in our program provide an analysis of the Case Study upon entering professional phase. And then they analyze the same Case Study 2 or more years later during student teaching.

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Demonstrate critical thinking

Related Measures

M 3: Pre/Post Test Critical Thinking Assessment
Pre/Post assessment students receive upon entering the program. Students complete the same assessment upon completing the program and is used to measure critical thinking. Pre to Post measurements occur every two years.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

Target:
100% of the graduates will score a 100 out of 150 on the rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Data collection didn’t go as planned for the Spring 2015 cohort. Therefore, Spring 2017 graduating student post-test assessments were not collected. Pre-tests were issued Fall 2016 and post-tests will be measured Spring 2018.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This finding is not reported in this cycle because students took this Critical Thinking Case-Study pretest measure in the fall of 2015. And they will not be re-assessed with a post-test measure until their student teaching semester. The student teaching semester is about 3 semesters later for most students (Spring of 2017). So at this point, we are three semesters away from being able to report first findings.

The student teachers have not submitted this assignment to date. We only have two submissions from the fall and both students scored over 100. Current student teachers will submit this during the week when grade are due for graduates.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Continue with the pre-assessment
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
We will continue collecting pre-assessments for this and give the post assessments as these students reach student teaching.

SLO 4: Lifelong Learning
Graduates of the BIED program will engage in lifelong learning by creating a Midpoint Improvement Plan of professional goals and execution in order to strengthen areas of deficiency in instructional delivery, classroom management, and professionalism as expected of an entry-level, highly qualified educator in the state of Texas.
Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6 Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 4: Midpoint Improvement Plan
90% of students will score between a 10 or 15 on the MidPoint Clinical Teaching Semester Project Rubric.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Documents
Midpoint Assignment Guidelines 7.3.17
Midpoint Assignment Rubric

Target:
90% of students will score a 25/30 on the section of the MidPoint Intervention Rubric that has to do with Future Reflective Practice.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met
90% of the students did not meet expectation on this. The "Future reflection" aspect was weak for most. Unfortunately, it was not evident that what the students' learned is truly going to impact practice in the future.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
0% of the students scored a 25 or above. The mean score for students was 18. Therefore the target was not met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the students scores an A on this assignment as rated by the student teaching supervisor. Next fall (2016) we will be creating a new midpoint improvement plan that incorporates more of an instructional coaching model.

We only had two student teachers in the fall 2014 and they both scored a 10. The current student teachers will not submit this assignment until the week of graduation.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

New to Include Coaching Model
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This summer we are developing a new rubric that takes into consideration the work the students will be doing in terms of receive...

Curricular Improvements to Midpoint and Single Case Capstone Project
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
We will continue with current practice in our program in order to support student progress in terms of the Learning Outcomes r...

Professional development plan
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
For the single-case intervention study there is evidence of growth. Yet, students appear to need more help and direction regardi...

SLO 5: Technology Proficiency
Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate proficiency in current technologies and the ability to adapt to emerging technologies as evidenced in the development of their online teaching portfolio.

Related Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6 Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Related Measures

M 5: Online Portfolio
The direct measure being used is the professional online teaching portfolio created by students as evaluated by a rubric being adapted from https://www2.uwstout.edu/content/profdev/rubrics/eportfolioRubric.html. Students are evaluated in the following categories:

- Selection of Artifacts
- Descriptive Text
- Reflective Commentary
- Citations
- Navigation
- Usability and Accessibility
- Writing Conventions
- Multimedia Elements

The rubric has four ratings (unsatisfactory, emerging, proficient, and exemplary). Students will work on their portfolio starting the first semester of professional phase until the end of student teaching.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target: 100% of students will score proficient or better in their the online portfolio rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met
Not met as less than 100% of students scored proficient or better on their online portfolio rubric. Target set high based on portfolio’s alignment with state accreditation standards.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Data will be collected on Spring 2018 graduating cohort. Findings not reported this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
The portfolio target was not met. There were inconsistencies in having this project carry across various other courses by other professors in the program. Second the platform that we were using was WordPress and it was free to students and would be free to them when they became teachers. And now, the educational component was removed from Blue Host and this medium would not be free for students once they graduate, making the tool of less long-term value.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No findings are available at this time. The fall 2014 cohort was the first one to create an online portfolio and they will be adding to and improving the portfolio for another 3 semesters.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

New Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This year we will identify a portfolio platform that we can use. Simultaneously we will begin to create portfolio mini-projects...

Professional development plan
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
For the single-case intervention study there is evidence of growth. Yet, students appear to need more help and direction regardi...

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Update Finding
I anticipate that 90% of students will have passed the Bilingual Generalist by August.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Bilingual Supplemental Certification Exam | Outcome/Objective: Depth of Knowledge
Implementation Description: Update needed
Responsible Person/Group: The Undergraduate Coordinator will update this finding in August.

Continue with the pre-assessment
We will continue collecting pre-assessments for this and give the post assessments as these students reach student teaching.
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Pre/Post Test Critical Thinking Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking (Case-Study)
Implementation Description: Continue to offer this assessment (pre) to new cohorts
Responsible Person/Group: Miranda Walichowski

New Portfolio
This year we will identify a portfolio platform that we can use. Simultaneously we will begin to create portfolio mini-projects that string across multiple courses to help students build their portfolio, semester-by-semester. The current cohort of students will create a basic layout for their portfolio this fall 2016. And they will upload 2 projects and 1 artifact per course (BEFB 474, 472, and 428).
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Online Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Technology Proficiency
Responsible Person/Group: Miranda Walichowski

New to Include Coaching Model
This summer we are developing a new rubric that takes into consideration the work the students will be doing in terms of receiving instructional coaching.
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Midpoint Improvement Plan | Outcome/Objective: Lifelong Learning
Implementation Description: Create a new rubric
Responsible Person/Group: Miranda Walichowski

Reinstate
As mentioned earlier this will be reinstated under an UG Honors Research project. For those students not accepted into that, will complete this as a traditional project.

**Reinstate this for Fall 2016**
This project will be reinstated in the fall of 2016 as a long term capstone, as we move to having all students prepare a proposal and apply for the undergraduate research program. Those who are not accepted to the program will complete this as their capstone.

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016  
**Implementation Status:** On-Hold  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Communication Skills (Capstone - Written)

**Implementation Description:** Rework a rubric that can accommodate both the UG research project and capstone.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Miranda Walichowski

**Update Needed when Data are In**
In August these data will be reported as that is when the certification officer is able to pull these from TEA.

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Bilingual Supplemental Certification Exam  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Depth of Knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Ask Misiti to pull pass rates.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Miranda Walichowski

**Curricular Improvements to Midpoint and Single Case Capstone Project**
We will continue with current practice in our program in order to support student progress in terms of the Learning Outcomes related to the measure of the Bilingual Certification Exam, Critical Thinking Skills, and the Portfolio. Those three things are in flux and it would be good to get an understanding of a couple years of data before making significant changes to impact those areas.

However, in terms of the outcomes related to the Single Case Capstone Project and the Midpoint Improvement plan, it is evident that we can make curricular changes to improve student learning. For example, it is apparent that students are not amply understanding how to apply content knowledge to an organic inquiry process. It is imperative that we help bridge that gap in praxis. As one of our goals is to ensure that all our future teachers know how to use data to make instructional decisions. We will bridge the gap by creating modules for each of the inquiry components that need to be mastered in order to execute an intervention project well. These will serve as refreshers for the students and will help them gain a better understanding of what is expected in each section.

Second, it is evident that students need additional writing and professional communication support. Effective writing is a key indicator of success for any teacher of record. And we can support stronger writing skills by being deliberate in creating an assignment in each bilingual class that has a heavy focus on writing. In these assignments, students will pre-submit for feedback. And then they will resubmit after they incorporate the feedback from peers and the instructor. This will also allow the instructor to identify which students might need additional supports with writing and address those on a case by case basis.

**Established in Cycle:** 2016-2017  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Depth of Knowledge  
- **Measure:** Midpoint Improvement Plan  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Lifelong Learning

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2019  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

**Professional Development Plan**
For the single-case intervention study there is evidence of growth. Yet, students appear to need more help and direction regarding written communication for their capstone project. As well, 90% of students did not meet expectation for the midpoint improvement plan, and future reflect was among the weakest within the rubric domains. It is not evident that what students’ learned is truly impacting their practice for future teaching careers. Hence, we have decided to institute a professional development plan for students through group coaching. Our goal, by developing these plans, is that students connect and integrate what they are supposed to be learning within the outlined measures to professional development and actualization. Program faculty are currently coordinating efforts to schedule group coaching sessions with students, we will develop a plan outline, and will see the impact on students’ portfolio and midpoint improvement plans. Dr. Walichowski will oversee the coaching coordination.

**Established in Cycle:** 2017-2018
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

Unfortunately, we did not meet many targets as outlined this year. We believe students are encountering challenges with making the connection that we would want them to make between these measures (in particular with what they are supposed to learn leading up to these measures) to future learning, to using these as opportunities for professional development and actualization. As a program, we have decided to have students create a professional and personal development plan. They will do this as part of a group coaching effort. In this plan they will be able to show connections between the goals that they set and the outcomes (evidence) of growth on those goals portrayed by these program measures. Because we are a small program we have the ability to do this with students...to help them make meaningful connections.

*CRITICAL* Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

UG Reinstatement & Reinstate Capstone from 15-16: This action plan is currently on-hold. The program has encountered challenges with developing adequate faculty support to implement this new research requirement. Therefore, this action plan, and the corresponding one related to capstone proposals, are both on hold.

Curricular improvements to mid-point and single case study plan: This action plan, established in the 2016-2017 cycle, is still in progress.

Last year, we were able to clearly identify what we need to be measuring. The artifacts that were chosen make sense and they do inform us of where students are. The overall observation seems to be capture in this one statement: *students seem to be meeting expectations for the measure but only to the degree that is required. It seems that our rubrics are designed to capture students who go beyond what is expected.*
Mission / Purpose

The bilingual undergraduate education program is committed to serving culturally and linguistically diverse students across Texas, the United States, and around the world. The mission of the Hispanic Bilingual Education Undergraduate Program is to prepare students to be highly qualified teachers. Field-experiences, coursework and other academic requirements are designed to further prepare students to, as educators, meet the educational needs of the increasing culturally and linguistically diverse student populations and their families. The program offers a variety of courses in language and literacy acquisition (L1 and L2), culture, pedagogy, assessment, foundations of bilingualism, latest technology, and more.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Depth of Knowledge

Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate that they have mastered required content knowledge and skills required of a highly certified, entry-level educator by applying knowledge from core-curriculum, disciplined-based courses, and field-based experiences.

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures

M 1: Bilingual Supplemental Certification Exam

The direct measure being used is the Licensure Exam: Bilingual Education Supplemental (164) which is taken during student’s senior methods semester. Graduates of the BIED program will show mastery of content knowledge and skills required to be a highly certified, entry-level teachers in the state of Texas, by passing the Bilingual Supplemental (164) exam within 1 year of sitting for the first test. This exam is one of the four TExES exams required to become a bilingual certified teacher in the state of Texas. This particular exam does not measure language proficiency. This exam attempts to measure the knowledge base that a teacher-to-be has, in alignment with the Texas Educator Standards. It seems that, ironically, this exam poses more a challenge for our students than the generalist exam. And because this bilingual supplemental correlates directly to the population our students will be working with (and the content that is taught in the program) using this target seems to be a good indicator of student success.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
70% of graduates of the BIED program will show mastery of content knowledge and skills required to be a highly certified, entry-level teachers in the state of Texas, by passing the Bilingual Supplemental (164) exam within 1 year of sitting for the first test. This exam is taken during the first semester of Senior Methods. We are setting the requirement of 70% pass rate because this is a new exam for our students. Previously our students took the Bilingual Generalist EC-6 which has been phased-out.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% (15/15) of students passed the bilingual education supplemental exam and 100% of students (15/15) passed the bilingual education supplemental exam in Spanish. Therefore this target was met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
At this time, the pass rate for this exam is not available. For TEA the assessment cycle does not close until August 1st. However, as an indicator, these findings for the previous cycle were 92% pass rate for the Bilingual Supplemental.

Because this is a transition year, it seems that most students (for the fall 2014) opted to take the 3 exams that will be replaced by the new 4 exams. In other words, our students had the opportunity to just take the Bilingual Generalist, instead of the Generalist and the Bilingual Supplemental. All opted for the familiar and having to pay for one less exam. The spring 2015 cohort has tested under the new format: Generalist and the Bilingual Supplemental, however those scores have not come in.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
For 90% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist with a 240, we can’t report at this time, as the data are not in. The data will be available Summer 2014.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
A few students are retaking their exams. They have until August to show that they have passed. Data are
A few students are retaking their exams. They have until August to show that they have passed. Data are not complete at this time.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Update Finding**
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
I anticipate that 90% of students will have passed the Bilingual Generalist by August.

**Update Needed when Data are In**
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*
In August these data will be reported as that is when the certification officer is able to pull these from TEA.

**M 2: Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study**
These papers will be evaluated by a college committee solely for the purpose of assessing whether the students was able to provide effective written communication. Because this is a capstone and the writing committee convenes in early spring, we will need to either form our own committee among the bilingual faculty or report scores for the previous year.

Communication skills demonstrated as evidenced by scoring a 34 out of 40 on the Single Case Intervention Capstone Rubric's writing and communication sections (Disciplinary Conventions, Professional Communication, and Control of Syntax and Mechanics).

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Connected Documents**
- Single Case Intervention Capstone Guidelines
- Single CaseStudy Intervention Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students will score a 120/140 on the Single Case Intervention Rubric.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met**
50% of the students scored a 120 or above therefore the target was not met. The mean score was 107 for students.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This project was changed for this year because of two reasons. The student teachers had completed a research project to present at a conference (either as part of the UG Honors Research Program or on their own). Because these were time-consuming endeavors we allowed them to count towards this capstone. These projects demonstrated the same skills we sought to measure in the capstone. Also, this year, we implemented a new pilot for coaching student teachers. And given the new project, we had to make room in the curriculum to test new things. Because the students had conducted a large research-based project, we deemed this as something that could be substituted this year.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Reinstate this for Fall 2016**
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*
This project will be reinstated in the fall of 2016 as a long term capstone, as we move to having all students prepare a proposa...

**Curricular Improvements to Midpoint and Single Case Capstone Project**
*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*
We will continue with current practice in our program in order to support student progress in terms of the Learning Outcomes r...

**SLO 2: Communication Skills (Capstone - Written)**
Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate effective written communication skills as evidenced by scoring satisfactorily (10 or 15 ) on the CEHD Writing Assessment rubric when applied to assess the Single-Case Intervention Capstone Project.

**Relevant Associations:**
- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  3 Communicate effectively

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study**
These papers will be evaluated by a college committee solely for the purpose of assessing whether the students was able to provide effective written communication. Because this is a capstone and the writing committee convenes in early spring, we will need to either form our own committee among the bilingual faculty or report scores for the previous year.

Communication skills demonstrated as evidenced by scoring a 34 out of 40 on the Single Case Intervention Capstone Rubric's writing and communication sections (Disciplinary Conventions, Professional Communication, and Control of Syntax and Mechanics).

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Connected Documents**
- Single Case Intervention Capstone Guidelines
- Single CaseStudy Intervention Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students will score a 34 out of 40 on the Single Case Intervention Rubric writing related sections.
Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
According to data, 0% of students scored at least at 34 out of 40 on Single Case Intervention Rubric, related to communication. The mean score was 28. Therefore this target was not met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This project was changed for this year because of two reasons. The student teachers had completed a research project to present at a conference (either as part of the UG Honors Research Program or on their own). Because these were time-consuming endeavors we allowed them to count towards this capstone. These projects demonstrated the same skills we sought to measure in the capstone. Also, this year, we implemented a new pilot for coaching student teachers. And given the new program, we had to make room in the curriculum to test new things. Because the students had conducted a large research-based project, we deemed this as something that could be substituted this year.

Only two students were evaluated during the fall 2014 semester. These students scored a 10. And the current student teachers will submit this project during the week of graduation.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Results indicate that 100% of Special Education and Bilingual Education students scored 2 or above. Thus, the target was met.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Results indicate that 100% of Special Education students scored 2 or above. Thus, the target was met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Reinstate
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
As mentioned earlier this will be reinstated under an UG Honors Research project. For those students not accepted into that, will...

SLO 3: Critical Thinking (Case-Study)
Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate that they have increased their critically thinking/problem-solving skills by showing improvement in a Case Study Analysis. This Case Study provides a scenario about academic and behavior problems that a teacher is comforted with in her/his classroom. The students in our program provide an analysis of the Case Study upon entering professional phase. And then they analyze the same Case Study 2 or more years later during student teaching.

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2  Demonstrate critical thinking

Related Measures
M 3: Pre/Post Test Critical Thinking Assessment
Pre/Post assessment students receive upon entering the program. Students complete the same assessment upon completing the program and is used to measure critical thinking. Pre to Post measurements occur every two years.
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

Target: 100% of the graduates will score a 100 out of 150 on the rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Data collection didn’t go as planned for the Spring 2015 cohort. Therefore, Spring 2017 graduating student post-test assessments were not collected. Pre-tests were issued Fall 2016 and post-tests will be measured Spring 2018.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This finding is not reported in this cycle because students took this Critical Thinking Case-Study pretest measure in the fall of 2015. And they will not be re-assessed with a post-test measure until their student teaching semester. The student teaching semester is about 3 semesters later for most students (Spring of 2017). So at this point, we are three semesters away from being able to report first findings.

The students teachers have not submitted this assignment to date. We only have two submissions from the fall and both students scored over 100. Current student teachers will submit this during the week when grade are due for graduates.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Continue with the pre-assessment
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
We will continue collecting pre-assessments for this and give the post assessments as these students reach student teaching.

SLO 4: Lifelong Learning
Graduates of the BIED program will engage in lifelong learning by creating a Midpoint Improvement Plan of professional goals and execution in order to strengthen areas of deficiency in instructional delivery, classroom management, and professionalism as expected of an entry-level, highly qualified educator in the state of Texas.

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6  Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.
Related Measures

M 4: Midpoint Improvement Plan
90% of students will score between a 10 or 15 on the AACU Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning Value Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Documents
Midpoint Assignment Guidelines 7.3.17
Midpoint Assignment Rubric

Target:
90% of students will score a 25/30 on the section of the MidPoint Intervention Rubric that has to do with Future Reflective Practice.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
0% of the students scored a 25 or above. The mean score for students was 18. Therefore the target was not met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the students scores an A on this assignment as rated by the student teaching supervisor. Next fall (2016) we will be creating a new midpoint improvement plan that incorporates more of an instructional coaching model.

We only had two student teachers in the fall 2014 and they both scored a 10. The current student teachers will not submit this assignment until the week of graduation.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

New to Include Coaching Model
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This summer we are developing a new rubric that takes into consideration the work the students will be doing in terms of receiv...

Curricular Improvements to Midpoint and Single Case Capstone Project
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
We will continue with current practice in our program in order to support student progress in terms of the Learning Outcomes r...

SLO 5: Technology Proficiency
Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate proficiency in current technologies and the ability to adapt to emerging technologies as evidenced in the development of their online teaching portfolio.

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6 Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Related Measures

M 5: Online Portfolio
The direct measure being used is the professional online teaching portfolio created by students as evaluated by a rubric being adapted from https://www2.uwstout.edu/content/profdev/rubrics/eportfoliorubric.html. Students are evaluated in the following categories:

- Selection of Artifacts
- Descriptive Text
- Reflective Commentary
- Citations
- Navigation
- Usability and Accessibility
- Writing Conventions
- Multimedia Elements

The rubric has four ratings (unsatisfactory, emerging, proficient, and exemplary). Students will work on their portfolio starting the first semester of professional phase until the end of student teaching.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
100% of students will score proficient or better in their the online portfolio rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Data will be collected on Spring 2018 graduating cohort. Findings not reported this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
The portfolio target was not met. There were inconsistencies in having this project carry across various other courses by other professors in the program. Second the platform that we were using was WordPress and it was free to students and would be free to them when they became teachers. And now, the educational component was removed from Blue Host and this medium would not be free for students once they graduate, making the tool of less long-term value.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No findings are available at this time. The fall 2014 cohort was the first one to create an online portfolio and they will be adding to and improving the portfolio for another 3 semesters.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
New Portfolio

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

This year we will identify a portfolio platform that we can use. Simultaneously we will begin to create portfolio mini-projects ...

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Update Finding**

I anticipate that 90% of students will have passed the Bilingual Generalist by August.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013

Implementation Status: Terminated

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Bilingual Supplemental Certification Exam | Outcome/Objective: Depth of Knowledge

Implementation Description: Update needed

Responsible Person/Group: The Undergraduate Coordinator will update this finding in August.

**Continue with the pre-assessment**

We will continue collecting pre-assessments for this and give the post assessments as these students reach student teaching.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Pre/Post Test Critical Thinking Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking (Case-Study)

Implementation Description: Continue to offer this assessment (pre) to new cohorts

Responsible Person/Group: Miranda Walichowski

**New Portfolio**

This year we will identify a portfolio platform that we can use. Simultaneously we will begin to create portfolio mini-projects that string across multiple courses to help students build their portfolio, semester-by-semester. The current cohort of students will create a basic layout for their portfolio this fall 2016. And they will upload 2 projects and 1 artifact per course (BEFB 474, 472, and 428).

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Online Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Technology Proficiency

Responsible Person/Group: Miranda Walichowski

**New to Include Coaching Model**

This summer we are developing a new rubric that takes into consideration the work the students will be doing in terms of receiving instructional coaching.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Midpoint Improvement Plan | Outcome/Objective: Lifelong Learning

Implementation Description: Create a new rubric

Responsible Person/Group: Miranda Walichowski

**Reinstate**

As mentioned earlier this will be reinstated under an UG Honors Research project. For those students not accepted into that, will complete this as a traditional project.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills (Capstone - Written)

Implementation Description: Rework a rubric that can accommodate both the UG research project and capstone.

Responsible Person/Group: Miranda Walichowski

**Reinstate this for Fall 2016**

This project will be reinstated in the fall of 2016 as a long term capstone, as we move to having all students prepare a proposal and apply for the undergraduate research program. Those who are not accepted to the program will complete this as their capstone.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study | Outcome/Objective: Depth of Knowledge

Implementation Description: New program being created this summer to have all students participate in the UG
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

In terms of the outcomes related to the Single Case Capstone Project and the Midpoint Improvement plan, it is evident that we can make curricular changes to improve student learning. For example, it is apparent that students are not amply understanding how to apply content knowledge to an organic inquiry process. It is imperative that we help bridge that gap in praxis. As one of our goals is to ensure that all our future teachers know how to use data to make instructional decisions. We will bridge the gap by creating modules for each of the inquiry components that need to be mastered in order to execute an intervention project well. These will serve as refreshers for the students and will help them gain a better understanding of what is expected in each section.

Second, it is evident that students need additional writing and professional communication support. Effective writing is a key indicator of success for any teacher of record. And we can support stronger writing skills by being deliberate in creating an assignment in each bilingual class that has a heavy focus on writing. In these assignments, students will pre-submit for feedback. And then they will resubmit after they incorporate the feedback from peers and the instructor. This will also allow the instructor to identify which students might need additional supports with writing and address those on a case by case basis.

Rubric for Coaching Model: This plan is still in progress. We have to submit IRB as data will be collected on program effectiveness.
Mission / Purpose

The bilingual undergraduate education program is committed to serving culturally and linguistically diverse students across Texas, the United States, and around the world. The mission of the Hispanic Bilingual Education Undergraduate Program is to prepare students to be highly qualified teachers. Field-experiences, coursework and other academic requirements are designed to further prepare students to, as educators, meet the educational needs of the increasing culturally and linguistically diverse student populations and their families. The program offers a variety of courses in language and literacy acquisition (L1 and L2), culture, pedagogy, assessment, foundations of bilingualism, latest technology, and more.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Depth of Knowledge

Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate that they have mastered required content knowledge and skills required of a highly certified, entry-level educator by applying knowledge from core-curriculum, disciplined-based courses, and field-based experiences.

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree

Strategic Plan Associations

Texas A&M University

12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures

M 1: Bilingual Supplemental Certification Exam

The direct measure being used is the Licensure Exam: Bilingual Education Supplemental (164) which is taken during student's senior methods semester. Graduates of the BIED program will show mastery of content knowledge and skills required to be a highly certified, entry-level teachers in the state of Texas, by passing the Bilingual Supplemental (164) exam within 1 year of sitting for the first test. This exam is one of the four TExES exams required to become a bilingual certified teacher in the state of Texas. This particular exam does not measure language proficiency. This exam attempts to measure the knowledge base that a teacher-to-be has, in alignment with the Texas Educator Standards. It seems that, ironically, this exam poses more a challenge for our students than the generalist exam. And because this bilingual supplemental correlates directly to the population our students will be working with (and the content that is taught in the program) using this target seems to be a good indicator of student success.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:

70% of graduates of the BIED program will show mastery of content knowledge and skills required to be a highly certified, entry-level teachers in the state of Texas, by passing the Bilingual Supplemental Exam (164) within 1 year of sitting for the first test. This exam is taken during the first semester of Senior Methods. We are setting the requirement of 70% pass rate because this is a new exam for our students. Previously our students took the Bilingual Generalist EC-6 which has been phased-out.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

At this time, the pass rate for this exam is not available. For TEA the assessment cycle does not close until August 1st. However, as an indicator, these findings for the previous cycle were 92% pass rate for the Bilingual Supplemental.


Because this is a transition year, it seems that most students (for the fall 2014) opted to take the 3 exams that will be replaced by the new 4 exams. In other words, our students had the opportunity to just take the Bilingual Generalist and the Bilingual Supplemental. All opted for the familiar and having to pay for one less exam. The spring 2015 cohort has tested under the new format: Generalist and the Bilingual Supplemental, however those scores have not come in.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

For 90% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist with a 240, we can't report at this time, as the data are not in. The data will be available Summer 2014.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met

A few students are retaking their exams. They have until August to show that they have passed. Data are not complete at this time.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
**Update Finding**

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*

I anticipate that 90% of students will have passed the Bilingual Generalist by August.

**Update Needed when Data are In**

*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*

In August these data will be reported as that is when the certification officer is able to pull these from TEA.

---

**M 2: Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study**

The direct measure being used is the capstone paper "Single-Case Intervention" as graded using the AAC&U Inquiry and Analysis rubric and the AAC&U Written Communication rubric. These papers will be evaluated by a college committee solely for the purpose of assessing whether the students was able to provide effective written communication. Because this is a capstone and the writing committee convenes in early spring, we will need to either form our own committee among the bilingual faculty or report scores for the previous year.

**Source of Evidence:** Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Connected Documents**

- AASC Writing Value Rubric
- Inquiry Analysis Rubric
- Single Case Intervention Capstone Guidelines

**Target:**

**TARGET FOR INQUIRY AND ANALYSIS RUBRIC**

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This project was changed for this year because of two reasons. The student teachers had completed a research project to present at a conference (either as part of the UG Honors Research Program or on their own). Because these were time-consuming endeavors we allowed them to count towards this capstone. These projects demonstrated the same skills we sought to measure in the capstone. Also, this year, we implemented a new pilot for coaching student teachers. And given the new program, we had to make room in the curriculum to test new things. Because the students had conducted a large research-based project, we deemed this as something that could be substituted this year.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Reinstate this for Fall 2016**

*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*

This project will be reinstated in the fall of 2016 as a long term capstone, as we move to having all students prepare a proposa...

---

**SLO 2: Communication Skills (Capstone - Written)**

Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate effective written communication skills as evidenced by scoring satisfactorily (10 or 15 ) on the CEHD Writing Assessment rubric when applied to assess the Single-Case Intervention Capstone Project.

**Relevant Associations:**

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

3 Communicate effectively

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study**

The direct measure being used is the capstone paper "Single-Case Intervention" as graded using the AAC&U Inquiry and Analysis rubric and the AAC&U Written Communication rubric. These papers will be evaluated by a college committee solely for the purpose of assessing whether the students was able to provide effective written communication. Because this is a capstone and the writing committee convenes in early spring, we will need to either form our own committee among the bilingual faculty or report scores for the previous year.

**Source of Evidence:** Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Connected Documents**

- AASC Writing Value Rubric
- Inquiry Analysis Rubric
- Single Case Intervention Capstone Guidelines

**Target:**

70% of graduates of the BIED program will score between a 10 and 15 on the rubric BECAUSE....

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This project was changed for this year because of two reasons. The student teachers had completed a research project to present at a conference (either as part of the UG Honors Research Program or on their own). Because these were time-consuming endeavors we allowed them to count towards this capstone. These projects demonstrated the same skills we sought to measure in the capstone. Also, this year, we implemented a new pilot for coaching student teachers. And given the new program, we had to make room in the curriculum to test new things. Because the students had conducted a large research-based project, we deemed this as something that could be substituted this year.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Partially Met**

Only two students were evaluated during the fall 2014 semester. These students scored a 10. And the current student teachers will submit this project during the week of graduation.

**Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Results indicate that 100% of Special Education and Bilingual Education students scored 2 or above. Thus, the target was met.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Results indicate that 100% of Special Education students scored 2 or above. Thus, the target was met.
SLO 3: Critical Thinking (Case-Study)
Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate that they have increased their critically thinking/problem-solving skills by showing improvement in a Case Study Analysis. This Case Study provides a scenario about academic and behavior problems that a teacher is comforted with in her/his classroom. The students in our program provide an analysis of the Case Study upon entering professional phase. And then they analyze the same Case Study 2 or more years later during student teaching.

Relevant Associations:
- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  2  Demonstrate critical thinking

Related Measures
M 3: Critical Thinking Case Study
The direct measure being used is the rubric for the “Single-Case Intervention Capstone Project”
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery
Target:
100% of the graduates will score a 100 out of 150 on the rubric.
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This finding is not reported in this cycle because students took this Critical Thinking Case-Study pretest measure in the fall of 2015. And they will not be re-assessed with a post-test measure until their student teaching semester. The student teaching semester is about 3 semesters later for most students (Spring of 2017). So at this point, we are three semesters away from being able to report first findings.
The students teachers have not submitted this assignment to date. We only have two submissions from the fall and both students scored over 100. Current student teachers will submit this during the week when grade are due for graduates.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Continue with the pre-assessment
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
We will continue collecting pre-assessments for this and give the post assessments as these students reach student teaching.

SLO 4: Lifelong Learning
Graduates of the BIED program will engage in lifelong learning by creating a Midpoint Improvement Plan of professional goals and execution in order to strengthen areas of deficiency in instructional delivery, classroom management, and professionalism as expected of an entry-level, highly qualified educator in the state of Texas.

Relevant Associations:
- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  6  Prepare to engage in lifelong learning
- Strategic Plan Associations
  Texas A&M University
  3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures
M 4: Midpoint Improvement Plan
90% of students will score between a 10 or 15 on the AACU Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning Value Rubric.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Connected Documents
Life Long Learning
Midpoint Improvement Plan Guidelines
Target:
90% of Graduates of the BIED program will show that they can formulate a plan of personal and professional goals, established to strengthen areas of deficiency, so that they can have the tools necessary to continue to progress from a highly qualified, entry-level teacher to an excellent, experienced teacher throughout their careers, as evidenced in scoring an 80 or better on the Midpoint Improvement Plan rubric.
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the students scores an A on this assignment as rated by the student teaching supervisor. Next fall (2016) we will be creating a new midpoint improvement plan that incorporates more of an instructional coaching model.
We only had two student teachers in the fall 2014 and they both scored a 10. The current student teachers will not submit this assignment until the week of graduation.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
New to Include Coaching Model
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This summer we are developing a new rubric that takes into consideration the work the students will be doing in terms of receipt...

SLO 5: Technology Proficiency
Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate proficiency in current technologies and the ability to adapt to emerging technologies as evidenced in the development of their online teaching portfolio.

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6 Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Related Measures
M 5: Online Portfolio
The direct measure being used is the professional online teaching portfolio created by students as evaluated by a rubric being adapted from https://www2.uwstout.edu/content/profdev/rubrics/eportfoliorubric.html. Students are evaluated in the following categories:

- Selection of Artifacts
- Descriptive Text
- Reflective Commentary
- Citations
- Navigation
- Usability and Accessibility
- Writing Conventions
- Multimedia Elements

The rubric has four ratings (unsatisfactory, emerging, proficient, and exemplary). Students will work on their portfolio starting the first semester of professional phase until the end of student teaching.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
100% of students will score proficient or better in their the online portfolio rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
The portfolio target was not met. There were inconsistencies in having this project carry across various other courses by other professors in the program. Second the platform that we were using was WordPress and it was free to students and would be free to them when they became teachers. And now, the educational component was removed from Blue Host and this medium would not be free for students once they graduate, making the tool of less long-term value.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No findings are available at this time. The fall 2014 cohort was the first one to create an online portfolio and they will be adding to and improving the portfolio for another 3 semesters.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

New Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This year we will identify a portfolio platform that we can use. Simultaneously we will begin to create portfolio mini-projects...

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Update Finding
I anticipate that 90% of students will have passed the Bilingual Generalist by August.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Bilingual Supplemental Certification Exam | Outcome/Objective: Depth of Knowledge

Implementation Description: Update needed
Responsible Person/Group: The Undergraduate Coordinator will update this finding in August.

Written Communication VALUE Rubric
Our students capstone project will be evaluated next academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: High

Implementation Description: The student teachers will submit their intervention project to be scored using the Value Rubric next academic year.
Responsible Person/Group: The undergraduate coordinator will ensure that the papers are forwarded to be scored.

Continue with the pre-assessment
We will continue collecting pre-assessments for this and give the post assessments as these students reach student teaching.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Critical Thinking Case Study | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking (Case-Study)

Implementation Description: Continue to offer this assessment (pre) to new cohorts
Responsible Person/Group: Miranda Walichowski

New Portfolio
This year we will identify a portfolio platform that we can use. Simultaneously we will begin to create portfolio mini-projects that string across multiple courses to help students build their portfolio, semester-by-semester. The current cohort of students will create a basic layout for their portfolio this fall 2016. And they will upload 2 projects and 1 artifact per course (BEFB 474, 472, and 428).

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Online Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Technology Proficiency

Responsible Person/Group: Miranda Walichowski

New to Include Coaching Model
This summer we are developing a new rubric that takes into consideration the work the students will be doing in terms of receiving instructional coaching.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Midpoint Improvement Plan | Outcome/Objective: Lifelong Learning

Implementation Description: Create a new rubric
Responsible Person/Group: Miranda Walichowski

Reinstate
As mentioned earlier this will be reinstated under an UG Honors Research project. For those students not accepted into that, will complete this as a traditional project.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills (Capstone - Written)

Implementation Description: Rework a rubric that can accommodate both the UG research project and capstone.
Responsible Person/Group: Miranda Walichowski

Reinstate this for Fall 2016
This project will be reinstated in the fall of 2016 as a long term capstone, as we move to having all students prepare a proposal and apply for the undergraduate research program. Those who are not accepted to the program will complete this as their capstone.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study | Outcome/Objective: Depth of Knowledge

Implementation Description: New program being created this summer to have all students participate in the UG Honors research program. And this will serve as a substitute for this, perhaps requiring a new measure. But those students not in the UG honors research program will still complete this.
Responsible Person/Group: Miranda Walichowski

Update Needed when Data are In
In August these data will be reported as that is when the certification officer is able to pull these from TEA.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Bilingual Supplemental Certification Exam | Outcome/Objective: Depth of Knowledge

Implementation Description: Ask Misiti to pull pass rates.
Responsible Person/Group: Miranda

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

It seems that many of our measures could not be executed this past cycle for various reasons. So adjustments will be made this summer in order to be able to bring back those measures. In essence, we substituted some approaches that were equally, and probably more informative of student success. So progress in where we are going and the vision is certainly more clear.
Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

We have relatively new action plans, so there is not much of a comparison point to previous years. In previous years, we had broad targets and measures. And we have narrowed our vision for the program and how we want to measure student success.
Mission / Purpose

The bilingual undergraduate education program is committed to serving culturally and linguistically diverse students across Texas, the United States, and around the world. The mission of the Hispanic Bilingual Education Undergraduate Program is to prepare students to be highly qualified teachers. Field-experiences, coursework and other academic requirements are designed to further prepare students to, as educators, meet the educational needs of the increasing culturally and linguistically diverse student populations and their families. The program offers a variety of courses in language and literacy acquisition (L1 and L2), culture, pedagogy, assessment, foundations of bilingualism, latest technology, and more.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Depth of Knowledge

Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate that they have mastered required content knowledge and skills required of a highly certified, entry-level educator by applying knowledge from core-curriculum, disciplined-based courses, and field-based experiences.

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1  Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures

M 1: Bilingual Supplemental Certification Exam

The direct measure being used is the Licensure Exam: Bilingual Education Supplemental (164) which is taken during student's senior methods semester. Graduates of the BIED program will show mastery of content knowledge and skills required to be a highly certified, entry-level teachers in the state of Texas, by passing the Bilingual Supplemental (164) exam within 1 year of sitting for the first test. This exam is one of the four TExES exams required to become a bilingual certified teacher in the state of Texas. This particular exam does not measure language proficiency. This exam attempts to measure the knowledge base that a teacher-to-be has, in alignment with the Texas Educator Standards.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
70% of graduates of the BIED program will show mastery of content knowledge and skills required to be a highly certified, entry-level teachers in the state of Texas, by passing the Bilingual Supplemental Exam (164) within 1 year of sitting for the first test. This exam is taken during the first semester of Senior Methods. We are setting the requirement of 70% pass rate because this is a new exam for our students. Previously our students took the Bilingual Generalist EC-6 which has been phased-out.

Because this is a transition year, it seems that most students (for the fall 2014) opted to take the 3 exams that will be replaced by the new 4 exams. In other words, our students had the opportunity to just take the Bilingual Generalist, instead of the Generalist and the Bilingual Supplemental. All opted for the familiar and having to pay for one less exam. The spring 2015 cohort has tested under the new format: Generalist and the Bilingual Supplemental, however those scores have not come in.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
For 90% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist with a 240, we can't report at this time, as the data are not in. The data will be available Summer 2014.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
A few students are retaking their exams. They have until August to show that they have passed. Data are not complete at this time.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Update Finding
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
I anticipate that 90% of students will have passed the Bilingual Generalist by August.

M 2: Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study
The direct measure being used is the capstone paper "Single-Case Intervention" as graded using the AACu Inquiry and Analysis rubric.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Connected Document
Single Case Intervention Capstone Guidelines

SLO 2: REMOVE Depth of Knowledge (Capstone)
All BIED graduates will apply knowledge from core curriculum courses, discipline-based courses, and other experiences in identifying an academic or behavioral problem and make decisions, create an intervention, and solve the identified problem via a Single-Case Intervention study.

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree

Related Measures

M 2: Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study
The direct measure being used is the capstone paper "Single-Case Intervention" as graded using the AACu Inquiry and Analysis rubric.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Connected Document
Single Case Intervention Capstone Guidelines

M 3: Written Capstone Piece, Single-Case Intervention Project
The direct measure being used is the Capstone Paper, Single-Case Study. These papers will be evaluated by a college committee solely for the purpose of assessing whether the students was able to provide effective written communication. Because this is a capstone and the writing committee convenes in early spring, we will need to either form our own committee among the bilingual faculty or report scores for the previous year.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
70% of Students will score between a 10 or 15 or above on the Written Communication VALUE Rubric

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No findings are available at this time. The fall 2014 cohort was the first one to create an online portfolio and they will be adding to and improving the portfolio for another 3 semesters.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We contacted the Assessment to have our students included in the Written Communication Value Assessment. We were informed that they were on a three year cycle and they would not be testing this year. It is possible that we can participate in 2014-2015.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We were not included in the pilot group for the Written Communication VALUE Rubric; therefore, no data are available to report.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Written Communication VALUE Rubric
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Our students capstone project will be evaluated next academic year.

SLO 3: Communication Skills (Capstone - Written)
Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate effective written communication skills as evidenced by scoring satisfactorily (10 or 15) on the CEHD Writing Assessment rubric when applied to assess the Single-Case Intervention Capstone Project.

Connected Document
AASC Writing Value Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Communicate effectively

Related Measures

M 2: Capstone Single-Case Intervention Study
The direct measure being used is the capstone paper "Single-Case Intervention" as graded using the AACu Inquiry and Analysis rubric.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Connected Document
Single Case Intervention Capstone Guidelines

Target:
70% of graduates of the BIED program will score between a 10 and 15 on the rubric.

Only two students were evaluated during the fall 2014 semester. These students scored a 10. And the current student teachers will submit this project during the week of graduation.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Results indicate that 100% of Special Education and Bilingual Education students scored 2 or above. Thus, the target was met.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Results indicate that 100% of Special Education students scored 2 or above. Thus, the target was met.

SLO 4: Critical Thinking
Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate that they have increased their critical thinking skills (as a cohort) by showing growth on the CEHD critical thinking test from the baseline test (taken during the first semester of professional phase) to the post test (taken during student teaching).

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Demonstrate critical thinking

Related Measures

M 4: Critical Thinking Assessment
The CEHD Critical Thinking (General) test will be used as a pre- and post- test measure to determine growth in critical thinking skills from the time students first enter professional phase (during the fall BEFB courses) to the end of student teaching (during student teaching semester).
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
50% of Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate that they have increased their critical thinking skills by showing a 20% improvement or improvement on the CEHD critical thinking test from the baseline test (taken during the first semester of professional phase) to the post test (taken during student teaching).

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Our current cohort did not take this exam. We will be requesting that the fall 2015 cohort take this exam and that they post-test two years later during students teaching.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Overall, 90% of the students scored above the overall mean score of 2.00. This result is above the original goal of having at least 80% of the students score above a 2.00. Thus, the program met its goal for critical thinking.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
The mean score for Critical Thinking Assessment for EPSY UG Programs is 15.78, which is less than the cutoff target of 20.00 for critical thinking. Therefore, the target was not met.

M 5: Critical Thinking Case Study
The direct measure being used is the rubric for the "Single-Case Intervention Capstone Project"

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

SLO 5: Critical Thinking (Case-Study)
Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate that they have increased their critically thinking/problem-solving skills by showing improvement in a Case Study Analysis. This Case Study provides a scenario about academic and behavior problems that a teacher is comforted with in her/his classroom. The students in our program provide an analysis of the Case Study upon entering professional phase. And then they analyze the same Case Study 2 or more years later during student teaching.

Connected Document
Inquiry Analysis Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Demonstrate critical thinking

Related Measures

M 5: Critical Thinking Case Study
The direct measure being used is the rubric for the "Single-Case Intervention Capstone Project"

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

Target:
100% of the graduates will score a 100 out of 150 on the rubric.

The students teachers have not submitted this assignment to date. We only have two submissions from the fall and both students scored over 100. Current student teachers will submit this during the week when grade are due for graduates.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
The mean score for Critical Thinking Assessment for EPSY UG Programs is 15.78, which is less than the cutoff target of 20.00 for critical thinking. Therefore, the target was not met.

SLO 6: Lifelong Learning
Graduates of the BIED program will engage in lifelong learning by creating a Midpoint Improvement Plan of professional goals and execution in order to strengthen areas of deficiency in instructional delivery, classroom management, and professionalism as expected of an entry-level, highly qualified educator in the state of Texas.

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6 Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 6: Midpoint Improvement Plan
90% of students will score between a 10 or 15 on the AACU Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning Value Rubric. 

**Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Documents**

- Life Long Learning
- Midpoint Improvement Plan Guidelines

**Target:**
90% of Graduates of the BIED program will show that they can formulate a plan of personal and professional goals, established to strengthen areas of deficiency, so that they can have the tools necessary to continue to progress from a highly qualified, entry-level teacher to an excellent, experienced teacher throughout their careers, as evidenced in scoring an 80 or better on the Midpoint Improvement Plan rubric.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Partially Met**
We only had two student teachers in the fall 2014 and they both scored a 10. The current student teachers will not submit this assignment until the week of graduation.

**SLO 7: Technology Proficiency**
Graduates of the BIED program will demonstrate proficiency in current technologies and the ability to adapt to emerging technologies as evidenced in the development of their online teaching portfolio.

**Relevant Associations:**

- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  - 6 Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

**Related Measures**

- M 7: Online Portfolio
  The direct measure being used is the professional online teaching portfolio created by students as evaluated by a rubric being adapted from https://www2.uwstout.edu/content/profdev/rubrics/eportfoliorubric.html Students will work on their portfolio starting the first semester of professional phase until the end of student teaching.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
100% of students will score proficient or better in their the online portfolio rubric.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No findings are available at this time. The fall 2014 cohort was the first one to create an online portfolio and they will be adding to and improving the portfolio for another 3 semesters.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Update Finding**
I anticipate that 90% of students will have passed the Bilingual Generalist by August.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
**Implementation Status:** Terminated
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Bilingual Supplemental Certification Exam | Outcome/Objective: Depth of Knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Update needed
**Responsible Person/Group:** The Undergraduate Coordinator will update this finding in August.

**Written Communication VALUE Rubric**
Our students capstone project will be evaluated next academic year.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
**Implementation Status:** Terminated
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Written Capstone Piece, Single -Case Intervention Project | Outcome/Objective: REMOVE Depth of Knowledge (Capstone)

**Implementation Description:** The student teachers will submit their intervention project to be scored using the Value Rubric next academic year.
**Responsible Person/Group:** The undergraduate coordinator will ensure that the papers are forwarded to be scored.

**Implementation Plan**
This was our first semester to have our own WEAVE profile (separate from Special ED). So we have new outcomes and measures. Many of these are pre and post measures or capstone-type measures and scores are not available at this time. In order not to wait a full two-years for some of the scores, we will conduct a gap analysis to inform us about student progress. The following are measures that will be assessed in the gap: new bilingual exam, case-study, college critical thinking assessment, online portfolio.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2016
**Responsible Person/Group:** Miranda Walichowski

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program?
Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Our previous assessment efforts were tied with Special Education. As of this year, the Bilingual Education Program and the Special Education Program have separate assessment plans. Therefore, some of the analysis can't be done because these measures are new and some require long-term data collection (such as a pretest compared to a post test 3 to 4 semesters later). Below are the Analysis that I have for each outcome:

- **Bilingual Supplemental Exam:** ANALYSIS: At this time analysis could not be completed because, only, the spring cohort had taken the new format of exams. And the scores for the Bilingual Educational Supplemental 164 are not available at this time.

- **Single-Case Intervention Study:** ANALYSIS: We have just received IRB approval to analyze the performance of students over the past 5 years on this assignment. We will be analyzing the quality of the work and the patterns that we see. This will enable us to enhance the rubric to capture more details about student performance and students’ areas of deficiency (that we can develop).

- **CEHD Critical Thinking Test from the baseline test (taken during the first semester of professional phase) to the post test (taken during student teaching):** ANALYSIS: Since this is a new endeavor and we are approaching this in an exploratory way, we just want to see some indication of improvement with the first cohort.

- **Midpoint Improvement Plan:** ANALYSIS: The analysis is still as the student teachers have not submitted these projects for the spring of 2015. But it was evident that the rubric needs a few adjustments to align with this project.

- **Online Teaching Portfolio:** ANALYSIS: The analysis is not possible at this time. The fall 2014 cohort was the first one to create an online portfolio and they will be adding to and improving the portfolio for another 3 semesters.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

As mentioned in the analysis, we recently were given our own program assessment profile. Many of the new outcomes and measures that we have selected are not available at this time. For example, some measures are not collected for another week. Therefore, at this time it is not possible to determine a course of action. In general, our course of action, entails gathering exploratory data for some of these measures and refining the rubrics.
Mission / Purpose

Mission (Special Education): The mission of the special education program is to improve the quality of special education services for children and youth with disabilities and their families through teaching, research, and service. We provide initial preparation and advanced professional development of teachers, educational leaders (with on-campus and distance master's programs), and educational researchers (doctoral). We conduct research focused on improving school and community systems. We provide service to the field of special education through leadership in professional organizations and through knowledge dissemination activities.

Mission (Bilingual): The mission of the bilingual education program is to improve the quality of education services for culturally and linguistically diverse children and youth and their families across Texas, the United States, and around the world through teaching, research, and service. We provide initial preparation and advanced professional development of teachers, educational leaders (with on-campus and distance master's programs), and educational researchers (doctoral). We conduct research on second language acquisition in order focused on improving schools. We provide service to the field of bilingual education through leadership in professional organizations and through knowledge dissemination activities.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Critical Thinking
Students will demonstrate critical thinking within the discipline

Related Measures

M 1: Critical Thinking Assessment
Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT)
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
80% of students will score above a 20 on the CAT

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Overall, 90% of the students scored above the overall mean score of 2.00. This result is above the original goal of having at least 80% of the students score above a 2.00. Thus, the program met its goal for critical thinking.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
The mean score for Critical Thinking Assessment for EPSY UG Programs is 15.78, which is less than the cutoff target of 20.00 for critical thinking. Therefore, the target was not met.

M 3: Bil. ED. Critical Thinking Assessment
70% of students will score above a 20 on the Critical Thinking Assessment, during the student teaching semester.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target:
70% of students will score 70% on the Critical Thinking Assessment, during the student teaching semester.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We contacted the Assessment to have our students included in the CTA. We were informed that they were on a three year cycle and they would not be testing this year. It is possible that we can participate in 2014-2015.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We were not included in the pilot group for the CTA for this reporting period; therefore, no data are available to report.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Critical Thinking Assessment
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Our students will take the CTA in the next academic year.

SLO 2: Communication Skills
Students will demonstrate effective communication skills

Related Measures

M 2: Written Communication Evaluation
Evaluation of W-course artifacts using Written Communication VALUE rubric

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target:
80% of students will score a 2 or above on the Written Communication VALUE rubric

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Results indicate that 100% of Special Education and Bilingual Education students scored 2 or above. Thus, the target was met.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Results indicate that 100% of Special Education students scored 2 or above. Thus, the target was met.

SLO 3: Bil. ED. Critical Thinking
Students will demonstrate critical thinking within the discipline.

SLO 4: Bil. ED. Written Communication
Students will demonstrate effective written communication skill.

Related Measures

M 4: Bil. ED. Evaluation of Written Capstone Piece, Intervention Project
70% of Students will score a 2 or above on the Written Communication VALUE Rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
70% of Students will score a 2 or above on the Written Communication VALUE Rubric

Finding (2012-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We contacted the Assessment to have our students included in the Written Communication Value Assessment. We were informed that they were on a three year cycle and they would not be testing this year. It is possible that we can participate in 2014-2015.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We were not included in the pilot group for the Written Communication VALUE Rubric; therefore, no data are available to report.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Written Communication VALUE Rubric
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Our students capstone project will be evaluated next academic year.

SLO 5: Bil. ED. Content Mastery
For 2012 -2013, 90% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist with a score of 240.

For 2013 -2014 (if the new exam is in place) 70% of Students will pass (with a score of 240 or better) the new Bilingual Generalist exam. TEA is introducing a new exam. And this exam will be scored differently. Students will be required to pass all domains in the exam in order to pass the exam. As we move to this new exam model, we are setting are pass rate at 70% for the first two years and we plan to increase that by 10% each year.

Related Measures

M 5: Bil. ED. Bilingual Generalist Certification Exam
For 2012 - 2013, 90% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist with a 240.

Note: For 2013 - 2014, 70% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist Supplemental and the Generalist with a score of 240. This will be a new test. And the students will be required to pass each domain in order to pass the test.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
For 2012 - 2013, 90% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist with a 240.

Note: For 2013 - 2014, 70% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist Supplemental and the Generalist with a score of 240. This will be a new test. And the students will be required to pass each domain in order to pass the test.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
For 90% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist with a 240, we can’t report at this time, as the data are not in. The data will be available Summer 2014.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
A few students are retaking their exams. They have until August to show that they have passed. Data are not complete at this time.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Update Finding
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
I anticipate that 90% of students will have passed the Bilingual Generalist by August.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Certification Exam Support and Preparation
Bilingual Education:

Based on the findings from the outcomes that use the measure of the Bilingual Generalist Certification Exam we are going to make some changes. Our students pass the certification exam upon graduation. However, recently, we have seen a trend, many are not passing the exam on the first administration. We are going to set a new goal of having 80% of the students pass the exam at the first respective administration.

The steps for this Support and Preparation plan include but are not limited to: (1) having students pretest for the exam in the early stages of professional admission; (2) putting students who score below an 80 on a support track*; (3) requiring students to
test early during the methods semester; (4) having a clearance point before entering student teaching (to ensure that they are on track); (5) incorporate informal and formal assessment opportunities in the BEFB courses which align with the format of the test (so that students become more familiar with the format, sooner).

*The support track will offer students preparation sessions which address their needs. These sessions will be offered twice per semester, so as not to add to their course load and obligations. But they will be sufficient to help them become comfortable with the content of the exam and the testing format of the exam.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The clearance checkpoints will serve as an opportunity to ensure that students are preparing and taking the exams as outlined in the program sequence. The support track will offer students preparation sessions which address their needs. These sessions will be offered twice per semester, so as not to add to their course load and obligations. But they will be sufficient to help them become comfortable with the content of the exam and the testing format of the exam.

Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Program Coordinator

Critical Thinking Assessment
Our students will take the CTA in the next academic year.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Bil. ED. Critical Thinking Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking
Implementation Description: Our students will take the CTA in the next academic year.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2014
Responsible Person/Group: The Undergraduate Coordinator will make arrangements for the assessment to be administered to the student teachers.

Critical Thinking Assessment for Special Education UG
Review scope and sequence of curriculum to ensure measures of critical thinking related to the discipline are in place. Since the TEA certification exams are currently being revamped, we will hold off on any substantial changes until we receive the information on domains and criteria. At this point, we will require that 85% of SPED students will get 80% or higher on the measures of critical thinking related to the discipline on the first submission. Papers from upper level courses will be used to determine the level of critical thinking proficiency.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Will evaluate based on critical thinking rubrics
Projected Completion Date: 03/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Lynch and Dr. Fournier

Plan of Action for Strategies and Resources
Higher level questions, transitional techniques, and stating full objectives and closure activities will be emphasized in coursework and when writing lesson plans.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Lesson plans submitted by students will include higher level questions, transitional techniques, well developed statement of objectives and closure activities.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors in upper-level coursework

Update Finding
I anticipate that 90% of students will have passed the Bilingual Generalist by August.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Bil. ED. Bilingual Generalist Certification Exam | Outcome/Objective: Bil. ED. Content Mastery
Implementation Description: Update needed
Responsible Person/Group: The Undergraduate Coordinator will update this finding in August.

Writing Assessment for Special Education
Key conventions of writing will be explicitly taught in Writing intensive courses beginning in Fall of 2013. Results will be available in 2014 data.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Specific teaching of writing elements in class
Projected Completion Date: 03/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Fournier and Dr. Lynch
Additional Resources: Finding a GA for developing modules for training

Written Communication VALUE Rubric
Our students capstone project will be evaluated next academic year.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Bil. ED. Evaluation of Written Capstone Piece, Intervention Project | Outcome/Objective: Bil. ED. Written Communication

Implementation Description: The student teachers will submit their intervention project to be scored using the Value Rubric next academic year.

Responsible Person/Group: The undergraduate coordinator will ensure that the papers are forwarded to be scored.

New course for special education teachers
We have spent the last year analyzing our curriculum and aligning with state and national standards. We are currently gathering information from stakeholders, and will be making changes to the curriculum based on feedback. We have renewed the writing course status of SPED 428 Collaboration in school settings. As a result of input from stakeholders and students, we will be implementing a new course for teaching math directed toward special education teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2015

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program?
Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Bilingual Education:
Analysis are not available at this time. The CTA and the Writing Assessment were not offered this year, so our students do not have scores under these to report. At this time, certification exam passing rates have not been confirmed. Unofficial data indicate that 19/20 students have passed the Bilingual Certification exam at this time.

Special Education:
Analysis of the CTA and the Writing Assessment indicate our students in the SPED program scored the highest in the College of Education. We will continue with our writing plan as indicated above, and have included pieces in the curriculum such as having students write higher order questions in learning plans to hopefully improve or sustain higher level thinking. The pass rates for the certification exam are not yet available for Spring, 2014 students. The first time pass rate for our students in special education continues to be in the 94% to 100% range, which is higher than the state average. At this time we are still waiting on content and format for the new state certification exams to prepare our students. At this time, certification exam passing rates have not been confirmed.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.
In Special Education, the Writing and CTA assessments have been established as part of the curriculum cycle. The Assessment Office suggested contact at the start of fall 2014 to see if the CTA and W assessment cycle for bilingual education can be added.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Special Education Program is to prepare the highest quality professional educators to meet the diverse educational needs of students with disabilities in grades EC (Early Childhood) through grade 12. This program prepares professional educators to be state and national leaders in the field of special education through becoming critical consumers of research and implementing best practices throughout their careers.

Connected Documents
Assessment Rubric
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
Collaboration Rubric
Communication Rubric
Critical Thinking Rubric
Development and Characteristics Rubric
Foundations Rubric
Individual Learning Differences Rubric
Instructional Planning Rubric
Instructional Strategies Rubric
Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
Social Competence Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Goals

G 1: Skillful, Ethical, Caring Professionals
To prepare educators to serve as skillful, ethical, and caring professionals who respect the ethnic, linguistic, and cultural diversity of the students, families, and communities in which they work. All (100%) of our SPED students received "proficient" or "exemplary" on our capstone student teaching measures. If anyone had not received this level of rating initially, then a support plan would be in place. No support plans were need.

Connected Documents
CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric
Collaboration Rubric
Communication Rubric
Critical Thinking Rubric
Development and Characteristics Rubric
Foundations Rubric
Instructional Planning Rubric
Instructional Strategies Rubric
Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
Social Competence Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

G 2: Meeting needs of students
To prepare educators to meet the needs of students considered “at-risk” or “low-performing” as well as those with disabilities. All students (100%) passed in a project that provided individually developed transition plan for that individual and her/his family. In addition, all students (100%) received 'proficient' or 'exceeds expectations' on measures by field supervisors and mentor teachers on the items that specific reflect differentiating instruction.

Connected Documents
Assessment Rubric
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
Collaboration Rubric
Communication Rubric
Development and Characteristics Rubric
Foundations Rubric
Instructional Planning Rubric
Instructional Strategies Rubric
Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
Social Competence Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

G 3: Evidence-Based Practices
To prepare educators to implement evidence-based practices in relation to identification of students with special needs as well as instructional planning, implementation, and progress evaluation to meet the diverse needs of these students. All students received a 'proficient' score in researching and applying evidence based practices in SPED 311. Students show evidence based practices on their efolios through their learning plans. All students were at the "meeting expectation" level. Students demonstrate teaching at the "proficiency" level on all field supervisors and mentor teacher evaluation tools. Two students who did not meet this level had extra days in the field until "proficiency" was seen consistently by both mentor teacher and supervisor.

Connected Documents
Assessment Rubric
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
Collaboration Rubric
G 4: Critical Self-Judgment and Program Evaluation
To prepare educators to develop skills in critical self-judgment and program evaluation to ensure their ability to continue to develop as effective professionals after leaving the University.

Connected Documents
- CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
- Communication Rubric
- Critical Thinking Rubric
- Instructional Planning Rubric
- Instructional Strategies Rubric
- Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
- Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
- Social Competence Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Foundations
Identify and apply evidence-based principles, laws and policies, historical points of view and cultural and diverse aspects as related to exceptionality.

Connected Document
- Foundations Rubric

Relevant Associations:
- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
  2. Demonstrate critical thinking
  5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

Strategic Plan Associations
- Texas A&M University
  3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 1: Certification Exam
The Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) tests measure the content knowledge required of an entry-level educator in Special education within Texas public schools. The exam measures 12 competences across 4 domains:

- Domain 1: Understanding Individuals with Disabilities and Evaluating Their Needs
- Domain 2: Promoting Student Learning and Development
- Domain 3: Promoting Student Achievement in English Language Arts and Reading and in Mathematics
- Domain 4: Foundations and Professional Roles and Responsibilities

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Connected Documents
- Development and Characteristics Rubric
- Foundations Rubric
- Individual Learning Differences Rubric

Target:
Students will achieve an overall 85% pass rate of the licensing exam.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Changes to State reporting system prevented us from accessing 2017-2018 certification exam passage rates before the assessment deadlines. Therefore, we will not report on this exam this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Pass rate of the licensing exam for graduating students was 97.6%, therefore this target was met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Pass Rate Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12 99.40%
Pass Rate Special Education EC-12 100%
Pass Rate English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental 95%
Generalist EC-6 97.90%.

These results are at or above the previous year scores. Therefore, the target is met.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Tests Taken</th>
<th>Tests Passed</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PPR</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The certification exam is the primary measure for this objective, but scores have been provided as total scores and not the subtest scores. Our students have a 100% pass rate on the special education test, which measures this objective, but we are not sure of the subtest scores. We will be including electronic portfolios as part of assessing this objective in the next cycle.

SLO 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners

Demonstrate respect and appropriate responses to varying ability and behaviors of diverse students based on knowledge of development and exceptionality

Connected Document
Development and Characteristics Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 1: Certification Exam
The Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) tests measure the content knowledge required of an entry-level educator in Special education within Texas public schools. The exam measures 12 competences across 4 domains:

- Domain 1: Understanding Individuals with Disabilities and Evaluating Their Needs
- Domain 2: Promoting Student Learning and Development
- Domain 3: Promoting Student Achievement in English Language Arts and Reading and in Mathematics
- Domain 4: Foundations and Professional Roles and Responsibilities

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Connected Documents
Development and Characteristics Rubric
Foundations Rubric
Individual Learning Differences Rubric

Target:
Students will achieve an overall 85% pass rate of the licensing exam.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Changes to State reporting system prevented us from accessing 2017-2018 certification exam passage rates before the assessment deadline. Therefore, we will not report on this exam this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Test Tests Taken Tests Passed Pass Rate
Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12 600 597 99.50%
Total PPR 601 598 99.50%
Special Education EC-12 50 50 100%
Total Special Education EC-12 50 50 100%
English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental 305 272 89.20%
Total English as a Second Language Supplemental NA 305 272 89.20%
Generalist EC-6 219 218 99.50%
Total Generalist EC-6 222 221 99.50%

We are not specifically looking at this outcome this cycle. It will be reviewed in 2015-16.

SLO 3: Individual Learning Differences

Provide appropriate individualized instruction through actively seeking how language, culture, and family background impact individuals with exceptionalities

Connected Document
Individual Learning Differences Rubric
**Relevant Associations:**

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively

**Strategic Plan Associations**
Texas A&M University
3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Certification Exam**
The Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) tests measure the content knowledge required of an entry-level educator in Special education within Texas public schools. The exam measures 12 competences across 4 domains:

- Domain 1: Understanding Individuals with Disabilities and Evaluating Their Needs
- Domain 2: Promoting Student Learning and Development
- Domain 3: Promoting Student Achievement in English Language Arts and Reading and in Mathematics
- Domain 4: Foundations and Professional Roles and Responsibilities

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Connected Documents**
- Development and Characteristics Rubric
- Foundations Rubric
- Individual Learning Differences Rubric

**Target:**
Students will achieve an overall 85% pass rate of the licensing exam.

**Connected Document**
- Individual Learning Differences Rubric

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Changes to State reporting system prevented us from accessing 2017-2018 certification exam passage rates before the assessment deadline. Therefore, we will not report on this exam this cycle.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Test Tests Taken Tests Passed Pass Rate
Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12 600 597 99.50%
Total PPR 601 598 99.50%
Special Education EC-12 50 50 100%
Total Special Education EC-12 50 50 100%
English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental 305 272 89.20%
Total English as a Second Language Supplemental NA 305 272 89.20%
Generalist EC-6 219 218 99.50%
Total Generalist EC-6 222 221 99.50%

We are not evaluating this objective this cycle. It will be evaluated in the 2016-17 cycle.

**SLO 4: Instructional Strategies**
Select, adapt, and use evidence-based instructional strategies that individualize instruction and modify environments to develop, maintain, and generalize critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills for students with exceptional needs

**Connected Documents**
- Instructional Strategies Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

**Relevant Associations:**

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively

**Strategic Plan Associations**
Texas A&M University
3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Electronic Portfolio**
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Instructional Strategies rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Instructional Strategies Rubric

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of students met proficient levels on efolio regarding instructional strategies.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective will be assessed during the 2015-16 cycle.

SLO 5: Instructional Planning
Design systematic instruction that includes individual or group goals and objectives based on students' learning needs; implement best practices for teaching; consider linguistic factors; and work with students and relevant stakeholders to develop individualized transition plans

Connected Documents
Instructional Planning Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1  Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2  Demonstrate critical thinking
3  Communicate effectively

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Instructional Planning rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Instructional Planning Rubric

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of students on efolio review specific to instructional planning with students. Performance on eportfolio is consistent when comparing to previous years.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

The electronic portfolio will not be implemented until the fall 2015 semester. Students were asked to submit their best lesson plan and these were evaluated using the instructional planning rubric.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Instructional Planning improvement
The lesson plan template needs to be modified so that students are required to indicate modifications on the plan. A rubric for...

SLO 6: Assessment
Select reliable and valid formal and informal assessment tools that meet students' educational and behavioral needs; make educational decisions based on assessment results; adjust instruction or make modifications to enable students to access the general education curriculum and participate in statewide assessments

Connected Documents
Assessment Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1  Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
6  Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.
**Related Measures**

**M 2: Electronic Portfolio**
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
95% of students will be at proficient level using Assessment rubric (attached document)

**Connected Document**
Assessment Rubric

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
100% of students met proficiency levels on efolio regarding student learning assessment.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Not measured this cycle.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This objective will be assessed during the 2015-16 cycle.

**SLO 7: Professional and Ethical Practice**
Be lifelong learners and stay current with evidenced-based practices; display respectful attitude in all settings with colleagues, students, and families; demonstrate sensitivity toward cultures and diversity; ensure confidentiality; meet professional commitments in a timely manner; and practice within legal and ethical guidelines

**Connected Documents**
Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

**Relevant Associations:**

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
4 Practice personal and social responsibility
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
6 Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Electronic Portfolio**
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
95% of students will be at proficient level using Professional and Ethical Practice rubric (attached document)

**Connected Document**
Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
99% of students met proficiency levels as outlined on the rubric. Performance has remained consistent when comparing to previous years.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Not measured this cycle.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
The electronic portfolio will be implemented during the fall 2015 semester. Professional and ethical practice was assessed this semester through the student teaching evaluation.

**M 5: Student Teaching Evaluation**
Rubric that evaluates student performance in student teaching, the capstone experience in the program.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
95% of students will be at proficient or higher level using Student Teaching rubric (attached document)

**Connected Documents**
Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
100% are at proficient level in last university supervisor and mentor teacher evaluations.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Not measured this cycle.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
The student teaching evaluation for the 2015 student teachers were reviewed and the attached rubric applied. 100% of students scored at proficient in professional and ethical practice.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
The student teaching evaluation for the fall 2014 student teachers were reviewed and the the attached rubric applied. 100% of students scored at proficient in professional and ethical practice.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**professional and ethical practice**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
Although students have performed well on this objective, faculty will continue to stress the importance of professional and ethi...

**SLO 8: Learning Environment and Social Interactions**
Collaborate with general educators, paraprofessionals, and the community to create motivating learning environments that foster active engagement in learning and respect for diversity in both typical and crisis situations

**Related Associations:**
[General Education/Core Curriculum Associations]
1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree  
3 Communicate effectively  
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence  
7 Work collaboratively

**Strategic Plan Associations**
Texas A&M University  
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Electronic Portfolio**
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work  
**Target:** 95% of students will be at proficient level using Learning Environment and Social Interactions rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
[Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric]

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
100% of students met proficiency levels on efolio regarding learning environment and social interactions.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Partially Met**
The students are assessed by independent faculty and graduate assistants on the basis of the e-folio presentation and documents, using a rubric connected to SBEC and CEC standards. In this data below (sorry, tried every way possible to get this into a more readable ) What we can see is that two areas meet criteria: Behavior Management and Modifying to meet individual needs. Both are at 97% of the students being at the proficient level. Two areas are close--understanding learning demands at 92% and developing social skills at 94%. Two areas need more development: managing paraprofessionals at 89% and managing Crises at 86%

Frequencies table

| Objective Novice Developing Proficient Average score Total % proficient |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Learning demands| 1 4 58 2.91 92  | Social Skills 0 3 59 2.95 94  |
| Behavior management| 0 2.59 2.97 97  | Modifying to need individual needs 0 5 56 2.92 97  |
| Managing Paraprofessionals| 2 5 56 2.86 89  | Managing Crises 1 5 54 2.88 86  |

Connected Document
[2017 data for electronic portfolio]

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This objective was not assessed this cycle. It will be assessed during the 2016-17 cycle.

**SLO 9: Communications**
Understand language development, identify strategies to support students language and communication needs, determine appropriate assistive technology to support students communicative needs, and model effective language for all students including those whose primary language is not English

Connected Documents
[CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric]
[Communication Rubric]
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

3 Communicate effectively
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

Strategic Plan Associations

Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target: 95% of students will be at proficient level using Communications rubric (attached document)

Connected Document

Communication Rubric

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of students scored proficient on efolio regarding communication.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Connected Document

2017 data for electronic portfolio

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective was scheduled for this semester, but electronic portfolios will not be implemented until the fall 2015 semester. Communications was evaluated through the college’s writing assessment.

M 4: Transition Project Writing Skills
The final project in SEFB 420 is used as the writing sample provided to the college each year for evaluation in addition to also being included on the electronic portfolio as a measure of other disciplinary learning outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document

CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric

Target: 85% of students will score at sufficient or better on the CEHD rubric for Writing Assessment (document attached)

Connected Document

CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
Results show 92% (21/23) of students scored 2.0 (sufficient) or better on CEHD writing assessment rubric.

Mean scores for the rubric domains are are as follows:
- Style: 2.66
- Idea or Content: 2.65
- Organization: 2.67
- Conventions: 2.54

Each mean score was collectively .27 above the college mean of 2.36. Students continue to surpass expectations on written communication. Therefore this target was met.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Results indicate that 39/40 or 97.5% of students scored a 2 (sufficient) or higher on the CEHD writing assessment rubric. Therefore this target was met.

Means for each rubric category were: Style - 2.81; Idea or Content - 2.84, Organization - 2.99, Conventions - 2.91. Interrater reliability scores were statistically significant and were above the 0.70 cut off.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Results indicate the overall mean score was above than 2.00, and 100 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is above the cutoff level of 85 percent. Therefore, the target is met.


Written Communications at the Program Level

Students from the Special Education program (n = 20) participated in the assessment process. Results are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Measure</th>
<th>Program CEHD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Style</td>
<td>2.88 (.51) 2.72 (.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Idea</td>
<td>2.93 (.44) 2.62 (.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization</td>
<td>2.95 (.43) 2.69 (.58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation and Limitations

Results indicate the overall mean score was above 2.00, and 100 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is above the cutoff level of 80 percent. The results should be interpreted alongside other data sources, such as last year’s critical thinking assessment.

The results should be also interpreted in light of potential limitations. These represent scores from a subset of all students in the program. Rater reliability scores were statistically significant but less than the traditional cutoff point.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Writing skills

Even though students met the proficient level in writing, faculty feel like writing skills can be improved. We will require stu...

SLO 10: Collaboration
Effectively collaborate with families, educators, related service providers, and agency personnel in a culturally responsive manner in the education of children with exceptionalities

Objective Novice Developing Proficient Average score Total % proficient
Groups 0 2 61 2.97 97
Communication with others 1 3 59 2.29 94
Interviewing others 1 3 56 2.92 89
Coteaching 0 8 54 2.87 86
Ethics 0 7 53 2.94 94
Leadership 0 7 53 2.88 84

Connected Documents
Collaboration Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
7 Work collaboratively

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Collaboration rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Collaboration Rubric

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of students met proficiency levels for efolio regarding collaboration.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Partially Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Total % proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coteaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart above displays student performance based on rubric dynamics. Scores show 95% proficiency in group category, and 86-95% proficiency in communication with others, interviewing others, coteaching, ethics, and leadership proficiency. Therefore the target was partially met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective was not assessed this cycle. It will be assessed in the 2016-17 cycle.

SLO 11: Social and Global Competence
Live and work effectively in a diverse and global society and articulate the value of a diverse and global perspective

Connected Documents
Social Competence Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures
M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Social and Global Competence rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Social Competence Rubric

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of students met proficiency levels for social and global competence, as outlined on rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective was not assessed this cycle. It will be assessed in the 2015-16 cycle.

SLO 12: Critical Thinking
Apply critical thinking skills to solve problems in the field of education

Connected Documents
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
Critical Thinking Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Demonstrate critical thinking
Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures
M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Critical Thinking rubric (attached document)

Connected Documents
2017 data for electronic portfolio
Critical Thinking Rubric

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of students met proficiency levels on efolio for critical thinking, as outlined on rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Results indicate the overall mean score was above than 2.00, and 52 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is below the cutoff level of 80 percent. Therefore, the target is not met. See action plans for further updates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The electronic portfolio will be implemented during the fall 2015 semester. Critical thinking was evaluated this cycle using the College Critical Thinking Test.

M 3: Critical Thinking Test
College-developed standardized measure of critical thinking skills.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Connected Document
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric

Target:
85% of students will score at Sufficient or above (2.0)

Connected Document
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
(n=44) Overall, 80% of the students scored at or above a mean score of 2.0. This result is below original goal of having at least 85% of students score at or above a score of 2.0. Thus, **this program did not meet its goal** for critical thinking. Notably, Special Education students scored at or above the mean average of the College in all categories, with the most significant difference of 0.81 for Q1A-Explanation of Issues.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met


Critical Thinking at the Program Level

Students from the Special Education program (n = 29) participated in the study. Results are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Program Results</th>
<th>CEHD Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1A</td>
<td>Explain Issue</td>
<td>2.55 (.65)</td>
<td>2.41 (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1B</td>
<td>Use evidence in offering response</td>
<td>2.42 (.69)</td>
<td>2.36 (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Consider the influence of context and assumptions</td>
<td>2.04 (.45)</td>
<td>1.91 (.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3A</td>
<td>Clearly state position, perspective, or thesis</td>
<td>1.63 (.52)</td>
<td>1.57 (.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3B</td>
<td>Arrive at reasoned conclusions and outcomes</td>
<td>1.60 (.51)</td>
<td>1.60 (.54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Mean Score: 2.05 (.41) 1.97 (.51)
Percent over 2.0: 59% 62%

Interpretation and Limitations

Results indicate the overall mean score was below than 2.00, and 59 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is below the cutoff level of 80 percent. Therefore, the target is not met on this test.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Increase practice in critical thinking skills
The critical thinking skills rubric will be provided to all faculty teaching in the undergraduate program and case studies requi...

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Increase practice in critical thinking skills
The critical thinking skills rubric will be provided to all faculty teaching in the undergraduate program and case studies requiring critical thinking skills will be developed and included in all program courses. Faculty will also be explicit about the use of critical thinking and demonstrate the process during class activities.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Critical Thinking Test | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking

Implementation Description: During the 2015-16 school year, faculty will incorporate critical thinking activities into courses by specifically having students review the literature and support thinking

Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Special Education Undergraduate faculty and Particularly SPED 311 Assessment
Additional Resources: none

Instructional Planning improvement
The lesson plan template needs to be modified so that students are required to indicate modifications on the plan. A rubric for the lesson plan needs to be provided to all field supervisors so that they can reinforce proper planning
Leadership, coteaching, writing, and critical thinking

Writing skills

Even though students met the proficient level in writing, faculty feel like writing skills can be improved. We will require students to meet one-on-one with the University Writing Assistant in both writing intensive classes at least once. Students who do not show improvement will be required to go to the Writing Center for help with all written assignments. Students may be put on growth plans if improvement in writing skills is not demonstrated.

Critical Thinking Assessment Continued

In addition to the existing action plan for critical thinking, in which faculty will be given critical thinking rubrics to use aspects of within their written projects. Based on the critical thinking test results, we have two new actions. Having identified a pattern across the college regarding decreases in scores as the test progresses, we are changing the order of the questions to see if there is a difference. In addition, we are highlighting using professional literature to reinforce professional and ethical behaviors, especially in field based seminars through lectures and discussion. This has also been rewritten in the student handbook, and reviewed during incoming student orientation.

Leadership, coteaching, writing, and critical thinking

Reflective analysis of leadership and interviewing skills (collaboration elements not at or near proficient level of 95%) will be emphasized in Block III transitions by a self-reflective analyses of personal strengths and weaknesses as well a plan to increase strengths.

A rubric similar to current rubrics for the overall elements will be used to assess these skills.

Working effectively with paraprofessionals will be emphasized in our low incidence class with an assignment that has students create a lesson plan that incorporates paraprofessional assistance. A rubric similar to this element in collaboration will be used to assess these skills.

Although writings continue to improve, the SPED course is currently later in the curriculum sequence. We are moving the writing intensive course to Block I, and are keeping the individualized instruction through our Graduate Assistant.

Crisis management will be introduced in Block I seminar (Mental Health training), and will have an additional component in Block III seminar, where students will reflect on types of crises and management at the classroom level.
Coteaching (in collaboration) will be directly taught and demonstrated through the Reading class in Block I. Students will provide self-reflection which will be scored on a rubric element similar to the final rubric.

**Established in Cycle:** 2016-2017  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** These changes will be begin through course instructors in Fall, 2017 and Spring, 2018.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2020  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Melissa Fogarty and other program coordinators.

**Efolio Critical thinking Action Plan:**

In addition to the existing action plan for critical thinking, in which faculty will be given critical thinking rubrics to use aspects of within their written projects. Based on the critical thinking test results, we have two new actions. Having identified a pattern across the college regarding decreases in scores as the test progresses, we are changing the order of the questions to see if there is a difference. In addition, we are highlighting using professional literature to support student writing in SPED 311 Assessment and EPFB 4Transition to help develop or hone those skills. Initial results show an improvement in conclusions and related outcomes. Although we are not at the 2.0 level for this area yet, we have substantial improvement over the previous year, and so we are keeping this plan as is.

**Established in Cycle:** 2017-2018  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jennifer Ganz, Laura Styles

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

As a program, we identified three next steps for action. First, we are emphasizing peer review with rubrics on written products throughout the program. Since we are beginning to see improvement in key areas of writing and critical thinking, this has begun and will continue. Second, we have clarified where writing components are emphasized in order continue developing these skills. In this way, we ensuring that the components are covered, and specific problems are identified early. Third, we are revamping the area of collaboration skills make sure the skills are addressed in both teaching and field-based experiences.

*CRITICAL* Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

Last year we considered how we might improve critical thinking, and came up with peer-reviews utilizing rubrics on more written products across more classes. This will continue, and includes refinement of peer review rubrics. Challenges remain with TEA coming up with continued changes in expectations and requirements. We remain concerned that the TEA requirements for Mental Health area are not adequate to addresses novice teacher needs as they enter teaching. We continue to work closely with our students to develop support plans early in the program and as needed throughout the program for continued growth in professional and teaching skills. Our students achieve high level scores by graduation because of our close monitoring and support of their professional development.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Special Education Program is to prepare the highest quality professional educators to meet the diverse educational needs of students with disabilities in grades EC (Early Childhood) through grade 12. This program prepares professional educators to be state and national leaders in the field of special education through becoming critical consumers of research and implementing best practices throughout their careers.

Connected Documents
Assessment Rubric
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
Collaboration Rubric
Communication Rubric
Critical Thinking Rubric
Development and Characteristics Rubric
Foundations Rubric
Individual Learning Differences Rubric
Instructional Planning Rubric
Instructional Strategies Rubric
Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
Social Competence Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Goals

G 1: Skillful, Ethical, Caring Professionals
To prepare educators to serve as skillful, ethical, and caring professionals who respect the ethnic, linguistic, and cultural diversity of the students, families, and communities in which they work. All (100%) of our SPED students received "proficient" or "exemplary" on our capstone student teaching measures. If anyone had not received this level of rating initially, then a support plan would be in place. No support plans were needed.

Connected Documents
CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric
Collaboration Rubric
Communication Rubric
Critical Thinking Rubric
Development and Characteristics Rubric
Foundations Rubric
Instructional Planning Rubric
Instructional Strategies Rubric
Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
Social Competence Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

G 2: Meeting needs of students
To prepare educators to meet the needs of students considered "at-risk" or "low-performing" as well as those with disabilities. All students (100%) passed in a project that provided individually developed transition plan for that individual and her/his family. In addition, all students (100%) received 'proficient' or 'exceeds expectations' on measures by field supervisors and mentor teachers on the items that specific reflect differentiating instruction.

Connected Documents
Assessment Rubric
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
Collaboration Rubric
Communication Rubric
Development and Characteristics Rubric
Foundations Rubric
Instructional Planning Rubric
Instructional Strategies Rubric
Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
Social Competence Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

G 3: Evidence-Based Practices
To prepare educators to implement evidence-based practices in relation to identification of students with special needs as well as instructional planning, implementation, and progress evaluation to meet the diverse needs of these students. All students received a 'proficient' score in researching and applying evidence based practices in SPED 311. Students show evidence based practices on their efolios through their learning plans. All students were at the "meeting expectation" level. Students demonstrate teaching at the "proficiency" level on all field supervisors and mentor teacher evaluation tools. Two students who did not meet this level had extra days in the field until "proficiency" was seen consistently by both mentor teacher and supervisor.

Connected Documents
Assessment Rubric
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
Collaboration Rubric
G 4: Critical Self-Judgment and Program Evaluation

To prepare educators to develop skills in critical self-judgment and program evaluation to ensure their ability to continue
to develop as effective professionals after leaving the University.

Connected Documents

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets,
Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Foundations

Identify and apply evidence-based principles, laws and policies, historical points of view and cultural and diverse aspects
as related to exceptionality.

Connected Document

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 1: Certification Exam

The Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) tests measure the content knowledge required of an entry-
level educator in Special education within Texas public schools. The exam measures 12 competences across 4
domains:

- Domain 1: Understanding Individuals with Disabilities and Evaluating Their Needs
- Domain 2: Promoting Student Learning and Development
- Domain 3: Promoting Student Achievement in English Language Arts and Reading and in Mathematics
- Domain 4: Foundations and Professional Roles and Responsibilities

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Connected Documents

Target:
Students will achieve an overall 85% pass rate of the licensing exam.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Pass rate of the licensing exam for graduating students was 97.6%, therefore this target was met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Pass Rate Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12 99.40%
Pass Rate Special Education EC-12 100%
Pass Rate English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental 95%
Generalist EC-6 97.90%.

These results are at or above the previous year scores. Therefore, the target is met.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Tests Taken</th>
<th>Tests Passed</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PPR</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total English as a Second Language Supplemental NA</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The certification exam is the primary measure for this objective, but scores have been provided as total scores and not the subtest scores. Our students have a 100% pass rate on the special education test, which measures this objective, but we are not sure of the subtest scores. We will be including electronic portfolios as part of assessing this objective in the next cycle.

**SLO 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners**
Demonstrate respect and appropriate responses to varying ability and behaviors of diverse students based on knowledge of development and exceptionality

**Connected Document**
[Development and Characteristics Rubric](#)

**Relevant Associations:**
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Certification Exam**
The Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) tests measure the content knowledge required of an entry-level educator in Special education within Texas public schools. The exam measures 12 competences across 4 domains:

- Domain 1: Understanding Individuals with Disabilities and Evaluating Their Needs
- Domain 2: Promoting Student Learning and Development
- Domain 3: Promoting Student Achievement in English Language Arts and Reading and in Mathematics
- Domain 4: Foundations and Professional Roles and Responsibilities

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Connected Documents**
[Development and Characteristics Rubric](#), [Foundations Rubric](#), [Individual Learning Differences Rubric](#)

**Target:**
Students will achieve an overall 85% pass rate of the licensing exam.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Test Tests Taken Tests Passed Pass Rate
Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12 600 597 99.50%
Total PPR 601 598 99.50%

Special Education EC-12 50 50 100%
Total Special Education EC-12 50 50 100%

English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental 305 272 89.20%
Total English as a Second Language Supplemental NA 305 272 89.20%

Generalist EC-6 219 218 99.50%
Total Generalist EC-6 222 221 99.50%

We are not specifically looking at this outcome this cycle. It will be reviewed in 2015-16.

**SLO 3: Individual Learning Differences**
Provide appropriate individualized instruction through actively seeking how language, culture, and family background impact individuals with exceptionalities

**Connected Document**
[Individual Learning Differences Rubric](#)

**Relevant Associations:**
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

**Strategic Plan Associations**
Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 1: Certification Exam
The Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) tests measure the content knowledge required of an entry-level educator in Special education within Texas public schools. The exam measures 12 competences across 4 domains:

- Domain 1: Understanding Individuals with Disabilities and Evaluating Their Needs
- Domain 2: Promoting Student Learning and Development
- Domain 3: Promoting Student Achievement in English Language Arts and Reading and in Mathematics
- Domain 4: Foundations and Professional Roles and Responsibilities

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Connected Documents
Development and Characteristics Rubric
Foundations Rubric
Individual Learning Differences Rubric

Target:
Students will achieve an overall 85% pass rate of the licensing exam.

Connected Document
Individual Learning Differences Rubric

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Test Tests Taken Tests Passed Pass Rate Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12 99.40% Special Education EC-12 100% English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental 95% Generalist EC-6 97.90%

These results are at or above the previous year scores. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Test Tests Taken Tests Passed Pass Rate
Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12 600 597 99.50%
Total PPR 601 598 99.50%

Special Education EC-12 50 50 100%
Total Special Education EC-12 50 50 100%

English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental 305 272 89.20%
Total English as a Second Language Supplemental NA 305 272 89.20%

Generalist EC-6 219 218 99.50%
Total Generalist EC-6 222 221 99.50%

We are not evaluating this objective this cycle. It will be evaluated in the 2016-17 cycle.

SLO 4: Instructional Strategies
Select, adapt, and use evidence-based instructional strategies that individualize instruction and modify environments to develop, maintain, and generalize critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills for students with exceptional needs

Connected Documents
Instructional Strategies Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2 Demonstrate critical thinking
3 Communicate effectively

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Instructional Strategies rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Instructional Strategies Rubric

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective will be assessed during the 2015-16 cycle.

SLO 5: Instructional Planning
Design systematic instruction that includes individual or group goals and objectives based on students' learning needs; implement best practices for teaching; consider linguistic factors; and work with students and relevant stakeholders to develop individualized transition plans.

Connected Documents
Instructional Planning Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Instructional Planning rubric (attached document)

Connected Documents
Instructional Planning Rubric

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
The electronic portfolio will not be implemented until the fall 2015 semester. Students were asked to submit their best lesson plan and these were evaluated using the instructional planning rubric.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Instructional Planning improvement
The lesson plan template needs to be modified so that students are required to indicate modifications on the plan. A rubric for...

SLO 6: Assessment
Select reliable and valid formal and informal assessment tools that meet students' educational and behavioral needs; make educational decisions based on assessment results; adjust instruction or make modifications to enable students to access the general education curriculum and participate in statewide assessments.

Connected Documents
Assessment Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
6. Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Assessment rubric (attached document)

Connected Documents
Assessment Rubric

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This objective will be assessed during the 2015-16 cycle.

**SLO 7: Professional and Ethical Practice**
Be lifelong learners and stay current with evidenced-based practices; display respectful attitude in all settings with colleagues, students, and families; demonstrate sensitivity toward cultures and diversity; ensure confidentiality; meet professional commitments in a timely manner; and practice within legal and ethical guidelines.

**Connected Documents**
- Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

**Relevant Associations:**
- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  - Practice personal and social responsibility
  - Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
  - Prepare to engage in lifelong learning
- Strategic Plan Associations
  - Texas A&M University
  - Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Electronic Portfolio**
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target:**
95% of students will be at proficient level using Professional and Ethical Practice rubric (attached document)

**Connected Document**
- Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Not measured this cycle.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
The electronic portfolio will be implemented during the fall 2015 semester. Professional and ethical practice was assessed this semester through the student teaching evaluation.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The student teaching evaluation for the fall 2014 student teachers were reviewed and the attached rubric applied. 100% of students scored at proficient in professional and ethical practice.

**M 5: Student Teaching Evaluation**
Rubric that evaluates student performance in student teaching, the capstone experience in the program.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
95% of students will be at proficient or higher level using Student Teaching rubric (attached document)

**Connected Documents**
- Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Not measured this cycle.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
The student teaching evaluation for the 2015 student teachers were reviewed and the attached rubric applied. 100% of students scored at proficient in professional and ethical practice.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The student teaching evaluation for the fall 2014 student teachers were reviewed and the attached rubric applied. 100% of students scored at proficient in professional and ethical practice.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**SLO 8: Learning Environment and Social Interactions**
Collaborate with general educators, paraprofessionals, and the community to create motivating learning environments that foster active engagement in learning and respect for diversity in both typical and crisis situations.

**Connected Documents**
- Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

**Relevant Associations:**
- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  - Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
  - Communicate effectively
  - Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
7  Work collaboratively

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Learning Environment and Social Interactions rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Partially Met
The students are assessed by independent faculty and graduate assistants on the basis of the e-folio presentation and documents, using a rubric connected to SBEC and CEC standards. In this data below (sorry, tried every way possible to get this into a more readable )
What we can see is that two areas meet criteria: Behavior Management and Modifying to meet individual needs. Both are at 97% of the students being at the proficient level. Two areas are close--understanding learning demands at 92% and developing social skills at 94%. Two areas need more development: managing paraprofessionals at 89% and managing Crises at 86%

Frequencies table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Total % proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning demands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying to need individual needs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Crises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective was not assessed this cycle. It will be assessed during the 2016-17 cycle.

SLO 9: Communications
Understand language development, identify strategies to support students language and communication needs, determine appropriate assistive technology to support students communicative needs, and model effective language for all students including those whose primary language is not English

Connected Documents
CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric
Communication Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3  Communicate effectively
5  Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Communications rubric (attached document)

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Connected Document
2017 data for electronic portfolio

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan.
plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This objective was scheduled for this semester, but electronic portfolios will not be implemented until the fall 2015 semester. Communications was evaluated through the college’s writing assessment.

**M 4: Transition Project**
The final project in SEFB 420 is used as the writing sample provided to the college each year for evaluation in addition to also being included on the electronic portfolio as a measure of other disciplinary learning outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric

**Target:**
85% of students will score at sufficient or better on the CEHD rubric for Writing Assessment (document attached)

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
Results indicate that 39/40 or 97.5% of students scored a 2 (sufficient) or higher on the CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric. Therefore this target was met.

Means for each rubric category were: Style - 2.81; Idea or Content - 2.84, Organization - 2.99, Conventions - 2.91. Interrater reliability scores were statistically significant and were above the 0.70 cut off.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Results indicate the overall mean score was above than 2.00, and 100 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is above the cutoff level of 85 percent. Therefore, the target is met.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**

Written Communications at the Program Level

Students from the Special Education program (n = 20) participated in the assessment process. Results are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>CEHD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Style</td>
<td>2.88 (.51)</td>
<td>2.72 (.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Idea</td>
<td>2.93 (.44)</td>
<td>2.62 (.55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization</td>
<td>2.95 (.43)</td>
<td>2.69 (.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conventions</td>
<td>2.78 (.50)</td>
<td>2.52 (.61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.88 (.39)</td>
<td>2.64 (.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent over 2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation and Limitations**
Results indicate the overall mean score was above than 2.00, and 100 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is above the cutoff level of 80 percent. The results should be interpreted alongside other data sources, such as last year’s critical thinking assessment.

The results should be also interpreted in light of potential limitations. These represent scores from a subset of all students in the program. Rater reliability scores were statistically significant but less than the traditional cutoff point.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Writing skills**
Even though students met the proficient level in writing, faculty feel like writing skills can be improved. We will require stu...

**SLO 10: Collaboration**
Effectively collaborate with families, educators, related service providers, and agency personnel in a culturally responsive manner in the education of children with exceptionalities

Objective Novice Developing Proficient Average score Total % proficient
Groups 0 2 61 2.97 97
Communication with others 1 3 59 2.29 94
Interviewing others 1 3 56 2.92 89
Coteaching 0 8 54 2.87 86
Ethics 0 7 53 2.94 94
Leadership 0 7 53 2.88 84

Connected Documents
Collaboration Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric
**SLO 11: Social and Global Competence**

Live and work effectively in a diverse and global society and articulate the value of a diverse and global perspective

**Connected Documents**

- Social Competence Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

**Relevant Associations:**

- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  - 5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
- Strategic Plan Associations
  - Texas A&M University
    - 3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Electronic Portfolio**

Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**

95% of students will be at proficient level using Social and Global Competence rubric (attached document)

**Connected Document**

Collaboration Rubric

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Partially Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Total % proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coteaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart above displays student performance based on rubric dynamics. Scores show 95% proficiency in group category, and 86-95% proficiency in communication with others, interviewing others, coteaching, ethics, and leadership proficiency. Therefore the target was partially met.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**

Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This objective was not assessed this cycle. It will be assessed in the 2016-17 cycle.

**SLO 12: Critical Thinking**

Apply critical thinking skills to solve problems in the field of education

**Connected Documents**

CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
Critical Thinking Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Demonstrate critical thinking

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Critical Thinking rubric (attached document)

Connected Documents
2017 data for electronic portfolio
Critical Thinking Rubric

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Results indicate the overall mean score was above than 2.00, and 52 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is below the cutoff level of 80 percent. Therefore, the target is not met. See action plans for further updates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The electronic portfolio will be implemented during the fall 2015 semester. Critical thinking was evaluated this cycle using the College Critical Thinking Test.

M 3: Critical Thinking Test
College-developed standardized measure of critical thinking skills.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Connected Document
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric

Target:
85% of students will score at Sufficient or above (2.0)

Connected Document
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
(n=44) Overall, 80% of the students scored at or above a mean score of 2.0. This result is below original goal of having at least 85% of students score at or above a score of 2.0. Thus, this program did not meet its goal for critical thinking. Notably, Special Education students scored at or above the mean average of the College in all categories, with the most significant difference of 0.81 for Q1A-Explanation of Issues.

Connected Document
2016-2017 EPSY SPED CAT Report

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Results indicate the overall mean score was above than 2.00, and 52 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is below the cutoff level of 80 percent. Therefore, the target is not met on this test.

Critical Thinking at the Program Level
Students from the Special Education program (n = 29) participated in the study. Results are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Program Results</th>
<th>CEHD Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1A</td>
<td>Explain Issue</td>
<td>2.55 (.65)</td>
<td>2.41 (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1B</td>
<td>Use evidence in offering response</td>
<td>2.42 (.69)</td>
<td>2.36 (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Consider the influence of context and assumptions</td>
<td>2.04 (.45)</td>
<td>1.91 (.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3A</td>
<td>Clearly state position, perspective, or thesis</td>
<td>1.63 (.52)</td>
<td>1.57 (.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3B</td>
<td>Arrive at reasoned conclusions and outcomes</td>
<td>1.60 (.51)</td>
<td>1.60 (.54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Mean Score 2.05 (.41) 1.97 (.51)
Percent over 2.0 59% 62%

Interpretation and Limitations
Results indicate the overall mean score was below than 2.00, and 59 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is below the cutoff level of 80 percent. The results should be interpreted alongside other data sources, such as last year's critical thinking assessment.

The results should be also interpreted in light of potential limitations. These represent scores from a sub-set of all students in the program. Inter-rater reliability scores for three areas were statistically significant but less than the traditional cutoff point of .70.
Increase practice in critical thinking skills


The critical thinking skills rubric will be provided to all faculty teaching in the undergraduate program and case studies requi...

Implementation Description: During the 2015-16 school year, faculty will incorporate critical thinking activities into courses by specifically having students review the literature and support thinking.
In addition to the existing action plan for critical thinking, in which faculty will be given critical thinking rubrics to use aspects of within their written projects. Based on the critical thinking test results, we have two new actions. Having identified a pattern across the college regarding decreases in scores as the test progresses, we are changing the order of the questions to see if there is a difference. In addition, we are highlighting using professional literature to support student writing in SPED 311 Assessment and EPFB Transition to help develop or hone those skills.

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2017

### Leadership, coteaching, writing, and critical thinking

Reflected analysis of leadership and interviewing skills (collaboration elements not at or near proficient level of 95%) will be emphasized in Block III transitions by a self-reflective analysis of personal strengths and weaknesses as well as a plan to increase strengths.

A rubric similar to current rubrics for the overall elements will be used to assess these skills.

Working effectively with paraprofessionals will be emphasized in our low incidence class with an assignment that has students create a lesson plan that incorporates paraprofessional assistance. A rubric similar to this element in Collaboration will be used to assess these skills.

Although writing continues to improve, the SPED course is currently later in the curriculum sequence. We are moving the writing intensive course to Block I, and are keeping the individualized instruction through our Graduate Assistant.

Critical thinking at the college level has been low in conclusions and findings. We are including direct instruction and application of conclusions and finding in Block I Behavior management and Block II Assessment projects using the rubric elements of the overall measure for scoring in each project.

Crisis management will be introduced in Block I seminar (Mental Health training), and will have an additional component in Block III seminar, where students will reflect on types of crises and management at the classroom level.

Coteaching (in collaboration) will be directly taught and demonstrated through the Reading class in Block I. Students will provide self-reflection which will be scored on a rubric element similar to the final rubric.

**Established in Cycle:** 2016-2017  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** These changes will be begin through course instructors in Fall, 2017 and Spring, 2018.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2020  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Melissa Fogarty and other program coordinators.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

Previous for critical thinking:
We noticed that question about outcomes was consistently lower than the rest of the elements on the Critical Thinking Test. Because this was the last question, we randomized the order of questions; however, this score remained low. As a result, we will be working on directly teaching conclusions and related outcomes in SPED 471 with analyzing research, and adding a specific writing component on this question in SPED 311 Assessment and SPED 420 Transition. Rubrics will be used to mirror the ACCU critical thinking rubric of this element.

For writing, we are making a change to introduce a writing intensive course earlier in the sequence. Because our scores in our writing sample remain high, we will keep the Graduate Student assistance for individual feedback in writing.

Current Critical Thinking:
Students passed at the expected level; however, there was variance between full time faculty and others such as GA assessing presentation. We added a component of direct questions for each element if the presenter did not address this in the presentation. We hope this will produce clearer results, although our students did meet requirements.

Next Steps:
We considered both the findings and the curriculum in considering the next steps. In one case, emphasizing coteaching lesson plans covered several areas of concern. We also expanded writing and critical thinking actions to other specific courses. Why should this work?
By taking an integrated approach, the students will have more opportunity for exposure, learning, and practice. This in turn should help them clearly demonstrate these skills during the e-folio assessment.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

2014-2015 Critical thinking: We provided faculty with critical thinking rubrics and re-measured critical thinking. Results, particularly findings from this assessment cycle, show improvement in critical thinking elements and products throughout the course.

Instructional Planning improvement: We included modifications on all lesson plans and students are now able to modify
and produce appropriate lesson plans.

Professional and ethical practice: We continue to monitor students ethical practices and provide growth plans, as needed.

Writing Skills: We provide writing assistant in both professional classes. Students meet with the writing assistant at least once. Writing has improved, as measured on writing intensive course products.

Annual Report Section Responses

How is the program ensuring the comparability of the distance education program with comparable campus-based (i.e., face to face) programs?

There are two courses offered distance and face-to-face EPFB 210 and INST 210

1. Consistency of Faculty
   In both courses, the same faculty have taught both types of delivery in each course.
   The same faculty review the syllabi, requirements, and materials to ensure they are the same.
2. Exams, office hours, assignments, and grading are the same across both type of presentations.
3. Grading is done with the same rubrics both face to face and distance.
4. Students both face to face and distance have the opportunity to work together.
5. Students have the same access to university resources such as the library, writing center, and student services.

What data/evidence are used to regularly assess the effectiveness of the distance education program (in comparison to comparable campus-based programs)?

1. What data are routinely used to assess effectiveness and comparability?
2. What evidence does the program have to support the comparability of the distance education program with similar campus-based program(s)?

1. Data/Effectiveness: We will be using a comparison of student scores on projects. Since the projects and the scoring are the same, these should be comparable.
2. Comparability: We will be asking specific questions about student interaction, access to the instructor, and access to university resources. We are not sure if student ratings at the end of the semester or a separate rating will be better. We will be trying both out to see what works better.
3. Comparability: Currently the same instructor teaches both the on-line and face to face version of each course. We will be using the same syllabus, course requirements, resources, materials, textbooks, and projects with the same scoring systems to ensure the same content. Each course will have a faculty member responsible to check both versions are the same if someone else teaches either distance or face to face.

What steps have been taken, if any, for improvement of the distance education program to ensure comparability? (i.e., provide the basic components of an Action Plan)

Since this is new requirement, we are taking steps to establish protocols to examine this in more detail. Although currently student pass rates appear to be similar, we will look at two elements.
First, we will look at student final grades to see if these are comparable. Second, we will look at student ratings of the class overall on specific questions yet to be developed on the element such as student to student interaction, access to university resources, and access to the instructor.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Special Education Program is to prepare the highest quality professional educators to meet the diverse educational needs of students with disabilities in grades EC (Early Childhood) through grade 12. This program prepares professional educators to be state and national leaders in the field of special education through becoming critical consumers of research and implementing best practices throughout their careers.

Connected Documents
- Assessment Rubric
- CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
- Collaboration Rubric
- Communication Rubric
- Critical Thinking Rubric
- Development and Characteristics Rubric
- Foundations Rubric
- Individual Learning Differences Rubric
- Instructional Planning Rubric
- Instructional Strategies Rubric
- Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
- Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
- Social Competence Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

Goals

G 1: Skillful, Ethical, Caring Professionals
To prepare educators to serve as skillful, ethical, and caring professionals who respect the ethnic, linguistic, and cultural diversity of the students, families, and communities in which they work. All (100%) of our SPED students received “proficient” or “exemplary” on our capstone student teaching measures. If anyone had not received this level of rating initially, then a support plan would be in place. No support plans were needed.

Connected Documents
- CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric
- Collaboration Rubric
- Communication Rubric
- Critical Thinking Rubric
- Development and Characteristics Rubric
- Foundations Rubric
- Instructional Planning Rubric
- Instructional Strategies Rubric
- Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
- Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
- Social Competence Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

G 2: Meeting needs of students
To prepare educators to meet the needs of students considered “at-risk” or “low-performing” as well as those with disabilities. All students (100%) passed in a project that provided individually developed transition plan for that individual and her/his family. In addition, all students (100%) received ‘proficient’ or ‘exceeds expectations’ on measures by field supervisors and mentor teachers on the items that specific reflect differentiating instruction.

Connected Documents
- Assessment Rubric
- CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
- Collaboration Rubric
- Communication Rubric
- Development and Characteristics Rubric
- Foundations Rubric
- Instructional Planning Rubric
- Instructional Strategies Rubric
- Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
- Social Competence Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

G 3: Evidence-Based Practices
To prepare educators to implement evidence-based practices in relation to identification of students with special needs as well as instructional planning, implementation, and progress evaluation to meet the diverse needs of these students. All students received a ‘proficient’ score in researching and applying evidence based practices in SPED 311. Students show evidence based practices on their efolios through their learning plans. All students were at the "meeting expectation" level. Students demonstrate teaching at the "proficiency" level on all field supervisors and mentor teacher evaluation tools. Two students who did not meet this level had extra days in the field until "proficiency" was seen consistently by both mentor teacher and supervisor.

Connected Documents
- Assessment Rubric
- CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
- Collaboration Rubric
G 4: Critical Self-Judgment and Program Evaluation

To prepare educators to develop skills in critical self-judgment and program evaluation to ensure their ability to continue to develop as effective professionals after leaving the University.

Connected Documents
- CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
- Communication Rubric
- Critical Thinking Rubric
- Instructional Planning Rubric
- Instructional Strategies Rubric
- Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
- Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
- Social Competence Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Foundations
Identify and apply evidence-based principles, laws and policies, historical points of view and cultural and diverse aspects as related to exceptionalities.

Connected Document
- Foundations Rubric

Relevant Associations:
- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
  2. Demonstrate critical thinking
  5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

Strategic Plan Associations
- Texas A&M University
  3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 1: Certification Exam
The Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) tests measure the content knowledge required of an entry-level educator in Special education within Texas public schools. The exam measures 12 competences across 4 domains:

- Domain 1: Understanding Individuals with Disabilities and Evaluating Their Needs
- Domain 2: Promoting Student Learning and Development
- Domain 3: Promoting Student Achievement in English Language Arts and Reading and in Mathematics
- Domain 4: Foundations and Professional Roles and Responsibilities

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Connected Documents
- Development and Characteristics Rubric
- Foundations Rubric
- Individual Learning Differences Rubric

Target:
Students will achieve an overall 85% pass rate of the licensing exam.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Pass Rate Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12 99.40%
Pass Rate Special Education EC-12 100%
Pass Rate English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental 95%
Generalist EC-6 97.90%

These results are at or above the previous year scores. Therefore, the target is met.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Tests Taken</th>
<th>Tests Passed</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PPR</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total English as a Second Language Supplemental NA</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist EC-6</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Generalist EC-6</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The certification exam is the primary measure for this objective, but scores have been provided as total scores and not the subtest scores. Our students have a 100% pass rate on the special education test, which measures this objective, but we are not sure of the subtest scores. We will be including electronic portfolios as part of assessing this objective in the next cycle.

**SLO 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners**
Demonstrate respect and appropriate responses to varying ability and behaviors of diverse students based on knowledge of development and exceptionality

*Connected Document*
Development and Characteristics Rubric

*Relevant Associations:*

- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
  2. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

- Strategic Plan Associations
  Texas A&M University
  3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

*Related Measures*

**M 1: Certification Exam**
The Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) tests measure the content knowledge required of an entry-level educator in Special education within Texas public schools. The exam measures 12 competences across 4 domains:

- Domain 1: Understanding Individuals with Disabilities and Evaluating Their Needs
- Domain 2: Promoting Student Learning and Development
- Domain 3: Promoting Student Achievement in English Language Arts and Reading and in Mathematics
- Domain 4: Foundations and Professional Roles and Responsibilities

*Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state*

*Connected Documents*
Development and Characteristics Rubric
Foundations Rubric
Individual Learning Differences Rubric

**Target:**
Students will achieve an overall 85% pass rate of the licensing exam.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Test Results: Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12 99.40% Special Education EC-12 100% English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental 95% Generalist EC-6 97.90%. These results are at or above the previous year scores. Therefore, the target is met.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Tests Taken</th>
<th>Tests Passed</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PPR</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total English as a Second Language Supplemental NA</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist EC-6</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Generalist EC-6</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are not specifically looking at this outcome this cycle. It will be reviewed in 2015-16.

**SLO 3: Individual Learning Differences**
Provide appropriate individualized instruction through actively seeking how language, culture, and family background impact individuals with exceptionalities

*Connected Document*
Individual Learning Differences Rubric

*Relevant Associations:*

- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
  5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

- Strategic Plan Associations
  Texas A&M University
  3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.
**Related Measures**

**M 1: Certification Exam**
The Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) tests measure the content knowledge required of an entry-level educator in Special education within Texas public schools. The exam measures 12 competences across 4 domains:

- Domain 1: Understanding Individuals with Disabilities and Evaluating Their Needs
- Domain 2: Promoting Student Learning and Development
- Domain 3: Promoting Student Achievement in English Language Arts and Reading and in Mathematics
- Domain 4: Foundations and Professional Roles and Responsibilities

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Connected Documents**
- Development and Characteristics Rubric
- Foundations Rubric
- Individual Learning Differences Rubric

**Target:**
Students will achieve an overall 85% pass rate of the licensing exam.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Test Tests Taken Tests Passed Pass Rate
Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12 600 597 99.50%
Total PPR 601 598 99.50%
Special Education EC-12 50 50 100%
Total Special Education EC-12 50 50 100%
English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental 305 272 89.20%
Total English as a Second Language Supplemental NA 305 272 89.20%
Generalist EC-6 219 218 99.50%
Total Generalist EC-6 222 221 99.50%

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

We are not evaluating this objective this cycle. It will be evaluated in the 2016-17 cycle.

**SLO 4: Instructional Strategies**
Select, adapt, and use evidence-based instructional strategies that individualize instruction and modify environments to develop, maintain, and generalize critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills for students with exceptional needs

**Connected Documents**
- Instructional Strategies Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

**Relevant Associations:**
- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
  2. Demonstrate critical thinking
  3. Communicate effectively

- Strategic Plan Associations
  Texas A&M University
  3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Electronic Portfolio**
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
95% of students will be at proficient level using Instructional Strategies rubric (attached document)

**Connected Document**
- Instructional Strategies Rubric

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This objective will be assessed during the 2015-16 cycle.
SLO 5: Instructional Planning
Design systematic instruction that includes individual or group goals and objectives based on students' learning needs; implement best practices for teaching; consider linguistic factors; and work with students and relevant stakeholders to develop individualized transition plans.

Connected Documents
- Instructional Planning Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively

Strategic Plan Associations
- Texas A&M University
  3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures
M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Instructional Planning rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
- Instructional Planning Rubric

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

The electronic portfolio will not be implemented until the fall 2015 semester. Students were asked to submit their best lesson plan and these were evaluated using the instructional planning rubric.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Instructional Planning improvement
The lesson plan template needs to be modified so that students are required to indicate modifications on the plan. A rubric for...

SLO 6: Assessment
Select reliable and valid formal and informal assessment tools that meet students' educational and behavioral needs; make educational decisions based on assessment results; adjust instruction or make modifications to enable students to access the general education curriculum and participate in statewide assessments.

Connected Documents
- Assessment Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
6. Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Strategic Plan Associations
- Texas A&M University
  3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures
M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Assessment rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
- Assessment Rubric

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective will be assessed during the 2015-16 cycle.

SLO 7: Professional and Ethical Practice
Be lifelong learners and stay current with evidenced-based practices; display respectful attitude in all settings with colleagues, students, and families; demonstrate sensitivity toward cultures and diversity; ensure confidentiality; meet professional commitments in a timely manner; and practice within legal and ethical guidelines.

Connected Documents
Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Practice personal and social responsibility
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
6 Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target: 95% of students will be at proficient level using Professional and Ethical Practice rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
The finding was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The electronic portfolio will be implemented during the fall 2015 semester. Professional and ethical practice was assessed this semester through the student teaching evaluation.

M 5: Student Teaching Evaluation
Rubric that evaluates student performance in student teaching, the capstone experience in the program.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target: 95% of students will be at proficient or higher level using Student Teaching rubric (attached document)

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

SLO 8: Learning Environment and Social Interactions
Collaborate with general educators, paraprofessionals, and the community to create motivating learning environments that foster active engagement in learning and respect for diversity in both typical and crisis situations

Connected Documents
Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
3 Communicate effectively
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
7 Work collaboratively

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target: 95% of students will be at proficient level using Learning Environment and Social Interactions rubric (attached document)
Connected Documents
Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective was not assessed this cycle. It will be assessed during the 2016-17 cycle.

SLO 9: Communications
Understand language development, identify strategies to support students language and communication needs, determine appropriate assistive technology to support students communicative needs, and model effective language for all students including those whose primary language is not English.

Connected Documents
CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric
Communication Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Communicate effectively
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures
M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Communications rubric (attached document)

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective was not assessed this cycle. Electronic portfolios will not be implemented until the fall 2015 semester. Communications was evaluated through the college’s writing assessment.

M 4: Transition Project
The final project in SEFB 420 is used as the writing sample provided to the college each year for evaluation in addition to also being included on the electronic portfolio as a measure of other disciplinary learning outcomes.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric

Target:
85% of students will score at sufficient or better on the CEHD rubric for Writing Assessment (document attached)

Connected Document
CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Results indicate the overall mean score was above 2.00, and 100 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is above the cutoff level of 85 percent. Therefore, the target is met.


Written Communications at the Program Level
Students from the Special Education program (n = 20) participated in the assessment process. Results are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Program CEHD</th>
<th>CEHD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>2.88 (.51)</td>
<td>2.72 (.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>2.93 (.44)</td>
<td>2.62 (.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>2.95 (.43)</td>
<td>2.69 (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Conventions</td>
<td>2.78 (.50)</td>
<td>2.52 (.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88 (.39)</td>
<td>2.64 (.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent over 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100% 94.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation and Limitations
Results indicate the overall mean score was above 2.00, and 100 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is above the cutoff level of 80 percent. The results should be interpreted alongside other data sources, such as last year’s critical thinking assessment.
The results should also be interpreted in light of potential limitations. These represent scores from a subset of all students in the program. Rater reliability scores were statistically significant but less than the traditional cutoff point.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Writing Skills**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
Even though students met the proficient level in writing, faculty feel like writing skills can be improved. We will require stu...

**SLO 10: Collaboration**
Effectively collaborate with families, educators, related service providers, and agency personnel in a culturally responsive manner in the education of children with exceptionalities

**Connected Documents**
- Collaboration Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

**Relevant Associations:**
- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  - 5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
  - 7 Work collaboratively

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- Texas A&M University
  - 3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Electronic Portfolio**
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
95% of students will be at proficient level using Collaboration rubric (attached document)

**Connected Document**
- Collaboration Rubric

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This objective was not assessed this cycle. It will be assessed in the 2016-17 cycle.

**SLO 11: Social and Global Competence**
Live and work effectively in a diverse and global society and articulate the value of a diverse and global perspective

**Connected Documents**
- Social Competence Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

**Relevant Associations:**
- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  - 5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- Texas A&M University
  - 3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Electronic Portfolio**
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
95% of students will be at proficient level using Social and Global Competence rubric (attached document)

**Connected Document**
- Social Competence Rubric

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Target was met using independent observers. Issues with assessment processes are discussed in the action plan. Therefore, we achieved the target.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This objective was not assessed this cycle. It will be assessed in the 2015-16 cycle.

**SLO 12: Critical Thinking**
Apply critical thinking skills to solve problems in the field of education

**Connected Documents**
- CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
Critical Thinking Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Demonstrate critical thinking

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target: 95% of students will be at proficient level using Critical Thinking rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Critical Thinking Rubric

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Results indicate the overall mean score was above than 2.00, and 52 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is below the cutoff level of 80 percent. Therefore, the target is not met. See action plans for further updates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The electronic portfolio will be implemented during the fall 2015 semester. Critical thinking was evaluated this cycle using the College Critical Thinking Test.

M 3: Critical Thinking Test
College-developed standardized measure of critical thinking skills.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Connected Document
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric

Target: 85% of students will score at Sufficient or above (2.0)

Connected Document
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Results indicate the overall mean score was above than 2.00, and 52 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is below the cutoff level of 80 percent. Therefore, the target is not met on this test.


Critical Thinking at the Program Level
Students from the Special Education program (n = 29) participated in the study. Results are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Program Results</th>
<th>CEHD Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1A</td>
<td>Explain issue</td>
<td>2.55 (.65)</td>
<td>2.41 (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1B</td>
<td>Use evidence in offering response</td>
<td>2.42 (.69)</td>
<td>2.36 (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Consider the influence of context and assumptions</td>
<td>2.04 (.45)</td>
<td>1.91 (.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3A</td>
<td>Clearly state position, perspective, or thesis</td>
<td>1.63 (.52)</td>
<td>1.57 (.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3B</td>
<td>Arrive at reasoned conclusions and outcomes</td>
<td>1.60 (.51)</td>
<td>1.60 (.54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Mean Score 2.05 (.41) 1.97 (.51)
Percent over 2.0 59% 62%

Interpretation and Limitations
Results indicate the overall mean score was below than 2.00, and 59 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is below the cutoff level of 80 percent. The results should be interpreted alongside other data sources, such as last year's critical thinking assessment.

The results should be also interpreted in light of potential limitations. These represent scores from a sub-set of all students in the program. Inter-rater reliability scores for three areas were statistically significant but less than the traditional cutoff point of .70.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Increase practice in critical thinking skills
The critical thinking skills rubric will be provided to all faculty teaching in the undergraduate program and case studies requi...
Critical Thinking Assessment Continued

The critical thinking skills rubric will be provided to all faculty teaching in the undergraduate program and case studies requiring critical thinking skills will be developed and included in all program courses. Faculty will also be explicit about the use of critical thinking and demonstrate the process during class activities.

**Established in Cycle**: 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status**: Planned  
**Priority**: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure**: Critical Thinking Test  
**Outcome/Objective**: Critical Thinking

**Implementation Description**: During the 2015-16 school year, faculty will incorporate critical thinking activities into courses by specifically having students review the literature and support thinking

**Projected Completion Date**: 05/2016

**Responsible Person/Group**: Special Education Undergraduate faculty and Particularly SPED 311 Assessment  
**Additional Resources**: none

**Instructional Planning improvement**

The lesson plan template needs to be modified so that students are required to indicate modifications on the plan. A rubric for the lesson plan needs to be provided to all field supervisors so that they can reinforce proper planning procedures. We feel that students are implementing modifications, but not indicating them in their plans, so it is difficult to evaluate.

SPED 310 will incorporate the lesson plan template into instructional strategies used in that class.

**Established in Cycle**: 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status**: Planned  
**Priority**: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure**: Electronic Portfolio  
**Outcome/Objective**: Instructional Planning

**Implementation Description**: Undergraduate faculty will be cognizant of weaknesses in instructional planning and explicitly teach these concepts in coursework. Field supervisors will reinforce proper instructional planning based on the rubric provided to them.

**Projected Completion Date**: 05/2016

**Responsible Person/Group**: Special education undergraduate faculty, particularly field supervisors to see this in practice

**professional and ethical practice**

Although students have performed well on this objective, faculty will continue to stress the importance of professional and ethical practice. Students who exhibit unprofessional behaviors will be put on growth plans.

**Established in Cycle**: 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status**: Planned  
**Priority**: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure**: Student Teaching Evaluation  
**Outcome/Objective**: Professional and Ethical Practice

**Implementation Description**: Reinforce professional and ethical behaviors, especially in field based seminars through lectures and discussion. This has also been rewritten in the student handbook, and reviewed during incoming student orientation.

**Projected Completion Date**: 05/2016

**Responsible Person/Group**: Special education undergraduate faculty; new student orientation faculty

**Writing skills**

Even though students met the proficient level in writing, faculty feel like writing skills can be improved. We will require students to meet one-on-one with the University Writing Assistant in both writing intensive classes at least once. Students who do not show improvement will be required to go to the Writing Center for help with all written assignments. Students may be put on growth plans if improvement in writing skills is not demonstrated.

**Established in Cycle**: 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status**: Planned  
**Priority**: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure**: Transition Project  
**Outcome/Objective**: Communications

**Implementation Description**: Careful monitoring of students needing remediation began in the fall 2014 semester. We have a graduate assistant who helps struggling students directly. In addition, support plans are now drawn up when entering the program when writing challenges are noted.

**Projected Completion Date**: 12/2015

**Responsible Person/Group**: Instructors of writing intensive courses, University Writing Assistant.  
**Additional Resources**: University Writing Center

**Critical Thinking Assessment Continued**

In addition to the existing action plan for critical thinking, in which faculty will be given critical thinking rubrics to use aspects of within their written projects. Based on the critical thinking test results, we have two new actions. Having identified a pattern across the college regarding decreases in scores as the test progresses, we are changing the order of the questions to see if there is a difference. In addition, we are highlighting using professional literature to support student writing in SPED 311 Assessment and EPFB Transition to help develop or hone those skills.

**Established in Cycle**: 2015-2016  
**Implementation Status**: Planned  
**Priority**: High

**Projected Completion Date**: 05/2017
Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Based on the results of writing scores from the college where we are at or above the college averages, we have incorporated three changes. First, when student enter the program with writing challenges, they are counseled individually, and given a list of resources and suggestions that can be helpful. Second, for students in the program with writing challenges, they are put on a support plan to note the challenges and to give specific recommendations for improving. Third, we have a GA that works specifically with writing, and students have both a mandatory meeting, and open access to improve writing.

Based on the critical thinking test results, we have two considerations. There is a pattern, seen across the college, of scores going down as the test progresses. In order to determine if this might be a fatigue factor, we are changing the order of the questions to see if there is a difference. In addition, we are highlighting using professional literature to support student writing in SPED 311 Assessment and EPFB Transition to help develop or hone those skills.

In looking at the portfolio reviews that had varied responses from reviewers, we are doing several changes. First, students are being trained in how to use the on-line portfolio through IT. Second, this is followed up by additional training and checking on postings during our field based seminars. Third, students are being hired to help other students with loading and technical issues. Finally, we are training reviewers on our rubrics to ensure better inter-rater reliability.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

Our action plans are on-going.

1. Writing—we did hire a GA, and have made this a line item in our budget to ensure continuity. Student writing skills will continue to be measured. we will continue with early identification and support of those who have writing challenges.
2. Critical thinking—we did put the emphasis on integration of literature in our courses. We will see the outcome in the coming year.
3. Review of our elements (we have 11 that we review 3 to 4 at time rotating every 3 years), we are fine tuning our portfolio process, and should see outcomes this academic year.
4. Student teaching is our capstone, and we adjust expectations based on data collected and on supervisor feedback. We will be changing selected elements to better match the new TEA mandated statewide assessment as needed. Our first look at this suggests we are covering the elements, but may need new headings to match the measure.
Mission / Purpose

The purpose of degree programs in Special Education is to prepare professional educators to teach students with disabilities in grades EC (Early Childhood) through grade 12. This program prepares professional educators to become critical consumers of research and practitioners utilizing best practices throughout their careers.

Connected Documents
- Assessment Rubric
- CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
- Collaboration Rubric
- Communication Rubric
- Critical Thinking Rubric
- Development and Characteristics Rubric
- Foundations Rubric
- Individual Learning Differences Rubric
- Instructional Planning Rubric
- Instructional Strategies Rubric
- Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
- Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
- Social Competence Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

Goals

G 1: Skillful, Ethical, Caring Professionals
To prepare educators to serve as skillful, ethical, and caring professionals who respect the ethnic, linguistic, and cultural diversity of the students, families, and communities in which they work.

Connected Documents
- CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric
- Collaboration Rubric
- Communication Rubric
- Critical Thinking Rubric
- Development and Characteristics Rubric
- Foundations Rubric
- Instructional Planning Rubric
- Instructional Strategies Rubric
- Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
- Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
- Social Competence Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

G 2: Meeting needs of students
To prepare educators to meet the needs of students considered “at-risk” or “low-performing” as well as those with disabilities.

Connected Documents
- Assessment Rubric
- CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
- Collaboration Rubric
- Communication Rubric
- Development and Characteristics Rubric
- Foundations Rubric
- Instructional Planning Rubric
- Instructional Strategies Rubric
- Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
- Social Competence Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

G 3: Evidence-Based Practices
To prepare educators to implement evidence-based practices in relation to identification of students with special needs as well as instructional planning, implementation, and progress evaluation to meet the diverse needs of these students.

Connected Documents
- Assessment Rubric
- CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
- Collaboration Rubric
- Communication Rubric
- Development and Characteristics Rubric
- Foundations Rubric
- Instructional Planning Rubric
- Instructional Strategies Rubric
- Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
- Social Competence Rubric
- Student Teaching Rubric

G 4: Critical Self-Judgment and Program Evaluation
To prepare educators to develop skills in critical self-judgment and program evaluation to ensure their ability to continue to develop as effective professionals after leaving the University.
SLO 1: Foundations
Identify and apply evidence-based principles, laws and policies, historical points of view and cultural and diverse aspects as related to exceptionality.

Connected Document
Foundations Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures
M 1: Certification Exam
add description from TEA
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state
Target: 85% pass rate

Connected Document
Foundations Rubric


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Tests Taken</th>
<th>Tests Passed</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PPR</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total English as a Second Language Supplemental NA</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist EC-6</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Generalist EC-6</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The certification exam is the primary measure for this objective, but scores have been provided as total scores and not the subtest scores. Our students have a 100% pass rate on the special education test, which measures this objective, but we are not sure of the subtest scores. We will be including electronic portfolios as part of assessing this objective in the next cycle.

SLO 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners
Demonstrate respect and appropriate responses to varying ability and behaviors of diverse students based on knowledge of development and exceptionality

Connected Document
Development and Characteristics Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures
**M 1: Certification Exam**

add description from TEA

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
85% pass rate

**Connected Document**

Development and Characteristics Rubric

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Tests Taken</th>
<th>Tests Passed</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PPR</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total English as a Second Language Supplemental NA</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist EC-6</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Generalist EC-6</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are not specifically looking at this outcome this cycle. It will be reviewed in 2015-16.

**SLO 3: Individual Learning Differences**

Provide appropriate individualized instruction through actively seeking how language, culture, and family background impact individuals with exceptionalities

**Connected Document**

Individual Learning Differences Rubric

**Relevant Associations:**

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Certification Exam**

add description from TEA

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
85% pass rate

**Connected Document**

Individual Learning Differences Rubric

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Tests Taken</th>
<th>Tests Passed</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-12</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PPR</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Special Education EC-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total English as a Second Language Supplemental NA</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>89.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist EC-6</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Generalist EC-6</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are not evaluating this objective this cycle. It will be evaluated in the 2016-17 cycle.

**SLO 4: Instructional Strategies**

Select, adapt, and use evidence-based instructional strategies that individualize instruction and modify environments to develop, maintain, and generalize critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills for students with exceptional needs

**Connected Documents**

Instructional Strategies Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Instructional Strategies rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Instructional Strategies Rubric

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective will be assessed during the 2015-16 cycle.

SLO 5: Instructional Planning
Design systematic instruction that includes individual or group goals and objectives based on students' learning needs; implement best practices for teaching; consider linguistic factors; and work with students and relevant stakeholders to develop individualized transition plans

Connected Documents
Instructional Planning Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Instructional Planning rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Instructional Planning Rubric

The electronic portfolio will not be implemented until the fall 2015 semester. Students were asked to submit their best lesson plan and these were evaluated using the instructional planning rubric.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Instructional Planning improvement
The lesson plan template needs to be modified so that students are required to indicate modifications on the plan. A rubric for...

SLO 6: Assessment
Select reliable and valid formal and informal assessment tools that meet students' educational and behavioral needs; make educational decisions based on assessment results; adjust instruction or make modifications to enable students to access the general education curriculum and participate in statewide assessments

Connected Documents
Assessment Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
6. Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.
Related Measures

**M 2: Electronic Portfolio**
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
95% of students will be at proficient level using Assessment rubric (attached document)

**Connected Document**
Assessment Rubric

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This objective will be assessed during the 2015-16 cycle.

**SLO 7: Professional and Ethical Practice**
Be lifelong learners and stay current with evidenced-based practices; display respectful attitude in all settings with colleagues, students, and families; demonstrate sensitivity toward cultures and diversity; ensure confidentiality; meet professional commitments in a timely manner; and practice within legal and ethical guidelines

**Connected Documents**
Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

**Relevant Associations:**
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Practice personal and social responsibility
2. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
3. Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

**Strategic Plan Associations**
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

**M 2: Electronic Portfolio**
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
95% of students will be at proficient level using Professional and Ethical Practice rubric (attached document)

**Connected Document**
Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The electronic portfolio will be implemented during the fall 2015 semester. Professional and ethical practice was assessed this semester through the student teaching evaluation.

**M 5: Student Teaching Evaluation**
Rubric that evaluates student performance in student teaching, the capstone experience in the program.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
95% of students will be at proficient or higher level using Student Teaching rubric (attached document)

**Connected Documents**
Professional and Ethical Practice Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
The student teaching evaluation for the fall 2014 student teachers were reviewed and the the attached rubric applied. 100% of students scored at proficient in professional and ethical practice.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Professional and Ethical Practice**
Although students have performed well on this objective, faculty will continue to stress the importance of professional and ethi...

**SLO 8: Learning Environment and Social Interactions**
Collaborate with general educators, paraprofessionals, and the community to create motivating learning environments that foster active engagement in learning and respect for diversity in both typical and crisis situations

**Connected Documents**
Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

**Relevant Associations:**
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Communicate effectively
3. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
7. Work collaboratively

**Strategic Plan Associations**
Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Learning Environment and Social Interactions rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Learning Environments and Social Interaction Rubric

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective was not assessed this cycle. It will be assessed during the 2016-17 cycle.

SLO 9: Communications
Understand language development, identify strategies to support students language and communication needs, determine appropriate assistive technology to support students communicative needs, and model effective language for all students including those whose primary language is not English

Connected Documents
CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric
Communication Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3. Communicate effectively
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Communications rubric (attached document)

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective was scheduled for this semester, but electronic portfolios will not be implemented until the fall 2015 semester. Communications was evaluated through the college's writing assessment.

M 4: Transition Project
The final project in SEFB 420 is used as the writing sample provided to the college each year for evaluation in addition to also being included on the electronic portfolio as a measure of other disciplinary learning outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
CEHD Writing Assessment Rubric

Written Communications at the Program Level

Students from the Special Education program (n = 20) participated in the assessment process. Results are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>CEHD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Style</td>
<td>2.88 (.51)</td>
<td>2.72 (.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Idea</td>
<td>2.93 (.44)</td>
<td>2.62 (.55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization</td>
<td>2.95 (.43)</td>
<td>2.69 (.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conventions</td>
<td>2.78 (.50)</td>
<td>2.52 (.61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 2.88 (.39) 2.64 (.49)
Percent over 2 100% 94.6%

Interpretation and Limitations
Results indicate the overall mean score was above 2.00, and 100 percent of the students had mean
scores greater than 2.00. This is above the cutoff level of 80 percent. The results should be interpreted alongside other data sources, such as last year's critical thinking assessment.

The results should be also interpreted in light of potential limitations. These represent scores from a subset of all students in the program. Rater reliability scores were statistically significant but less than the traditional cutoff point.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Writing skills
Even though students met the proficient level in writing, faculty feel like writing skills can be improved. We will require stu...

SLO 10: Collaboration
Effectively collaborate with families, educators, related service providers, and agency personnel in a culturally responsive manner in the education of children with exceptionalities

Connected Documents
Collaboration Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5  Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
7  Work collaboratively

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Collaboration rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Collaboration Rubric

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective was not assessed this cycle. It will be assessed in the 2016-17 cycle.

SLO 11: Social and Global Competence
Live and work effectively in a diverse and global society and articulate the value of a diverse and global perspective

Connected Documents
Social Competence Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5  Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
3 Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Social and Global Competence rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Social Competence Rubric

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This objective was not assessed this cycle. It will be assessed in the 2015-16 cycle.

SLO 12: Critical Thinking
Apply critical thinking skills to solve problems in the field of education

Connected Documents
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric
Critical Thinking Rubric
Student Teaching Rubric

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

2. Demonstrate critical thinking

Strategic Plan Associations

Texas A&M University

3. Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

Related Measures

M 2: Electronic Portfolio
Electronic portfolio which includes artifacts/assignments from the program and student reflections.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
95% of students will be at proficient level using Critical Thinking rubric (attached document)

Connected Document
Critical Thinking Rubric

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The electronic portfolio will be implemented during the fall 2015 semester. Critical thinking was evaluated this cycle using the College Critical Thinking Test.

M 3: Critical Thinking Test
College-developed standardized measure of critical thinking skills.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Connected Document
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric

Target:
85% of students will score at Sufficient or above (2.0)

Connected Document
CEHD Critical Thinking Rubric

Critical Thinking at the Program Level

Students from the Special Education program (n = 29) participated in the study. Results are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Program Results</th>
<th>CEHD Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1A</td>
<td>Explain Issue</td>
<td>2.55 (.65)</td>
<td>2.41 (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1B</td>
<td>Use evidence in offering response</td>
<td>2.42 (.69)</td>
<td>2.36 (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Consider the influence of context and assumptions</td>
<td>2.04 (.45)</td>
<td>1.91 (.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3A</td>
<td>Clearly state position, perspective, or thesis</td>
<td>1.63 (.52)</td>
<td>1.57 (.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3B</td>
<td>Arrive at reasoned conclusions and outcomes</td>
<td>1.60 (.51)</td>
<td>1.60 (.54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Mean Score | 2.05 (.41) | 1.97 (.51)
Percent over 2.0 | 59% | 62%

Interpretation and Limitations
Results indicate the overall mean score was below than 2.00, and 59 percent of the students had mean scores greater than 2.00. This is below the cutoff level of 80 percent. The results should be interpreted alongside other data sources, such as last year’s critical thinking assessment.

The results should be also interpreted in light of potential limitations. These represent scores from a sub-set of all students in the program. Inter-rater reliability scores for three areas were statistically significant but less than the traditional cutoff point of .70.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Increase practice in critical thinking skills
The critical thinking skills rubric will be provided to all faculty teaching in the undergraduate program and case studies requi...

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Increase practice in critical thinking skills
The critical thinking skills rubric will be provided to all faculty teaching in the undergraduate program and case studies requiring critical thinking skills will be developed and included in all program courses. Faculty will also be explicit about the use of critical thinking and demonstrate the process during class activities.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Critical Thinking Test | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking

Implementation Description: During the 2015-16 school year, faculty will incorporate critical thinking activities into courses.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
Instructional Planning improvement

The lesson plan template needs to be modified so that students are required to indicate modifications on the plan. A rubric for the lesson plan needs to be provided to all field supervisors so that they can reinforce proper planning procedures. We feel that students are implementing modifications, but not indicating them in their plans, so it is difficult to evaluate.

SPED 310 will incorporate the lesson plan template into instructional strategies used in that class.

Faculty need to better teach the concept of "generalization and maintenance of skills" in instructional methods class. This concept is not clearly articulated in lesson plans.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Electronic Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Instructional Planning

Implementation Description: Undergraduate faculty will be cognizant of weaknesses in instructional planning and explicitly teach these concepts in coursework. Field supervisors will reinforce proper instructional planning based on the rubric provided to them.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2016

Responsible Person/Group: Special education undergraduate faculty

professional and ethical practice

Although students have performed well on this objective, faculty will continue to stress the importance of professional and ethical practice. Students who exhibit unprofessional behaviors will be put on growth plans.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Student Teaching Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Professional and Ethical Practice

Implementation Description: reinforce professional and ethical behaviors

Projected Completion Date: 05/2016

Responsible Person/Group: special education undergraduate faculty

Additional Resources: none

Writing skills

Even though students met the proficient level in writing, faculty feel like writing skills can be improved. We will require students to meet one-on-one with the University Writing Assistant in both writing intensive classes at least once. Students who do not show improvement will be required to go to the Writing Center for help with all written assignments. Students may be put on growth plans if improvement in writing skills is not demonstrated.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Transition Project | Outcome/Objective: Communications

Implementation Description: Careful monitoring of students needing remediation will be implemented in the fall 2014 semester.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2015

Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of writing intensive courses, University Writing Assistant.

Additional Resources: University Writing Center

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Based on reviewing lesson plans submitted by students and the results of the critical thinking skills test administered by the college, we have made two major changes.

1. We are going to revise our lesson plan template and incorporate the lesson plan into SPED 310. All faculty will explicitly teach the component of "teaching generalization and maintenance of skills" as that is a particular weakness. Field supervisors will be provided with the instructional planning rubric and the lesson plan template so that they can reinforce instructional planning practices in the field.

2. Case studies requiring critical thinking will be developed and incorporated into all undergraduate courses. Faculty will explicitly teach critical thinking skills and show students how to problem solve in the cases.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

In previous years our program was combined with the Bilingual Education program. We have spent the past two years aligning our curriculum with national standards, developing rubrics to assess each of the standards, and creating an assessment plan and committee. We have revised our entire program and created new WEAVE entries. We will be following this plan starting with this cycle.
Mission / Purpose

Mission (Special Education): The mission of the special education program is to improve the quality of special education services for children and youth with disabilities and their families through teaching, research, and service. We provide initial preparation and advanced professional development of teachers, educational leaders (with on-campus and distance master’s programs), and educational researchers (doctoral). We conduct research focused on improving school and community systems. We provide service to the field of special education through leadership in professional organizations and through knowledge dissemination activities.

Mission (Bilingual): The mission of the bilingual education program is to improve the quality of education services for culturally and linguistically diverse children and youth and their families across Texas, the United States, and around the world through teaching, research, and service. We provide initial preparation and advanced professional development of teachers, educational leaders (with on-campus and distance master's programs), and educational researchers (doctoral). We conduct research on second language acquisition in order focused on improving schools. We provide service to the field of bilingual education through leadership in professional organizations and through knowledge dissemination activities.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Critical Thinking
Students will demonstrate critical thinking within the discipline

Related Measures

M 1: Critical Thinking Assessment
Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT)
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state
Target:
80% of students will score above a 20 on the CAT

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Overall, 90% of the students scored above the overall mean score of 2.00. This result is above the original goal of having at least 80% of the students score above a 2.00. Thus, the program met its goal for critical thinking.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
The mean score for Critical Thinking Assessment for EPSY UG Programs is 15.78, which is less than the cutoff target of 20.00 for critical thinking. Therefore, the target was not met.

M 3: Bil. ED. Critical Thinking Assessment
70% of students will score above a 20 on the Critical Thinking Assessment, during the student teaching semester.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge
Target:
70% of students will score 70% on the Critical Thinking Assessment, during the student teaching semester.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We contacted the Assessment to have our students included in the CTA. We were informed that they were on a three year cycle and they would not be testing this year. It is possible that we can participate in 2014-2015.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We were not included in the pilot group for the CTA for this reporting period; therefore, no data are available to report.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Critical Thinking Assessment
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Our students will take the CTA in the next academic year.

SLO 2: Communication Skills
Students will demonstrate effective communication skills

Related Measures

M 2: Written Communication Evaluation
Evaluation of W-course artifacts using Written Communication VALUE rubric
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge
Target:
80% of students will score a 2 or above on the Written Communication VALUE rubric
Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Results indicate that 100% of Special Education and Bilingual Education students scored 2 or above. Thus, the target was met.
the target was met.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met

Results indicate that 100% of Special Education students scored 2 or above. Thus, the target was met.

SLO 3: Bil. ED. Critical Thinking
Students will demonstrate critical thinking within the discipline.

SLO 4: Bil. ED. Written Communication
Students will demonstrate effective written communication skill.

Related Measures

M 4: Bil. ED. Evaluation of Written Capstone Piece, Intervention Project
70% of Students will score a 2 or above on the Written Communication VALUE Rubric

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
70% of Students will score a 2 or above on the Written Communication VALUE Rubric

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

We contacted the Assessment to have our students included in the Written Communication Value Assessment. We were informed that they were on a three year cycle and they would not be testing this year. It is possible that we can participate in 2014-2015.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

We were not included in the pilot group for the Written Communication VALUE Rubric; therefore, no data are available to report.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Written Communication VALUE Rubric
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013

Our students capstone project will be evaluated next academic year.

SLO 5: Bil. ED. Content Mastery

For 2012 -2013, 90% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist with a score of 240.

For 2013 -2014 (if the new exam is in place) 70% of Students will pass (with a score of 240 or better) the new Bilingual Generalist exam. TEA is introducing a new exam. And this exam will be scored differently. Students will be required to pass all domains in the exam in order to pass the exam. As we move to this new exam model, we are setting are pass rate at 70% for the first two years and we plan to increase that by 10% each year.

Related Measures

M 5: Bil. ED. Bilingual Generalist Certification Exam
For 2012 - 2013, 90% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist with a 240.

Note: For 2013 - 2014, 70% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist Supplemental and the Generalist with a score of 240. This will be a new test. And the students will be required to pass each domain in order to pass the test.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
For 2012 - 2013, 90% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist with a 240.

Note: For 2013 - 2014, 70% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist Supplemental and the Generalist with a score of 240. This will be a new test. And the students will be required to pass each domain in order to pass the test.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
For 90% of students will pass the Bilingual Generalist with a 240, we can’t report at this time, as the data are not in. The data will be available Summer 2014.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
A few students are retaking their exams. They have until August to show that they have passed. Data are not complete at this time.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Update Finding
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
I anticipate that 90% of students will have passed the Bilingual Generalist by August.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Certification Exam Support and Preparation

Bilingual Education:

Based on the findings from the outcomes that use the measure of the Bilingual Generalist Certification Exam we are going to make some changes. Our students pass the certification exam upon graduation. However, recently, we have seen a trend, many are not passing the exam on the first administration. We are going to set a new goal of having 80% of the students pass the exam at the first respective administration.

The steps for this Support and Preparation plan include but are not limited to: (1) having students pretest for the exam in the early stages of professional admission; (2) putting students who score below an 80 on a support track*; (3) requiring students to
test early during the methods semester; (4) having a clearance point before entering student teaching (to ensure that they are on track); (5) incorporate informal and formal assessment opportunities in the BEFB courses which align with the format of the test (so that students become more familiar with the format, sooner).

*The support track will offer students preparation sessions which address their needs. These sessions will be offered twice per semester, so as not to add to their course load and obligations. But they will be sufficient to help them become comfortable with the content of the exam and the testing format of the exam.

**Critical Thinking Assessment**

Our students will take the CTA in the next academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

**Critical Thinking Assessment for Special Education UG**

Review scope and sequence of curriculum to ensure measures of critical thinking related to the discipline are in place. Since the TEA certification exams are currently being revamped, we will hold off on any substantial changes until we receive the information on domains and criteria. At this point, we will require that 85% of SPED students will get 80% or higher on the measures of critical thinking related to the discipline on the first submission. Papers from upper level courses will be used to determine the level of critical thinking proficiency.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

**Plan of Action for Strategies and Resources**

Higher level questions, transitional techniques, and stating full objectives and closure activities will be emphasized in coursework and when writing lesson plans.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High

**Writing Assessment for Special Education**

Key conventions of writing will be explicitly taught in Writing intensive courses beginning in Fall of 2013. Results will be available in 2014 data.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

**Written Communication VALUE Rubric**

Our students capstone project will be evaluated next academic year.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Bil. ED. Evaluation of Written Capstone Piece, Intervention Project | Outcome/Objective: Bil. ED. Written Communication

Implementation Description: The student teachers will submit their intervention project to be scored using the Value Rubric next academic year.
Responsible Person/Group: The undergraduate coordinator will ensure that the papers are forwarded to be scored.

New course for special education teachers
We have spent the last year analyzing our curriculum and aligning with state and national standards. We are currently gathering information from stakeholders, and will be making changes to the curriculum based on feedback. We have renewed the writing course status of SPED 428 Collaboration in school settings. As a result of input from stakeholders and students, we will be implementing a new course for teaching math directed toward special education teachers

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2015

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program?
Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Bilingual Education:
Analysis are not available at this time. The CTA and the Writing Assessment were not offered this year, so our students do not have scores under these to report. At this time, certification exam passing rates have not been confirmed. Unofficial data indicate that 19/20 students have passed the Bilingual Certification exam at this time.

Special Education:
Analysis of the CTA and the Writing Assessment indicate our students in the SPED program scored the highest in the College of Education. We will continue with our writing plan as indicated above, and have included pieces in the curriculum such as having students write higher order questions in learning plans to hopefully improve or sustain higher level thinking. The pass rates for the certification exam are not yet available for Spring, 2014 students. The first time pass rate for our students in special education continues to be in the 94% to 100% range, which is higher than the state average. At this time we are still waiting on content and format for the new state certification exams to prepare our students. At this time, certification exam passing rates have not been confirmed.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

In Special Education, the Writing and CTA assessments have been established as part of the curriculum cycle. The Assessment Office suggested contact at the start of fall 2014 to see if the CTA and Writing assessment cycle for bilingual education can be added.
Mission / Purpose

The Child Professional Services degree is a flexible 120-hour program that enables a student to combine a prescribed concentration, two minors, the core curriculum and electives to create a comprehensive degree that aligns with their individual professional interest. The program is heavily student centered. It is essential the student has a clear understanding of their professional or further educational interests and the selected plan of study positions them for success.

The Child Professional Services concentration prepares individuals to work with children in various organizations, which support youth development.

As a means of preparing graduates for careers in civic, social or religious organizations; hospitals or non-profit organizations; or family and community services, this concentration offers study in upper level education courses that provide a strong foundation in:

- Child and adolescent development,
- Instructional methods,
- Educational psychology,
- Kinesiology,
- Human resource development and
- Sociology.

The Child Professional Services degree aligns closely with the University Learning Outcomes set for undergraduate students. Students who receive their degree in this area will be able to:

* Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree, including the ability to
  Articulate disciplinary and interdisciplinary theories, concepts, principles, skills and practices, specifically as they relate to working with children
  Synthesize knowledge across courses and other experiences
  Apply knowledge from core curriculum courses, discipline-based courses, and other experiences in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions in a "real world" context

* Demonstrate critical thinking, including the ability to
  Evaluate, analyze, and integrate information from a variety of sources
  Use appropriate strategies and tools to represent, analyze and integrate information
  Develop critical, reasoned positions

* Communicate effectively
  Demonstrate effective oral, written, and non-verbal communication skills
  Listen actively and critically
  Effectively communicate original and creative ideas

* Practice personal and social responsibility, including the ability to
  Practice ethical leadership
  Recognize an ethical dilemma and apply rational decision-making in order to address it
  Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice
  Acknowledge and address the consequences of one's own actions
  Engage in local and global civic activities

* Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence, including the ability to
  Live and work effectively in a diverse and global society
  Articulate the value of a diverse and global perspective
  Recognize diverse economic, political, cultural and religious opinions and practices

* Prepare to engage in lifelong learning, including the ability to
  Exhibit the skills necessary to acquire, organize, reorganize and interpret new knowledge
  Show proficiency in current technologies and the ability to adapt to emerging technologies
  Recognize and participate in activities that enhance wellness of body, mind and spirit
  Formulate a plan of personal goals for continued professional growth
  Demonstrate intellectual curiosity

* Work collaboratively, including the ability to
  Participate effectively in teams
  Consider different points of view
  Work with others to support a shared purpose or goal

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans
SLO 1: Core & Discipline Based Courses
Be able to demonstrate content mastery across core and discipline based-courses.

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree

Related Measures

EHRD 371 Applied Learning Principles is a writing intensive (W) designated class in the Child Professional Services concentration degree plan. Students' observation analysis research paper will be evaluated based on Format, Grammar and Style, Organization, Academic Scholarship, and Content & Analysis via the corresponding rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
EHRD 371 Observation Analysis Research Paper Grading Rubric

Target:
80% of students will obtain a B (80%) or higher, thus demonstrating their ability to effectively communicate their thoughts and establish a reasoned position on their philosophy of education.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Data not collected in 2015-2016. Data will be collected in 2016-2017 for the purpose of reporting assessment summary for this measure.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Product Development
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle...

M 3: INST 301 Culture and Diversity Project
INST 301 "Educational Psychology" is listed as part of the core curriculum requirements for the Child Professional services degree. Students enrolled in this class will complete a final project that calls for them to create a video presentation that fully answers the open-ended question: “What role does culture and diversity play in education?” The video is expected to incorporate factual information from the textbook while integrating information from earlier semester units on development, learning, and motivation. Students are expected to do their own research and rely on their own experiences / reflections in crafting their lecture. Proficiency will be determined by the clarity of the recorded presentation, the correctness of the factual information conveyed, and the completeness of the content coverage and how well students answered the question.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Connected Document
INST 301 Culture and Diversity Project Grading Rubric

Target:
80% of students will receive meets expectations on project intangibles (3 or higher) and above-average effort (10 or higher) on project essentials, according the project rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Partially Met
90% of students scored 'met expectations' or higher on project intangibles rubric domain Communication (mean score Communication 4.10).
90% of students scored 'met expectations' or higher on project intangibles rubric domain Creativity. (mean score Creativity 4.10).
90% of students scored 'met expectations' or higher on project intangible rubric domains Clarity (mean score Clarity 4.25).
75% of students scored at least 'above-average effort' or a 10 or higher on project rubric (mean score was 10.45).

Therefore this target was partially met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Data not collected in 2015-2016. Data will be collected in 2016-2017 for the purpose of reporting assessment summary for this measure.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This was a new program and we didn't had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Child Professional Services Action Plan**  
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*  
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...

**Product Development**  
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*  
We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle...

**INST 301 Content Domain Improvement**  
*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*  
Results on INST 301 Paper show that students are surpassing expectations on intangibles (communication, creativity, and clarity)...

**M 5: INST 301 Survey Design Project**  
Students must create a survey, collect data, and generate a paper based on that survey.  
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Connected Document**  
[INST 301 Survey Design Grading Rubric](#)

**Target:**  
80% of students will score 8 or better (highly evident) in the survey creation/data collection rubric domain, and 16 or better (highly evident) in the empirical and quantitative skills rubric domain.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Partially Met**  
While 85% (11/13) of students scored an 8 or better within the survey creation/data collection rubric domain, only 30% (4/13) of students scored a 16 or better for the empirical and quantitative skills rubric domain. Therefore, this target was partially met. There are no data from which to compare these results as this is a new assignment.

**M 6: EPSY 321 Intro Project Grading Rubric**  
Students must complete a project involving survey creation and data collection.  
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Connected Document**  
[INST 321 Intro Project Grading Rubric](#)

**Target:**  
80% of students will score a 9 or better (highly evident) on the rubric domain survey creation/data collection, and an 18 or better (highly evident) in the empirical and quantitative skills rubric domain.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Partially Met**  
94% (14/15) students scored a 9 or higher on the rubric domain for survey creation/data collection. 74% (11/15) students scored 18 or higher in the empirical and quantitative skills rubric domain. Therefore, these findings were partially met.

**SLO 2: Original and Creative Ideas**  
Demonstrate the ability to express original ideas and produce creative works through the completion of divergent thinking assignments and projects

**Relevant Associations:**  
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations  
3 Communicate effectively

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Critical Thinking Assessment Test**  
Students complete read and evaluated a critical thinking case study, which is a College-developed standardized measure of critical thinking skills.

This is a direct measure which will be administered to students as a group in the semester after they have accumulated 96 credit hours on their degree plan  
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Connected Documents**  
[CEHD Critical Thinking Case Study](#)  
[CEHD Critical Thinking Test Scoring Rubric](#)

**Target:**  
75% of students will score a 2.0 or better on the CEHD Critical Thinking rubric

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**  
Not measured this cycle.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**  
Data not collected during this assessment cycle.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**  
Data not collected in 2015-2016. Data will be collected in 2016-2017 for the purpose of reporting assessment summary for this measure.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**  
This was a new program and we didn't had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Child Professional Services Action Plan
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stage...

Product Development
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle...

SLO 3: Ethics and Personal Responsibility
Demonstrate sound judgment, intuitive reasoning, and decisive decision making when working with children in a dynamic setting

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Demonstrate critical thinking
4 Practice personal and social responsibility

Related Measures
M 4: EPFB 210 Educational Psychology Field Based Project
EPFB 210 Family Involvement & Empowerment is listed as part of the core curriculum requirements for the Child Professional Services degree. This is a field-based course that provides information and skills necessary for educators to work with diverse families.

Students must complete a reflection including an overall evaluation of the experiences and what implications for teaching and working with families were gained from the experience (see guidelines on eCampus for the reflection). Students will also have their primary supervisor complete an evaluation about their professionalism during the practicum. Professor for this course evaluates the student reflection.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
EPFB 210 Practicum Grading Rubric

Target:
80% of students enrolled in EPFB 210 will score ‘Acceptable’ on all categories of the rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met
74% of students (34/46) scored acceptable on all rubric categories for this paper. Based on these results the target was not met. Findings cannot be compared as two previous years of data were not reported.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
TBD

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

EPFB 210 Educational Psychology Project
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Students did not meet targets for the field based ed psychology project and no data has reported on previous student performance...

SLO 4: Reasoned Position
Develop and communicate a reasoned position based on information from a variety of sources

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Demonstrate critical thinking
3 Communicate effectively

Related Measures
EHRD 371 Applied Learning Principles is a writing intensive (W) designated class in the Child Professional Services concentration degree plan. Students’ observation analysis research paper will be evaluated based on Format, Grammar and Style, Organization, Academic Scholarship, and Content & Analysis via the corresponding rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
EHRD 371 Observation Analysis Research Paper Grading Rubric

Target:
80% of students will obtain either an A or B on this assignment demonstrating their ability to effectively communicate their thoughts and establish a reasoned position on their philosophy of education

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.
Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Data not collected in 2015-2016. Data will be collected in 2016-2017 for the purpose of reporting assessment summary for this measure.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This was a new program and we didn't had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Child Professional Services Action Plan
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...

Product Development
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle...

SLO 5: Communication Skills
Students will communicate effectively in written and oral form.

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Communicate effectively

Related Measures

M 3: INST 301 Culture and Diversity Project
INST 301 “Educational Psychology” is listed as part of the core curriculum requirements for the Child Professional services degree. Students enrolled in this class will complete a final project that calls for them to create a video presentation that fully answers the open-ended question: “What role does culture and diversity play in education?” The video is expected to incorporate factual information from the textbook while integrating information from earlier semester units on development, learning, and motivation. Students are expected to do their own research and rely on their own experiences / reflections in crafting their lecture. Proficiency will be determined by the clarity of the recorded presentation, the correctness of the factual information conveyed, and the completeness of the content coverage and how well students answered the question.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Connected Document
INST 301 Culture and Diversity Project Grading Rubric

Target:
80% of students will demonstrate effective oral presentation skills by receiving at least 'meets expectations' (3 or higher) in Communication domain on project rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
90% of students scored ‘met expectations’ or higher on project intangibles rubric domain Communication. (mean score Communication 4.10). Therefore, the target was met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

INST 301 Content Domain Improvement
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Results on INST 301 Paper show that students are surpassing expectations on intangibles (communication, creativity, and clarity)...

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Child Professional Services Action Plan
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stages of how student progress should be assessed and evaluated.

The outcomes and measures that are listed will be implemented this upcoming academic year. Based on this, we have no data to report at this time for this cycle. However, the plan is to collect data starting from next cycle (2016-2017). We will be able to have specific action plans based on findings from next year cycle onward.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Critical Thinking Assessment Test | Outcome/Objective: Original and Creative Ideas
- Measure: EHRD 371 Applied Learning Principles Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Core & Discipline Based Courses
- Position
- Measure: INST 301 Culture and Diversity Project | Outcome/Objective: Core & Discipline Based Courses

Implementation Description: The outcomes and measures for this new program have been planned for data collection and evaluation purposes.

Projected Completion Date: 08/2016

Responsible Person/Group: UG Advisor and Program Coordinator

Product Development

We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle for 2016-2017.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2017

INST 301 Content Domain Improvement

Results on INST 301 Paper show that students are surpassing expectations on intangibles (communication, creativity, and clarity). However, they perform slightly below expectations regarding the ability to integrate content into their presentation. Moving forward the instructor will plan a special project work day to help students understand how better to integrate content into their presentation. Specifically, examples will be provided on incorporating text book examples, relevant experiences (as some sections of INST 301 study abroad) and essential information into the project in order to achieve at the level stated (score at least a 10 thereby meeting expectations on the rubric).

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Completed
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: INST 301 Culture and Diversity Project | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills
  | Core & Discipline Based Courses

Projected Completion Date: 05/2018

EPFB 210 Educational Psychology Project

Students did not meet targets for the field based ed psychology project and no data has reported on previous student performance. The challenge with improving learning within this course lies in the fact that this course, while included in the USEH degree, is not overseen by the major's program coordinator and thus the coordinator has limited direction and control from which to improve learning. Nonetheless, USEH Non-cert child services will connect with program faculty regarding student performance and explore possible solutions to improving students' writing and general performance on this project.

Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: EPFB 210 Educational Psychology Field Based Project | Outcome/Objective: Ethics and Personnal Responsibility

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

This year some outcomes were partially met while other outcomes were not met. However, it is difficult to compare previous findings as project designs have changed and/or there is no previous data from which to compare results. Due to challenges involving learning improvements since many courses included in the students' degree plan are not overseen by the program coordinator, the program is currently exploring options to participate in the USEH university wide assessment process. We think this will allow for more effective learning assessment, as the current assessment process relies to heavily on courses that are beyond the program's oversight and control.

"CRITICAL" Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

INST 301 Content Domain Improvement: Action plan was completed. To further support student learning, students were provided with more examples and direction regarding certain rubric domains for the content domain development. As well, faculty revised the rubric to measure different areas of learning. Both factors improved student performance.
Mission / Purpose

The Child Professional Services degree is a flexible 120-hour program that enables a student to combine a prescribed concentration, two minors, the core curriculum and electives to create a comprehensive degree that aligns with their individual professional interest. The program is heavily student centered. It is essential the student has a clear understanding of their professional or further educational interests and the selected plan of study positions them for success.

The Child Professional Services concentration prepares individuals to work with children in various organizations, which support youth development.

As a means of preparing graduates for careers in civic, social or religious organizations; hospitals or non-profit organizations; or family and community services, this concentration offers study in upper level education courses that provide a strong foundation in:

- Child and adolescent development,
- Instructional methods,
- Educational psychology,
- Kinesiology,
- Human resource development and
- Sociology.

The Child Professional Services degree aligns closely with the University Learning Outcomes set for undergraduate students. Student who receive their degree in this area will be able to:

*Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree, including the ability to Articulate disciplinary and interdisciplinary theories, concepts, principles, skills and practices, specifically as they relate to working with children Synthesize knowledge across courses and other experiences Apply knowledge from core curriculum courses, discipline-based courses, and other experiences in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions in a "real world" context*

*Demonstrate critical thinking, including the ability to Evaluate, analyze, and integrate information from a variety of sources Use appropriate strategies and tools to represent, analyze and integrate information Develop critical, reasoned positions*

*Communicate effectively Demonstrate effective oral, written, and non-verbal communication skills Listen actively and critically Effectively communicate original and creative ideas*

*Practice personal and social responsibility, including the ability to Practice ethical leadership Recognize an ethical dilemma and apply rational decision-making in order to address it Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice Acknowledge and address the consequences of one's own actions Engage in local and global civic activities*

*Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence, including the ability to Live and work effectively in a diverse and global society Articulate the value of a diverse and global perspective Recognize diverse economic, political, cultural and religious opinions and practices*

*Prepare to engage in lifelong learning, including the ability to Exhibit the skills necessary to acquire, organize, reorganize and interpret new knowledge Show proficiency in current technologies and the ability to adapt to emerging technologies Recognize and participate in activities that enhance wellness of body, mind and spirit Formulate a plan of personal goals for continued professional growth Demonstrate intellectual curiosity*

*Work collaboratively, including the ability to Participate effectively in teams Consider different points of view Work with others to support a shared purpose or goal*
SLO 1: Core & Discipline Based Courses
Be able to demonstrate content mastery across core and discipline based-courses.

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree

Related Measures

EHRD 371 Applied Learning Principles is a writing intensive (W) designated class in the Child Professional Services concentration degree plan. Students' observation analysis research paper will be evaluated based on Format, Grammar and Style, Organization, Academic Scholarship, and Content & Analysis via the corresponding rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
EHRD 371 Observation Analysis Research Paper Grading Rubric

Target:
80% of students will obtain a B (80%) or higher, thus demonstrating their ability to effectively communicate their thoughts and establish a reasoned position on their philosophy of education.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Data not collected in 2015-2016. Data will be collected in 2016-2017 for the purpose of reporting assessment summary for this measure.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Product Development
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle...

M 3: INST 301 Educational Psychology Project
INST 301 "Educational Psychology" is listed as part of the core curriculum requirements for the Child Professional services degree. Students enrolled in this class will complete a final project that calls for them to create a video presentation that fully answers the open-ended question: “What role does culture and diversity play in education?” The video is expected to incorporate factual information from the textbook while integrating information from earlier semester units on development, learning, and motivation. Students are expected to do their own research and rely on their own experiences / reflections in crafting their lecture. Proficiency will be determined by the clarity of the recorded presentation, the correctness of the factual information conveyed, and the completeness of the content coverage and how well students answered the question.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Connected Document
INST 301 Culture and Diversity Project Grading Rubric

Target:
80% of students will receive meets expectations on project intangibles (3 or higher) and above-average effort (10 or higher) on project essentials, according the project rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Partially Met
90% of students scored 'met expectations' or higher on project intangibles rubric domain Communication (mean score Communication 4.10).
90% of students scored 'met expectations' or higher on project intangibles rubric domain Creativity. (mean score Creativity 4.10).
90% of students scored 'met expectations' or higher on project intangible rubric domains Clarity (mean score Clarity 4.25).

75% of students scored at least 'above-average effort' or a 10 or higher on project rubric (mean score was 10.45).

Therefore this target was partially met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Data not collected in 2015-2016. Data will be collected in 2016-2017 for the purpose of reporting assessment summary for this measure.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This was a new program and we didn't had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Child Professional Services Action Plan
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we...
Product Development  
**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016  
We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle...

INST 301 Content Domain Improvement  
**Established in Cycle:** 2016-2017  
Results on INST 301 Paper show that students are surpassing expectations on intangibles (communication, creativity, and clarity)...

**SLO 2: Original and Creative Ideas**  
Demonstrate the ability to express original ideas and produce creative works through the completion of divergent thinking assignments and projects

**Relevant Associations:**  
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations  
3 Communicate effectively

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Critical Thinking Assessment Test**  
Students complete read and evaluated a critical thinking case study, which is a College-developed standardized measure of critical thinking skills.

This is a direct measure which will be administered to students as a group in the semester after they have accumulated 96 credit hours on their degree plan  
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Connected Documents**

- CEHD Critical Thinking Case Study
- CEHD Critical Thinking Test Scoring Rubric

**Target:**  
75% of students will score a 2.0 or better on the CEHD Critical Thinking rubric

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**  
Data not collected during this assessment cycle.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**  
Data not collected in 2015-2016. Data will be collected in 2016-2017 for the purpose of reporting assessment summary for this measure.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**  
This was a new program and we didn’t had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Child Professional Services Action Plan**  
**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...

**Product Development**  
**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016  
We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle...

**SLO 3: Ethics and Personal Responsbility**  
Demonstrate sound judgment, intuitive reasoning, and decisive decision making when working with children in a dynamic setting

**Relevant Associations:**  
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations  
2 Demonstrate critical thinking  
4 Practice personal and social responsibility

**Related Measures**

**M 4: EPFB 210 Educational Psychology Field Based Project**  
EPFB 210 Family Involvement & Empowerment is listed as part of the core curriculum requirements for the Child Professional services degree. This is a field-based course that provides information and skills necessary for educators to work with diverse families.

Students must complete a reflection including an overall evaluation of the experiences and what implications for teaching and working with families were gained from the experience (see guidelines on eCampus for the reflection). Students will also have their primary supervisor complete an evaluation about their professionalism during the practicum. Professor for this course evaluates the student reflection.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**

- EPFB 210 Practicum Grading Rubric

**Target:**
80% of students enrolled in EPFB 210 will score ‘Acceptable’ on all categories of the rubric.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
TBD

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
TBD

**SLO 4: Reasoned Position**
Develop and communicate a reasoned position based on information from a variety of sources

**Relevant Associations:**
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Demonstrate critical thinking
2. Communicate effectively

**Related Measures**

**M 1: EHRD 371 Applied Learning Principles Research Paper**
EHRD 371 Applied Learning Principles is a writing intensive (W) designated class in the Child Professional Services concentration degree plan. Students’ observation analysis research paper will be evaluated based on Format, Grammar and Style, Organization, Academic Scholarship, and Content & Analysis via the corresponding rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**
EHRD 371 Observation Analysis Research Paper Grading Rubric

**Target:**
80% of students will obtain either an A or B on this assignment demonstrating their ability to effectively communicate their thoughts and establish a reasoned position on their philosophy of education

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Not measured this cycle.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Not measured this cycle.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Data not collected in 2015-2016. Data will be collected in 2016-2017 for the purpose of reporting assessment summary for this measure.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This was a new program and we didn't have any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Child Professional Services Action Plan**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stage...

**Product Development**
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*
We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle...

**SLO 5: Communication Skills**
Students will communicate effectively in written and oral form.

**Relevant Associations:**
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3. Communicate effectively

**Related Measures**

**M 3: INST 301 Educational Psychology Project**
INST 301 “Educational Psychology” is listed as part of the core curriculum requirements for the Child Professional services degree. Students enrolled in this class will complete a final project that calls for them to create a video presentation that fully answers the open-ended question: “What role does culture and diversity play in education?” The video is expected to incorporate factual information from the textbook while integrating information from earlier semester units on development, learning, and motivation. Students are expected to do their own research and rely on their own experiences / reflections in crafting their lecture. Proficiency will be determined by the clarity of the recorded presentation, the correctness of the factual information conveyed, and the completeness of the content coverage and how well students answered the question.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Connected Document**
INST 301 Culture and Diversity Project Grading Rubric
Target:
80% of students will demonstrate effective oral presentation skills by receiving at least ‘meets expectations’ (3 or higher) in Communication domain on project rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
90% of students scored ‘met expectations’ or higher on project intangibles rubric domain Communication. (mean score Communication 4.10). Therefore, the target was met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

INST 301 Content Domain Improvement
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Results on INST 301 Paper show that students are surpassing expectations on intangibles (communication, creativity, and clarity)...
Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

The 2014-2015 action plan about building assessment outcomes and measures has been completed. However, we are finding it challenging to collect data and make specific improvements to learning, as many courses built into the USEH degree are beyond the scope and control of the USEH Child Professional Services coordinator. We are at most able to provide recommendations to faculty teaching courses in the USEH degree plan.
Mission / Purpose

The Child Professional Services degree is a flexible 120-hour program that enables a student to combine a prescribed concentration, two minors, the core curriculum and electives to create a comprehensive degree that aligns with their individual professional interest. The program is heavily student centered. It is essential the student has a clear understanding of their professional or further educational interests and the selected plan of study positions them for success.

The Child Professional Services concentration prepares individuals to work with children in various organizations, which support youth development.

As a means of preparing graduates for careers in civic, social or religious organizations; hospitals or non-profit organizations; or family and community services, this concentration offers study in upper level education courses that provide a strong foundation in:

- Child and adolescent development,
- Instructional methods,
- Educational psychology,
- Kinesiology,
- Human resource development and
- Sociology.

The Child Professional Services degree aligns closely with the University Learning Outcomes set for undergraduate students.

Students who receive their degree in this area will be able to:

* Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree, including the ability to
  Articulate disciplinary and interdisciplinary theories, concepts, principles, skills and practices, specifically as they relate to working with children
  Synthesize knowledge across courses and other experiences
  Apply knowledge from core curriculum courses, discipline-based courses, and other experiences in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions in a "real world" context

* Demonstrate critical thinking, including the ability to
  Evaluate, analyze, and integrate information from a variety of sources
  Use appropriate strategies and tools to represent, analyze and integrate information
  Develop critical, reasoned positions

* Communicate effectively
  Demonstrate effective oral, written, and non-verbal communication skills
  Listen actively and critically
  Effectively communicate original and creative ideas

* Practice personal and social responsibility, including the ability to
  Practice ethical leadership
  Recognize an ethical dilemma and apply rational decision-making in order to address it
  Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice
  Acknowledge and address the consequences of one's own actions
  Engage in local and global civic activities

* Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence, including the ability to
  Live and work effectively in a diverse and global society
  Articulate the value of a diverse and global perspective
  Recognize diverse economic, political, cultural and religious opinions and practices

* Prepare to engage in lifelong learning, including the ability to
  Exhibit the skills necessary to acquire, organize, reorganize and interpret new knowledge
  Show proficiency in current technologies and the ability to adapt to emerging technologies
  Recognize and participate in activities that enhance wellness of body, mind and spirit
  Formulate a plan of personal goals for continued professional growth
  Demonstrate intellectual curiosity

* Work collaboratively, including the ability to
  Participate effectively in teams
  Consider different points of view
  Work with others to support a shared purpose or goal

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans
SLO 2: Original and Creative Ideas
Demonstrate the ability to express original ideas and produce creative works through the completion of divergent thinking assignments and projects

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Communicate effectively

Related Measures
M 1: Critical Thinking Assessment Test
75% of students will score a 2.0 or better on the CEHD Critical Thinking rubric.

This is a direct measure which will be administered to students as a group in the semester after they have accumulated 96 credit hours on their degree plan.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Connected Document
CEHD Critical Thinking Test Scoring Rubric

Target:
75% of students will score a 2.0 or better on the CEHD Critical Thinking rubric

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Data not collected in 2015-2016. Data will be collected in 2016-2017 for the purpose of reporting assessment summary for this measure.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This was a new program and we didn't had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Child Professional Services Action Plan
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...

Product Development
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle...

SLO 3: Ethics and Personal Responsibility
Demonstrate sound judgment, intuitive reasoning, and decisive decision making when working with children in a dynamic setting

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Demonstrate critical thinking
4 Practice personal and social responsibility

Related Measures
M 3: Educational Psychology Project
INST 301 "Educational Psychology" is listed as part of the core curriculum requirements for the Child Professional services degree.

This class introduces students to nature of social science based research while covering the principles and theories pertaining to development, learning, and motivation. The role of culture and context is emphasized as students realize the impact that individual differences can have on education.

Students enrolled in this class will complete a final project that calls for them to create a video presentation that fully answers the open-ended question: “What role does culture and diversity play in education?”

The video is expected to incorporate factual information from the textbook while integrating information from earlier semester units on development, learning, and motivation. Students are expected to do their own research and rely on their own experiences / reflections in crafting their lecture

The grade will be determined by the clarity of the recorded presentation, the correctness of the factual information conveyed, and the completeness of the content coverage and how well students answered the question.

It is expected that 70% of students will receive a grade of "C" or better (2.0 GPR equivalent) on this assignment.

A rubric is attached that explains the grading requirements.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Connected Document
INST 301 Culture and Diversity Project Grading Rubric

Target:
90% of students enrolled in EPFB 210 will receive acceptable to outstanding reviews (as determined by the
grading rubric) from their primary supervisor regarding their work in the individual practicum

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Data not collected in 2015-2016. Data will be collected in 2016-2017 for the purpose of reporting assessment summary for this measure.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This was a new program and we didn't had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Child Professional Services Action Plan**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...

**Product Development**
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*
We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle...

**SLO 4: Reasoned Position**
Develop and communicate a reasoned position based on information from a variety of sources

**Relevant Associations:**
- General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  - 2 Demonstrate critical thinking
  - 3 Communicate effectively

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Critical Writing Assessment**
EHRD 371 Applied Learning Principles is a writing intensive (W) designated class in the Child Professional Services concentration degree plan.

The course culminates with the students having to write an observation analysis research paper.

This direct measure calls for students to participate in and observe an adult learning activity/event of their choice and then evaluate the experience using the theories and principles of the course as a basis for analysis.

According to the syllabus, final submissions are expected to be 10-12 pages in length and include 7-10 academic references (cited correctly using APA format)

At the end of the term, these papers will be collected and then sent off for analysis.

It is expected that 70% of students will score at least a 2.0 for this submission

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**
EHRD 371 Observation Analysis Research Paper Grading Rubric

**Target:**
80% of students will obtain either an A or B on this assignment demonstrating their ability to effectively communicate their thoughts and establish a reasoned position on their philosophy of education

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Data not collected in 2015-2016. Data will be collected in 2016-2017 for the purpose of reporting assessment summary for this measure.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This was a new program and we didn't had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Child Professional Services Action Plan**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...

**Product Development**
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*
We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle...

**Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O/O 1: Core & Discipline Based Courses**
Be able to demonstrate consistent performance across core and discipline based-courses by maintaining a 2.5 GPA by
the 3rd semester of enrollment in USEH

Related Measures

**M 2: Critical Writing Assessment**
EHRD 371 Applied Learning Principles is a writing intensive (W) designated class in the Child Professional Services concentration degree plan.

The course culminates with the students having to write an observation analysis research paper.

This direct measure calls for students to participate in and observe an adult learning activity/event of their choice and then evaluate the experience using the theories and principles of the course as a basis for analysis.

According to the syllabus, final submissions are expected to be 10-12 pages in length and include 7-10 academic references (cited correctly using APA format)

At the end of the term, these papers will be collected and then sent off for analysis.

It is expected that 70% of students will score at least a 2.0 for this submission

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**
EHRD 371 Observation Analysis Research Paper Grading Rubric

**Target:**
80% of students will obtain a B (80%) or higher, thus demonstrating their ability to effectively communicate their thoughts and establish a reasoned position on their philosophy of education.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Data not collected in 2015-2016. Data will be collected in 2016-2017 for the purpose of reporting assessment summary for this measure.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

**Product Development**
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle...

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**M 3: Educational Psychology Project**
INST 301 "Educational Psychology" is listed as part of the core curriculum requirements for the Child Professional services degree.

This class introduces students to nature of social science based research while covering the principles and theories pertaining to development, learning, and motivation.

The role of culture and context is emphasized as students realize the impact that individual differences can have on education.

Students enrolled in this class will complete a final project that calls for them to create a video presentation that fully answers the open-ended question: "What role does culture and diversity play in education?"

The video is expected to incorporate factual information from the textbook while integrating information from earlier semester units on development, learning, and motivation. Students are expected to do their own research and rely on their own experiences / reflections in crafting their lecture.

The grade will be determined by the clarity of the recorded presentation, the correctness of the factual information conveyed, and the completeness of the content coverage and how well students answered the question.

It is expected that 70% of students will receive a grade of "C" or better (2.0 GPR equivalent) on this assignment.

A rubric is attached that explains the grading requirements.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Connected Document**
INST 301 Culture and Diversity Project Grading Rubric

**Target:**
80% of students enrolled in EPFB 210 will obtain a grade of 80% (or higher) on the individual practicum assignment

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Data not collected in 2015-2016. Data will be collected in 2016-2017 for the purpose of reporting assessment summary for this measure.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This was a new program and we didn't had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

**Product Development**
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...
Product Development
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle...

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Child Professional Services Action Plan**
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stages of how student progress should be assessed and evaluated.

The outcomes and measures that are listed will be implemented this upcoming academic year. Based on this, we have no data to report at this time for this cycle. However, the plan is to collect data starting from next cycle (2016-2017). We will be able to have specific action plans based on findings from next year cycle onward.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Critical Thinking Assessment Test | Outcome/Objective: Original and Creative Ideas
- Measure: Critical Writing Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Reasoned Position
- Measure: Educational Psychology Project | Outcome/Objective: Core & Discipline Based Courses | Ethics and Personal Responsibility

Implementation Description: The outcomes and measures for this new program have been planned for data collection and evaluation purposes.

Responsible Person/Group: UG Advisor and Program Coordinator

**Product Development**

We will be identifying products and rubrics used to assess fulfillment of outcomes. This is also our first data collection cycle for 2016-2017.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Critical Thinking Assessment Test | Outcome/Objective: Original and Creative Ideas
- Measure: Critical Writing Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Core & Discipline Based Courses | Reasoned Position
- Measure: Educational Psychology Project | Outcome/Objective: Core & Discipline Based Courses | Ethics and Personal Responsibility

Projected Completion Date: 05/2017

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Currently, we are in the process of finalizing the plans to collect data starting next academic year. The plans on what to collect and how to collect it were generated from meetings with other program coordinators in EPSY who provided advice on best practices. While we currently do not have any changes to make based on any findings, we do believe that we will have the ability to answer this question fully starting next cycle (2016-2017) and adjust and plan accordingly going forward.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

We are not in the process of actively collecting data in this cycle. However, regarding an improvement from 2014-2015, for this current cycle (2015-2016) an action plan for the collection of data has been developed and will be initiated in the fall of 2016.
Mission / Purpose

The Child Professional Services degree is a flexible 120-hour program that enables a student to combine a prescribed concentration, two minors, the core curriculum and electives to create a comprehensive degree that aligns with their individual professional interest. The program is heavily student centered. It is essential the student has a clear understanding of their professional or further educational interests and the selected plan of study positions them for success.

The Child Professional Services concentration prepares individuals to work with children in various organizations, which support youth development.

As a means of preparing graduates for careers in civic, social or religious organizations; hospitals or non-profit organizations; or family and community services, this concentration offers study in upper level education courses that provide a strong foundation in:

- Child and adolescent development,
- Instructional methods,
- Educational psychology,
- Kinesiology,
- Human resource development and
- Sociology.

The Child Professional Services degree aligns closely with the University Learning Outcomes set for undergraduate students. Students who receive their degree in this area will be able to:

* Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree, including the ability to
  Articulate disciplinary and interdisciplinary theories, concepts, principles, skills and practices, specifically as they relate to working with children
  Synthesize knowledge across courses and other experiences
  Apply knowledge from core curriculum courses, discipline-based courses, and other experiences in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions in a "real world" context

* Demonstrate critical thinking, including the ability to
  Evaluate, analyze, and integrate information from a variety of sources
  Use appropriate strategies and tools to represent, analyze and integrate information
  Develop critical, reasoned positions

* Communicate effectively
  Demonstrate effective oral, written, and non-verbal communication skills
  Listen actively and critically
  Effectively communicate original and creative ideas

* Practice personal and social responsibility, including the ability to
  Practice ethical leadership
  Recognize an ethical dilemma and apply rational decision-making in order to address it
  Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice
  Acknowledge and address the consequences of one's own actions
  Engage in local and global civic activities

* Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence, including the ability to
  Live and work effectively in a diverse and global society
  Articulate the value of a diverse and global perspective
  Recognize diverse economic, political, cultural and religious opinions and practices

* Prepare to engage in lifelong learning, including the ability to
  Exhibit the skills necessary to acquire, organize, reorganize and interpret new knowledge
  Show proficiency in current technologies and the ability to adapt to emerging technologies
  Recognize and participate in activities that enhance wellness of body, mind and spirit
  Formulate a plan of personal goals for continued professional growth
  Demonstrate intellectual curiosity

* Work collaboratively, including the ability to
  Participate effectively in teams
  Consider different points of view
  Work with others to support a shared purpose or goal

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans
SLO 1: Core & Discipline Based Courses

Be able to demonstrate consistent performance across core and discipline based-courses by maintaining a 2.5 GPA by the 3rd semester of enrollment in USEH.

Related Measures

M 3: Educational Psychology Field Based Project

EPFB 210 Family Involvement & Empowerment is listed as part of the core curriculum requirements for the Child Professional services degree.

This is a field-based course that provides information and skills necessary for educators to work with diverse families. It addresses the need for positive school-family collaboration and characteristics of families throughout the life cycle, the collaboration of educators with families through the special education process, and the provision of family services through community agencies.

As part of this class, students must complete an individual practicum that helps cultivate personal responsibility while completing the requirements of this core curriculum class. The requirements of this project are as follows:

Individual Practicum:

Students will complete an individual practicum working with persons and families with diverse backgrounds and needs. The practicum will consist of 45 clock hours. You may not substitute another practicum or paid employment for this practicum.

In order to pass this course, a student must earn at least a satisfactory grade on the practicum in addition to earning a passing level of points.

Activities to be included in the practicum include:

1. Complete your practicum hours in activities related to family involvement in education (parent support meetings, parent education classes, parent advocacy meetings, Options for Teen Parents activities, Project Unity activities - a list of options is posted on eCampus). You must participate in two different activities; one must qualify as service learning. Activities can be suggested based on your experiences.
2. Spend a minimum of 45 clock hours in approved practicum experiences and keep a record of these hours.
3. Demonstrate appropriate and professional behavior at the practicum sites.

Documentation includes a daily log which includes dates/hours, brief description of activity, and signature of a supervisor. Also submit a summary reflection including an overall evaluation of the experiences and what implications for teaching and working with families were gained from the experience (see guidelines on eCampus for the reflection). Students will also have their primary supervisor complete an evaluation about their professionalism during the practicum.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:

80% of students enrolled in EPFB 210 will obtain a grade of 80% (or higher) on the individual practicum assignment

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

This was a new program and we didn't have any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Child Professional Services Action Plan


As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...

M 5: Completion of Educational Psychology Developmental Coursework

The core curriculum of the Child Professional Services degree plan features two courses that directly deal with developmental aspects of children.

These courses are as follows:

EPSY 320 Child Development

Growth and development of the normal child from infancy to adolescence; implications of children's cognitive, language and psychosocial development for success in academic and social interactions.

EPSY 321 Adolescent Development

Characteristics of adolescent growth and development emphasizing behavior within secondary school setting; influences of prior development; home, family and community; peer group, as these affect school adjustment and success.

Building a strong foundation in and background knowledge of development across all ages is important as the purpose of this non-certification concentration is to prepare individuals to work with children in various organizations, which support youth development.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

Target:

80% of students will obtain an aggregate 3.0 GPA in EPSY 320 and EPSY 321 demonstrating their core knowledge of the developmental aspects of both children and adolescents

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

This was a new program and we didn't have any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.
SLO 2: Original and Creative Ideas
Demonstrate the ability to express original ideas and produce creative works through the completion of divergent thinking assignments and projects

Related Measures

M 1: Critical Thinking Assessment Test
75% of students will score a 2.0 or better on the CEHD Critical Thinking rubric
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target:
75% of students will score a 2.0 or better on the CEHD Critical Thinking rubric

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This was a new program and we didn’t had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

Child Professional Services Action Plan
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...

M 6: Completion of Creativity Minor
The Creative Studies Minor is a degree plan option for those students pursuing the Non-Certification Child Professional Services Concentration.

As noted on its website, the Creative Studies minor provides knowledge and strategies to help students think more creatively within the area of their future profession. The goal of these courses is to help students develop and grow your creative ability. Creativity changes the way you think about personal and professional situations.

Students who choose this as their second minor in the CPS degree plan will further develop their ability to produce original and creative ideas
Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

Target:
80% of the Child Professional Services students who choose this as their second minor will maintain a collective 2.8 GPA in their Creative Studies coursework, demonstrating their ability to develop original and creative ideas

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This was a new program and we didn’t had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Child Professional Services Action Plan
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...

SLO 3: Ethics and Personal Responsibility
Demonstrate sound judgment, intuitive reasoning, and decisive decision making when working with children in a dynamic setting

Related Measures

M 1: Critical Thinking Assessment Test
75% of students will score a 2.0 or better on the CEHD Critical Thinking rubric
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target:
75% of students will score a 2.0 or better on the CEHD Critical Thinking rubric

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This was a new program and we didn’t had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Child Professional Services Action Plan
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...

M 2: Completion of Sociology Minor

As noted on the Department of Sociology website here at Texas A&M University, Sociology is the scientific study of human behavior. It studies the larger forces outside the individual that affect people's personal experience and lives. It also studies those larger forces themselves, such as families, organizations, social classes, ethnic groups, nations, and the world system.

All students who complete the Child Professional Services degree will leave this university with a Sociology minor and have (a minimum) of 5 courses in the field, one of which must be a writing intensive course (directly helping with the ability to make and state a reasoned position).

Among the course options that CPS students have to choose from are:

- **SOCI 205 Introduction to Sociology**
  Introduction to Sociology. Sociological perspectives including concepts and methods; social class and social status, the family, minorities, crime, religion, power, urbanization and population.

- **SOCI 206 Global Social Trends**
  Long-term trends in world societies from ancient times to the present and to the foreseeable future; emphasis on contemporary international issues and problems, techniques of analysis and future projections.

- **SOCI 207 Introduction to Gender and Society**
  Similarities and differences between females and males in a number of cultures throughout the world; sociological analysis of gender in relation to social structure.

- **SOCI 217 Introduction to Race and Ethnicity**
  Introduction to the sociological examination of race and ethnicity in U.S. society; overview of theories and methods in the study of race and ethnicity, an understanding of how they function as individual and group-level identities, and organizing principles in social institutions.

- **SOCI 220 Methods of Social Research**
  Relationships between sociological theory, research, qualitative evaluation of data; construction and use of analytical procedures and research techniques, and participant observation.

Courses such as SOCI 207 and 217 help students develop an appreciation and understanding of diversity and their place in the world and workforce, leading to a greater understand of personal responsibility.

Courses such as SOCI 205, SOCI 206 and SOCI 220 help students understand the "current affairs" that are ongoing in today's society, international issues that impact us all on a global scale, the methods of data collection involved in the determination and assessment of these aspects, and the sociological concerns related to at-risk or vulnerable populations as it pertains to race, religion, gender, and urbanization the methods of data collection, helping to further and develop an ethical understanding among CPS graduates.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

**Target:**
80% of Child Professional Services students will maintain a collective 2.8 GPA in the courses they select to obtain their Sociology minor, demonstrating their understanding of the ethical issues facing our communities, cities, and countries and the realization of their personal responsibility in helping to make this world a better place.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This was a new program and we didn't had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Child Professional Services Action Plan
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...

M 3: Educational Psychology Field Based Project
EPFB 210 Family Involvement & Empowerment is listed as part of the core curriculum requirements for the Child Professional services degree.
This is a field-based course that provides information and skills necessary for educators to work with diverse families. It addresses the need for positive school-family collaboration and characteristics of families throughout the life cycle, the collaboration of educators with families through the special education process, and the provision of family services through community agencies.

As part of this class, students must complete an individual practicum that helps cultivate personal responsibility while completing the requirements of this core curriculum class. The requirements of this project are as follows:

**Individual Practicum:**
Students will complete an individual practicum working with persons and families with diverse backgrounds and needs. The practicum will consist of 45 clock hours. You may not substitute another practicum or paid employment for
In order to pass this course, a student must earn at least a satisfactory grade on the practicum in addition to earning a passing level of points.

Activities to be included in the practicum include:
1. Complete your practicum hours in activities related to family involvement in education (parent support meetings, parent education classes, parent advocacy meetings, Options for Teen Parents activities, Project Unity activities - a list of options is posted on eCampus). You must participate in two different activities; one must qualify as service learning. Activities can be suggested based on your experiences.
2. Spend a minimum of 45 clock hours in approved practicum experiences and keep a record of these hours.
3. Demonstrate appropriate and professional behavior at the practicum sites.

Documentation includes a daily log which includes dates/hours, brief description of activity, and signature of a supervisor. Also submit a summary reflection including an overall evaluation of the experiences and what implications for teaching and working with families were gained from the experience (see guidelines on eCampus for the reflection). Students will also have their primary supervisor complete an evaluation about their professionalism during the practicum.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
90% of students enrolled in EPFB 210 will receive acceptable to outstanding reviews (as determined by the grading rubric) from their primary supervisor regarding their work in the individual practicum

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This was a new program and we didn't had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Child Professional Services Action Plan
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stage...

SLO 4: Reasoned Position
Develop and communicate a reasoned position based on information from a variety of sources

Related Measures

M 2: Completion of Sociology Minor
As noted on the Department of Sociology website here at Texas A&M University, Sociology is the scientific study of human behavior. It studies the larger forces outside the individual that affect people's personal experience and lives. It also studies those larger forces themselves, such as families, organizations, social classes, ethnic groups, nations, and the world system.

All students who complete the Child Professional Services degree will leave this university with a Sociology minor and have (a minimum) of 5 courses in the field, one of which must be a writing intensive course (directly helping with the ability to make and state a reasoned position).

Among the course options that CPS students have to choose from are:

SOCI 205 Introduction to Sociology
Introduction to Sociology. Sociological perspectives including concepts and methods; social class and social status, the family, minorities, crime, religion, power, urbanization and population.

SOCI 206 Global Social Trends
Long-term trends in world societies from ancient times to the present and to the foreseeable future; emphasis on contemporary international issues and problems, techniques of analysis and future projections.

SOCI 207 Introduction to Gender and Society
Similarities and differences between females and males in a number of cultures throughout the world; sociological analysis of gender in relation to social structure.

SOCI 217 Introduction to Race and Ethnicity
Introduction to the sociological examination of race and ethnicity in U.S. society; overview of theories and methods in the study of race and ethnicity, an understanding of how they function as individual and group-level identities, and organizing principles in social institutions.

SOCI 220 Methods of Social Research
Relationships between sociological theory, research, qualitative evaluation of data; construction and use of analytical procedures and research techniques, and participant observation.

Courses such as SOCI 207 and 217 help students develop an appreciation and understanding of diversity and their place in the world and workforce, leading to a greater understand of personal responsibility.

Courses such as SOCI 205, SOCI 206 and SOCI 220 help students understand the "current affairs" that are ongoing...
in today’s society, international issues that impact us all on a global scale, the methods of data collection involved in the determination and assessment of these aspects, and the sociological concerns related to at-risk or vulnerable populations as it pertains to race, religion, gender, and urbanization the methods of data collection, helping to further and develop an ethical understanding among CPS graduates

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

**Target:**
70% of Child Professional Services students will maintain a collective 3.0 GPA in the 3 hour writing intensive course they select as part of their Sociology minor, demonstrating their understanding to make and effectively state a reasoned position

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This was a new program and we didn’t had any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Child Professional Services Action Plan**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...

---

**M 4: Teaching, Learning, and Culture Writing Project**
TEFB 273 Introduction to Culture, Community, Society, and Schools is a core curriculum class in the Child Professional Services concentration degree plan.

This field based course is offered through the Dept. of Teaching, Learning, and Culture and introduces the culture of schooling and classrooms for analysis within the scope of language, gender, racial, socio-economic, ethnic and academic diversity, and educational equity. As the syllabus indicates, extensive weekly field observations and participation in schools are included as part of this course and are especially designed to analyze learning environments and content methods as an important component of the human experience in this course.

This class has students keep a double entry journal of their experiences as part of the course requirements and helps students make and state a reasoned position about their philosophy of education

As the professor notes, this activity is useful in supporting metacognition because you must defend what you choose as important. Furthermore, this activity should help you become cognizant of the many interactions that occur in the classroom at any given time. Putting down what does and does not work will assist you in developing a successful teaching style and philosophy.

There are three main components to this assignment:

Part One- In the first part of your journal entry you will write a summary of each day’s experience on the public school campus to which you are assigned. You will reflect on an incident, situation or program you have observed. You are to begin with the first official day of your assignment to that campus. You will have as many journal entries as you have classroom participation days. While you are expected to be detailed and explicit, remember that confidentiality within public schools is extremely important. If you use names of teachers or students, please use pseudonyms and not their actual names. Incorporated with your observation, you are to include:

- Where your observation took place.
- When you made your observation.
- What you observed.
- What was unusual?

Part Two- In the second part of your journal entry, you will explain why you considered the observation in the first part noteworthy - why it was valuable or important to you. The focus should be on your growth and the changes these experiences have made on your philosophy of teaching and your future actions as a teacher in the classroom. You must be thorough. Questions you may want to consider when writing your journal.

1. How does this observation relate to the Ruby Payne book or other classroom presentations?
2. How does your observation support or contradict your perception of teaching?
3. How does your observation affect your perception of the ways children learn?
4. How would you evaluate what you know about the student or situation being described? Might there not be pertinent information relative to your observation that you do not have access to? Information which might alter the way you feel about the observation.
5. What are some activities or changes that you might put into place which might help?
6. What have you learned about interactions between students and teachers?
7. What have you learned about interactions between students and teachers?
8. If you were the teacher observing the student or situation described, what are some things you could do that might help? What might be important for you to do first?

Part Three - The last part of your journal will be a “Reflection of Your Field Experience”. You will write a summary of the impact your field experience has had on you. The focus should be on your growth and the changes this experience has made on your philosophy of teaching and your future actions as a classroom teacher. Your reflection should be at least five (5) paragraphs long. Your journal entry is NOT TO BE A CRITIQUE of anything that you see or hear within the confines of your school setting. Rather, the purpose of this assignment is for you to grow as an educator. Through the semester, you will have the opportunity to learn from yourself, classroom teachers and their assistants, and other faculty, staff and the volunteers in your school.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
80% of students will obtain either an A or B on this assignment demonstrating their ability to effectively communicate their thoughts and establish a reasoned position on their philosophy of education
Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This was a new program and we didn't have any data or findings this year. Therefore, no findings will be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Child Professional Services Action Plan
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stag...

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Child Professional Services Action Plan
As the Child Professional Services Non-Certification Concentration is a new degree granting program, we are in the planning stages of how student progress should be assessed and evaluated.
The outcomes and measures that are listed will be implemented this academic year. Based on this, we have no data to report at this time

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure**: Completion of Creativity Minor | **Outcome/Objective**: Original and Creative Ideas
- **Measure**: Completion of Educational Psychology Developmental Coursework | **Outcome/Objective**: Core 
  & Discipline Based Courses
- **Measure**: Completion of Sociology Minor | **Outcome/Objective**: Ethics and Personal Responsibility 
  | Reasoned Position
- **Measure**: Critical Thinking Assessment Test | **Outcome/Objective**: Ethics and Personal Responsibility 
  | Original and Creative Ideas
- **Measure**: Educational Psychology Field Based Project | **Outcome/Objective**: Core & Discipline Based Courses 
  | Ethics and Personal Responsibility
- **Measure**: Teaching, Learning, and Culture Writing Project | **Outcome/Objective**: Reasoned Position

Implementation Description: The outcomes and measures for this new program have been planned for data collection and evaluation purposes
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

As this is a new program, we have no data to report at this time

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.
As this is a new program, we have no updates from the previous year
### Summary of Outcome Data Reported for Master's Degrees and Specialization Area Programs Administered by Department of Educational Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Programs</th>
<th>Academic Years Outcome Data are Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd/MS Bilingual Education</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS/MEd EPSY - Learning Sciences</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd EPSY - School Counseling</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd Educational Technology</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd/MS Special Education</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission / Purpose

The bilingual education program is committed to serving culturally and linguistically diverse students across Texas, the United States, and around the world. The mission of the Hispanic Bilingual Education Master's Program is to expand in-service teachers' knowledge and skills in bilingual education. Course work and other academic requirements are designed to further prepare teachers to meet the educational needs of the increasing culturally and linguistically diverse student populations and their families. The program offers a variety of courses in language and literacy acquisition (L1 and L2), culture, pedagogy, assessment, research, and other related areas for teachers who are seeking certification in bilingual education and those who currently hold bilingual certification and would like to increase their expertise in the field.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Depth of Knowledge

The graduating students of the BIED master's program will demonstrate depth of knowledge and skills in theories of bilingual education and application of theories into practice.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Final Exam
BIED MEd students will pass Oral Master's Comprehensive Exam at the first attempt. Students are evaluated in an oral comprehensive exam through committee evaluation at the end of the program. Committee members evaluate student performance through the attached rubric.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Connected Document
Oral Exam Rubric

Target:
90% of students will score a 12 or better (on the rubric) in order to satisfy the requirements of the comprehensive final exam, at the first attempt.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% received as score of 12 or higher on their comprehensive exam first attempt, thus passing. Students' performance on comprehensive exams is consistent with previous years, where we seldom have student fail.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% received a score of 12 or higher in their final exam at the first attempt and graduated with a master’s degree.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
All 4 students assessed scored above a 15 on the comprehensive final exam rubric, thus this outcome was met.

We had 8 students graduate and all 8 passed the oral comprehensive exam at the first attempt.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Continue
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Plains are to continue with this instrument until we have enough data to determine where the lower scores are on the rubric so th...

*Comprehensive Exam Preparation
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
While the students continue to meet or surpass expectations of performance on the Oral Comprehensive Exams, we plan to provide s...

M 2: Thesis defense M.S. candidates
BIED will successfully defend thesis.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target:
90% of student will score 12 or higher (on the rubric) in order to satisfy the requirements of the comprehensive final exam, at the first attempt.
Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We have not had any MS students defend their thesis this assessment cycle. We have not had many thesis track students in the past several years. Will be considering thesis defense criteria.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This measure is just added and data will be collected in the next cycle of 2017-2018 for reporting.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

MS Thesis Defense
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Although we have not had any students choose the thesis M.S. program route, program faculty will convene to discuss criteria for...

SLO 2: Critical Use of Professional Literature
The graduating students of the BIED master's program will demonstrate the ability to engage in critical use of professional literature.

Relevant Associations:
  Graduate Outcome Associations
  1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures
M 3: BIED 616 Paper
The direct measure being used by BIED master's students to demonstrate the ability to engage in critical use of professional literature as evidenced in the research paper submitted at the end of the BIED 616 course.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Rubric for Research Paper (BIED 616)

Target:
100% students taking BIED 616 in the summer of 2017 scored 90 or higher on the rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of students (5 students) scored at least a 90 on the rubric. Performance is consistent with previous assessment cycle findings.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% students taking BIED 616 in the summer of 2016 scored 15 or higher on the rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students (15/15) scored a 90 or better on the BIED 616 final research paper. Therefore, this outcome was met.

100% (9 out of 9 students) met the expectation of critical use of professional literature related to issues in Bilingual Education.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Continue
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
A few more years of data are needed to identify specific areas to target in our curriculum.

M 4: BIED 610 Paper
Students must produce a final research paper for the bilingual assessment course.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
BIO 610 Spring Rubrics for Final Paper

Target:
90% of the students will meet expectations by scoring a 90 or better on rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not measured this cycle as course was not taught this academic year.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This measure is just added and data will be collected in the next cycle of 2017-2018 for reporting.

SLO 3: Work Collaboratively & Communicate Effectively
The graduating students of the BIED master's program will show that they can effectively work together to present information about a critical issue in bilingual education.

Relevant Associations:
  Graduate Outcome Associations
  1.4 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures
M 5: BIED 615 Bilingual Issue Presentation
The BIED masters student will participate in a group presentation in which students will work together to present information about a critical issue in bilingual education (in BIED 615).
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Connected Document
Rubric for Presentation (BIED 615)

Target:
90% of the students will meet expectations by scoring a 90 or better on the rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of students who took BIED 615 scored a 90 or higher on the rubric. Performance on this measure is on track with previous findings.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% students taking BIED 615 scored 90 or higher on the rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This course is not offered until the summer.

100% of students (9/9) engaged in the group presentation of a critical issue in Bilingual Education and satisfied the requirement.

M 6: Dual language methodology presentation
This assignment, in BIED 615, measures students' performance and participation in a group assignment regarding the use of dual language pedagogical practices within classroom settings. Students must score at least a 15 out of a 20 point scale to pass this competency.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Connected Document
Dual Language Methodology Presentation

Target:
90% of the students will meet expectations by scoring a 15 or better on the rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of students scored a 15 or higher as outlined on the rubric. No previous comparisons exists as this is the first year data was provided.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This measure is just added and data will be collected in the next cycle of 2017-2018 for reporting.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Action Plan: New Outcomes and Measures
The Bilingual Education MED/MS program has condensed and established 4 new outcomes and respective measure. The action plan is to implement the monitoring of those new items during the 2013-2014 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The new outcomes and measures will be entered as soon as the new cycle begins for 2013-2014. And the faculty will monitor student performance based on those outcomes/measures.

Responsibility Person/Group: Graduate Faculty

Establishing new goals, outcomes and measures for 2014-2015 AY
The faculty will new establish new goals, outcomes, and measures for the academic year of 2014-2015. At this time there are no action plans related to the previous year’s findings, since all the outcomes and goals were met, for that cycle. Because the outcomes and goals have been met for the past few years, the faculty will change those goals and outcomes to better inform program development, program assessment, and program instruction

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2015

Detailed Rubrics
Based on our findings that students have met and exceeded all targets, we will adjust the rubrics used to better capture students areas of strengths and weakness, so that we can address those in the future.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: BIED faculty
Responsibility Person/Group: Dr. Lara

Continue
A few more years of data are needed to identify specific areas to target in our curriculum.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: BIED 616 Paper | Outcome/Objective: Critical Use of Professional Literature

Implementation Description: Continue collecting data
Responsibility Person/Group: Graduate Faculty

Continue
Plans are to continue with this instrument until we have enough data to determine where the lower scores are on the rubric so that we can focus on those.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Comprehensive Final Exam | Outcome/Objective: Depth of Knowledge

Implementation Description: Graduate Faculty
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Faculty

Measure Additions BIED 610 and BIED 611
Students have satisfactorily met expectations as measured by the 3 learning outcomes. However, these 3 learning outcomes only cover 2 core courses for master's students, and we plan to add two more measures to more comprehensively assess students' progress and performance (e.g., BIED 610 bilingual assessment and BIED 611 dual language pedagogy). These two measures will be entered as soon as the cycle begins in the fall of 2017. In the rubric of the final paper for BIED 616 in the summer of 2017, it was identified that 30% of students missed 2 or more points out of 10 under 'Paper- Follows APA Format (10 points). The areas for improvement include in-text citations and bibliography, tables, and charts. Therefore, a specific topic on APA will be included in the course materials to reinforce and provide resources for students to properly use APA.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 02/2018

*Comprehensive Exam Preparation
While the students continue to meet or surpass expectations of performance on the Oral Comprehensive Exams, we plan to provide students with a bank of practice questions. By providing these practice questions, we expect students to better prepared and more knowledgeable, thus increasing their chance of success on the oral exam.

Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Comprehensive Final Exam | Outcome/Objective: Depth of Knowledge

Implementation Description: Dr. Padron will lead collecting a bank of practice questions to provide to students who are preparing for their comprehensive exams.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2018

MS Thesis Defense
Although we have not had any students choose the thesis M.S. program route, program faculty will convene to discuss criteria for success thesis defense, in the event a student does opt to complete a thesis. By creating a more systematic way to measure thesis defenses, we hope to provide students with clearer and more consistent expectations of thesis performance. Students can also use these criteria as guidance while developing their thesis.

Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Thesis defense M.S. candidates | Outcome/Objective: Depth of Knowledge

Implementation Description: Program faculty will convene in Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 to discuss enrollment in thesis track. We will also develop scoring criteria for students.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2019

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

We identified two areas from which to improve learning, one of which is Oral Comprehensive exam question bank. While students have and continue to meet expectations in passing the comprehensive exams on their first attempt, we as program faculty believe providing students with a bank of sample questions will result in increased preparation, competency, and performance on the exams. We anticipate even higher final scores that surpass the minimum 12 or higher requirement.

The second action plan, while not based on reported findings, was identified as an important area due to the length of time that has passed since we have MS thesis students. Considering that enrollment has been low to non-extent over the past several years, it is a good opportunity to discuss how students learning in thesis track differs from MEd track, and how can we prepare for students to demonstrate different types of learning, in the event that students enroll in the thesis track in the future.

*CRITICAL* Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

Action plans previously established are still in progress. Program faculty met over the past year to identify core courses to include in current and future assessment plan cycles (e.g., BIED 610, 611). We are still in the process of finalizing courses and culminating assignments from which to measure student learning at the program level.

Annual Report Section Responses
How is the program ensuring the comparability of the distance education program with traditional, campus-
based (i.e., face to face) programs? Specifically, what data are routinely gathered and reviewed to ensure the quality of the distance education program. Metrics could include, but are not limited to:

- comparisons related to assessment of similar student learning outcomes across modes of delivery or campuses;
- comparisons of student achievement metrics such as retention or student satisfaction;
- comparisons of course evaluation data across modes of delivery or campuses.

Courses in the online Bilingual Education program that are delivered face to face are taught by the same faculty, which all much meet specific credentialing levels, per Texas Education Agency (TEA) accreditation standards. Alignment between differing course delivery methods exists in regards to 1) learning outcome and assignment rigor and quality, 2) course and activities 3) teaching content, powerpoints, readings, field assignments, etc. Regardless of program delivery, me must ensure students are meeting outcome and competencies as set forth by TEA per accreditation requirements and to ensure that students will pass required state certification exams (which they have and continue to pass at high rates).

Additionally, all students are assigned a faculty advisor and will convene advisory committee consisting of three faculty members, to advise on student's fields of study and research (in cases of MS students).

Provide a summary of findings based on the strategies used by the programs (identified in question 1) to ensure comparability. Be sure to provide a summary of findings as well as contextual or interpretive information.

The Online MEd/MS program routinely monitors student progress in terms of grades, timely completion of required courses, and successfully passing master's oral exam in order to ensure effectiveness. Students enrolled in the program are automatically registered for their courses to ensure that they stay in step with the program. We collect student course evaluation as a piece of evidence to measure the effectiveness of the distance courses; further, we also conduct a survey asking students who have successfully completed their degree to comment on the program quality. Based on data, online students are on par to graduate within 3 years. However, this should not be compared to face to face students, as the percentage of full-time enrolled students is higher for F2F, thus leading to a sooner degree completion rates, than online students who primarily enroll half-time.

What steps have been taken, if any, to improve/strengthen the distance education program to ensure comparability? (i.e., provide the basic components of an Action Plan)

Program data shows that students are meet or surpassing expectations, thus no steps have been taken regarding comparability.
Mission / Purpose

The bilingual education program is committed to serving culturally and linguistically diverse students across Texas, the United States, and around the world. • The mission of the Hispanic Bilingual Education Master's Program is to expand in-service teachers' knowledge and skills in bilingual education. Course work and other academic requirements are designed to further prepare teachers to meet the educational needs of the increasing culturally and linguistically diverse student populations and their families. • The program offers a variety of courses in language and literacy acquisition (L1 and L2), culture, pedagogy, assessment, research, and other related areas for teachers who are seeking certification in bilingual education and those who currently hold bilingual certification and would like to increase their expertise in the field.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Depth of Knowledge

The graduating students of the BIED master's program will demonstrate depth of knowledge and skills in theories of bilingual education and application of theories into practice.

Relevant Associations:

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Final Exam

BIED MEd students will pass Master's Comprehensive Exam at the first attempt. Students are evaluated in an oral comprehensive exam through committee evaluation at the end of the program. Committee members evaluate student performance through the attached rubric.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Connected Document
Oral Exam Rubric

Target:
90% of students will score a 12 or better (on the rubric) in order to satisfy the requirements of the comprehensive final exam, at the first attempt.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% students received a score of 12 or higher in their final exam at the first attempt and graduated with a master's degree.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
All 4 students assessed scored above a 15 on the comprehensive final exam rubric, thus this outcome was met.

We had 8 students graduate and all 8 passed the oral comprehensive exam at the first attempt.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Continue
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Plans to continue with this instrument until we have enough data to determine where the lower scores are on the rubric so th...

M 2: Thesis defense M.S candidates

BIED MS will defend Thesis

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target:
90% of student will score 12 or higher (on the rubric) in order to satisfy the requirements of the comprehensive final exam, at the first attempt.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This measure is just added and data will be collected in the next cycle of 2017-2018 for reporting.

SLO 2: Critical Use of Professional Literature

The graduating students of the BIED master's program will demonstrate the ability to engage in critical use of professional literature.

Relevant Associations:

1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
Related Measures

M 3: BIED 616 Paper
The direct measure being used by BIED master’s students to demonstrate the ability to engage in critical use of professional literature as evidenced in the research paper submitted at the end of the BIED 616 course.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Rubric for Research Paper (BIED 616)

Target:
100% students taking BIED 616 in the summer of 2017 scored 90 or higher on the rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% students taking BIED 616 in the summer of 2016 scored 15 or higher on the rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students (15/15) scored a 90 or better on the BIED 616 final research paper. Therefore, this outcome was met.

100% (9 out of 9 students) met the expectation of critical use of professional literature related to issues in Bilingual Education.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 4: BIED 610 Paper
TBD

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
BIO 610 Spring Rubrics for Final Paper

Target:
90% of the students will meet expectations by scoring a 90 or better on rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This measure is just added and data will be collected in the next cycle of 2017-2018 for reporting.

SLO 3: Work Collaboratively & Communicate Effectively
The graduating students of the BIED master’s program will show that they can effectively work together to present information about a critical issue in bilingual education.

Relevant Associations:
1.4 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures

M 5: Bilingual Issue Presentation
The BIED masters student will participate in a group presentation in which students will work together to present information about a critical issue in bilingual education (in BIED 615).

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Connected Document
Rubric for Presentation (BIED 615)

Target:
90% of the students will meet expectations by scoring a 90 or better on the rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% students taking BIED 615 scored 90 or higher on the rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This course is not offered until the summer.

100% of students (9/9) engaged in the group presentation of a critical issue in Bilingual Education and satisfied the requirement.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Add findings after the summer
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This course has not been taught for this cycle

M 6: Dual language methodology presentation
TBD

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
90% of the students will meet expectations by scoring a 90 or better on the rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Action Plan: New Outcomes and Measures**

The Bilingual Education MEd/MS program has condensed and established 4 new outcomes and respective measure. The action plan is to implement the monitoring of those new items during the 2013-2014 academic year.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** The new outcomes and measures will be entered as soon as the new cycle begins for 2013-2014. And the faculty will monitor student performance based on those outcomes/measures.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Faculty

**Establishing new goals, outcomes and measures for 2014-2015 AY**

The faculty will new establish new goals, outcomes, and measures for the academic year of 2014-2015. At this time there are no action plans related to the previous year's findings, since all the outcomes and goals were met, for that cycle. Because the outcomes and goals have been met for the past few years, the faculty will change those goals and outcomes to better inform program development, program assessment, and program instruction.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2015

**Detailed Rubrics**

Based on our findings that students have met and exceeded all targets, we will adjust the rubrics used to better capture students areas of strengths and weakness, so that we can address those in the future.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** BIED faculty  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Lara

**Add findings after the summer**

This course has not been taught for this cycle.

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Bilingual Issue Presentation | **Outcome/Objective:** Work Collaboratively & Communicate Effectively

**Implementation Description:** Will add findings after the course is taught this summer  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Miranda Walichowski

**Continue**

A few more years of data are needed to identify specific areas to target in our curriculum.

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** BIED 616 Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Use of Professional Literature

**Implementation Description:** Continue collecting data  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Faculty

**Continue**

Plans are to continue with this instrument until we have enough data to determine where the lower scores are on the rubric so that we can focus on those.

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Comprehensive Final Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Depth of Knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Graduate Faculty  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Faculty

**Measure Additions BIED 610 and BIED 611**

Students have satisfactorily met expectations as measured by the 3 learning outcomes. However, these 3 learning outcomes only cover 2 core courses for master's students, and we plan to add two more measures to more comprehensively assess students' progress and performance (e.g., BIED 610 bilingual assessment and BIED 611 dual language pedagogy). These two measures will be entered as soon as the cycle begins in the fall of 2017. In the rubric of the final paper for BIED 616 in the summer of 2017, it was identified that 30% of students missed 2 or more points out of 10 under 'Paper- Follows APA Format (10 points). The areas for improvement include in-text citations and bibliography, tables, and charts. Therefore, a specific topic on APA will be included in the course materials to reinforce and provide resources for students to properly use APA.

**Established in Cycle:** 2016-2017
How is the program ensuring the comparability of the distance education program with comparable campus-based (i.e., face to face) programs?

For the online MED/MS program in Bilingual Education, the majority courses were taught previously face to face (F2F) before the distance education program was officially approved in 2010. BIED 632 is also taught both online and F2F currently which can be comparable. Take BIED 610 (Bilingual Assessment and Monitoring) as an example, the following explanation describes the comparability between the distance course of BIED 610 (taught in the spring of 2017) and what was taught F2F in the spring of 2013.

1. The learning outcomes on both syllabus are of the same level of rigor and quality can be identified in this course delivered via distance. The list of course content in the distance class is in a slightly different order, but covers the same amount of topics and activities as listed in the face-to-face syllabus. For example:

2. On both syllabi, each week there is a weekly folder with course ppt, reading materials, online discussion, field work assignments, interactive writing assignments, group activities, etc., for a total of 16 weeks. This is equivalent to what their face-to-face peers were required to do in 2013.

3. This is an asynchronous course. Students are given access to weekly materials on Monday through ecampus, and they would read the materials, reflect on their reading, and work either individually or with their group member to post their discussion and assignment on the discussion board (estimated to be 2-3 hours) that are due by Friday of that week. They are also required to read and comment on their peers work due by Sunday of that week, which is estimated to be about 50-60 minutes. Course materials will also include recorded lectures with each between 60-120 minutes. In addition to the weekly assignments, students are also required to complete field-based project (estimated to be 2-3 hours), mid-term project (estimated to be 3-5 hours), and final paper (estimated to be 8-10 hours). Faculty engagement is reflected on individual and group feedback provided by the instructor to facilitate dynamic student engagement and interaction, and to check on students' comprehension. Virtual lab (through GoToMeeting) outside ecampus is held to answer student questions. Email communication is a very frequent method of communication between the faculty and students to discuss their project assignments, selection of assessment instruments to review, and topics and the writing of mid-term and final paper, among other topics. Therefore, the above description indicates that throughout the semester BIED 610 course delivery accounts for more than 48 hours of instructional time which adheres to TAMU guidelines regarding three hours of course credit, and more than 96 hours student work outside the instructional time, which is aligned with University policy regarding number of student work hours commensurate with the credit hours associated with the course.

4. In both courses students are assessed in the same manner with the same requirement on projects, mid-term, and final paper.

The same elaboration applies to other courses in this distance education program. Further, for all the courses, instructors make themselves available and accessible to students via online meeting, email, chats, and other method of communication.

What data/evidence are used to regularly assess the effectiveness of the distance education program (in comparison to comparable campus-based programs)?

1. What data are routinely used to assess effectiveness and comparability?

2. What evidence does the program have to support the comparability of the distance education program with similar campus-based program(s)?

The Online MED/MS program routinely monitors student progress in terms of grades, timely completion of required courses, and successfully passing master’s oral exam in order to ensure effectiveness. Students enrolled in the program are automatically registered for their courses to ensure that they stay in step with the program.

Regarding evidence, we collect student course evaluation as a piece of evidence to measure the effectiveness of the distance courses; further, we also conduct a survey asking students who have successfully completed their degree to comment on the program quality. In the academic year of 2016-2017, we didn't have attrition, and all students successfully obtained their master's degree.

What steps have been taken, if any, for improvement of the distance education program to ensure comparability? (i.e., provide the basic components of an Action Plan)

We anticipate to collect more information during the academic year of 2017-2018 so as to identify areas for improvement to ensure comparability.
Mission / Purpose
The bilingual education program is committed to serving culturally and linguistically diverse students across Texas, the United States, and around the world. • The mission of the Hispanic Bilingual Education Master's Program is to expand in-service teachers' knowledge and skills in bilingual education. Course work and other academic requirements are designed to further prepare teachers to meet the educational needs of the increasing culturally and linguistically diverse student populations and their families. • The program offers a variety of courses in language and literacy acquisition (L1 and L2), culture, pedagogy, assessment, research, and other related areas for teachers who are seeking certification in bilingual education and those who currently hold bilingual certification and would like to increase their expertise in the field.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Depth of Knowledge
The graduating students of the BIED master's program will demonstrate depth of knowledge.

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Final Exam
The direct measure being used is the BIED Master's Comprehensive Exam at the first attempt. Students are evaluated in an oral comprehensive exam through committee evaluation at the end of the program. Committee members evaluate student performance through the attached rubric.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target: 90% of students will score a 12 or better (on the rubric) in order to satisfy the requirements of the comprehensive final exam, at the first attempt.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
All 4 students assessed scored above a 15 on the comprehensive final exam rubric, thus this outcome was met.

We had 8 students graduate and all 8 passed the oral comprehensive exam at the first attempt.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Continue
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Plans are to continue with this instrument until we have enough data to determine where the lower scores are on the rubric so th...

SLO 2: Critical Use of Professional Literature
The graduating students of the BIED master's program will demonstrate the ability to engage in critical use of professional literature.

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 2: BIED 616 Paper
The direct measure being used by BIED master's students to demonstrate the ability to engage in critical use of professional literature as evidenced in the research paper submitted at the end of the BIED 616 course.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Rubric for Research Paper (BIED 616)

Target: 90% of the students will meet expectations by scoring a 90 or better.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students (15/15) scored a 90 or better on the BIED 616 final research paper. Therefore, this outcome was met.
100% (9 out of 9 students) met the expectation of critical use of professional literature related to issues in Bilingual Education.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Continue
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
A few more years of data are needed to identify specific areas to target in our curriculum.

SLO 3: Work Collaboratively & Communicate Effectively
The graduating students of the BIED master's program will show that they can effectively work together to present information about a critical issue in bilingual education.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.4 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures
M 3: Bilingual Issue Presentation
The BIED masters student will participate in a group presentation in which students will work together to present information about a critical issue in bilingual education (in BIED 615).

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Connected Document
Rubric for Presentation (BIED 615)

Target:
90% of the students will meet expectations by scoring a 90 or better on the rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This course is not offered until the summer.

100% of students (9/9) engaged in the group presentation of a critical issue in Bilingual Education and satisfied the requirement.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Add findings after the summer
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This course has not been taught for this cycle

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Action Plan: New Outcomes and Measures
The Bilingual Education MEd/MS program has condensed and established 4 new outcomes and respective measure. The action plan is to implement the monitoring of those new items during the 2013-2014 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The new outcomes and measures will be entered as soon as the new cycle begins for 2013-2014. And the faculty will monitor student performance based on those outcomes/measures.
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Faculty

Establishing new goals, outcomes and measures for 2014-2015 AY
The faculty will new establish new goals, outcomes, and measures for the academic year of 2014-2015. At this time there are no action plans related to the previous year's findings, since all the outcomes and goals were met, for that cycle. Because the outcomes and goals have been met for the past few years, the faculty will change those goals and outcomes to better inform program development, program assessment, and program instruction

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2015

Detailed Rubrics
Based on our findings that students have met and exceeded all targets, we will adjust the rubrics used to better capture students areas of strengths and weakness, so that we can address those in the future.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: BIED faculty
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Lara

Add findings after the summer
This course has not been taught for this cycle

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Findings show that students are achieving learning in outcome 1) mastering content knowledge and outcome 2) critical use of professional literature. Faculty established new goals, outcomes, and measures for the academic year of 2014-2015 to better inform program development, program assessment, and program instruction. We will continue to focus using the oral examination rubric with new student cohorts to identify the lower areas of student performance. As this is only the second year of implementing outcomes and because of the small amount of students assessed, we do not have sufficient years of data to determine areas of weakness, or development for students, we are continuing to collect those.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

In 2014-2015 we implemented new program goals and outcomes. At the end of last year’s cycle it was decided to adjust the rubrics used to better capture students areas of strengths and weakness, so that we can address those in the future. Rubric adjustment is still ongoing as we do not have sufficient years of data to determine areas of weakness, or development for students, we are continuing to collect those. In order to improve we need to see what specific indicators on the various rubrics have lower performance patterns. Then we can target those areas in the curriculum.
Mission / Purpose

The bilingual education program is committed to serving culturally and linguistically diverse students across Texas, the United States, and around the world. • The mission of the Hispanic Bilingual Education Master’s Program is to expand in-service teachers’ knowledge and skills in bilingual education. Course work and other academic requirements are designed to further prepare teachers to meet the educational needs of the increasing culturally and linguistically diverse student populations and their families. • The program offers a variety of courses in language and literacy acquisition (L1 and L2), culture, pedagogy, assessment, research, and other related areas for teachers who are seeking certification in bilingual education and those who currently hold bilingual certification and would like to increase their expertise in the field.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Depth of Knowledge

The graduating students of the BIED master’s program will demonstrate depth of knowledge through satisfactory performance on a final examination.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Final Exam
The direct measure being used is the BIED Master’s Comprehensive Exam at the first attempt.

Students are evaluated in an oral comprehensive exam through committee evaluation at the end of the program. Committee members evaluate student performance through the attached rubric.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

| Target: |
| 90% of students will score a 12 or better (on the rubric) in order to satisfy the requirements of the comprehensive final exam, at the first attempt. |

Connected Document

Oral Exam Rubric

We had 8 students graduate and all 8 passed the oral comprehensive exam at the first attempt.

SLO 2: Critical Use of Professional Literature

The graduating students of the BIED master’s program will demonstrate the ability to engage in critical use of professional literature as evidenced in the BIED 615 paper.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 2: BIED 615 Paper
The direct measure being used by BIED master’s students to demonstrate the ability to engage in critical use of professional literature as evidenced in the research paper submitted at the end of the BIED 616 course, is by scoring a 15 or better in the .

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

| Connected Document |
| Rubric for Research Paper (BIED 616) |

| Target: |
| 90% of the students will meet expectations by scoring a 15 or better. |

100% (9 out of 9 students) met the expectation of critical use of professional literature related to issues in Bilingual Education.

SLO 3: Work Collaboratively & Communicate Effectively

The graduating students of the BIED master’s program will show that they can effectively work together to present information about a critical issue in bilingual education.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.4 Communicate effectively.

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Bilingual Issue Presentation**
The BIED masters student will participate in a group presentation in which students will work together to present information about a critical issue in bilingual education (in BIED 616).

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
90% of the students will meet expectations by scoring a 15 or better on the rubric.

**Connected Document**
*Rubric for Presentation (BIED 615)*

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% of students (9/9) engaged in the group presentation of a critical issue in Bilingual Education and satisfied the requirement.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Action Plan: New Outcomes and Measures**
The Bilingual Education MEd/MS program has condensed and established 4 new outcomes and respective measure. The action plan is to implement the monitoring of those new items during the 2013-2014 academic year.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** The new outcomes and measures will be entered as soon as the new cycle begins for 2013-2014. And the faculty will monitor student performance based on those outcomes/measures.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Faculty

**Establishing new goals, outcomes and measures for 2014-2015 AY**
The faculty will new establish new goals, outcomes, and measures for the academic year of 2014-2015. At this time there are no action plans related to the previous year’s findings, since all the outcomes and goals were met, for that cycle. Because the outcomes and goals have been met for the past few years, the faculty will change those goals and outcomes to better inform program development, program assessment, and program instruction.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Priority:** High
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2015

**Detailed Rubrics**
Based on our findings that students have met and exceeded all targets, we will adjust the rubrics used to better capture students areas of strengths and weakness, so that we can address those in the future.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** BIED faculty
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Lara

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Students have met the criteria established for the program. We are going to create indebt rubrics that can give us more insights into student performance.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements. These measures are new for the 2014 - 2015 cycle. So there are no changes to report.
Mission / Purpose
The bilingual education program is committed to serving culturally and linguistically diverse students across Texas, the United States, and around the world. The mission of the Hispanic Bilingual Education Master's Program is to expand in-service teachers' knowledge and skills in bilingual education. Course work and other academic requirements are designed to further prepare teachers to meet the educational needs of the increasing culturally and linguistically diverse student populations and their families. The program offers a variety of courses in language and literacy acquisition (L1 and L2), culture, pedagogy, assessment, research, and other related areas for teachers who are seeking certification in bilingual education and those who currently hold bilingual certification and would like to increase their expertise in the field.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Use pertinent information from the literature
Acquire, analyze, interpret, critique, and synthesize pertinent information from the literature.

Related Measures

M 1: Pass EPSY 636 and 690
• Pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in courses that emphasize this outcome such as EPSY 636; EPSY 690: Theory of Hispanic Populations; qualitative research methods courses chosen by student and approved by the student's advisory committee.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% of graduates will have successfully completed EPSY 636 and EPSY 690 with an A or B.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Met 90% of graduates successfully completed EPSY 636 and EPSY 690 with an A or B
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
90% of graduates successfully completed EPSY 636 and EPSY 690 with an A or B
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
90% of graduates will have successfully completed EPSY 636 and EPSY 690 with an A or B.
Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of graduates successfully completed EPSY 636 and EPSY 690 with an A or B.

M 2: Systematic & insightful integration of literature
Prepare a systematic and insightful integration of pertinent literature in the written preliminary examination as approved by the student's advisory committee.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target:
90% of students will pass the written preliminary examination the first time.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Met 90% of students passed the written preliminary examination the first time
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
90% of students passed the written preliminary examination the first time.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
90% of students will pass the written preliminary examination the first time.
Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This is reviewed every other year and will be in next year's review.

SLO 2: Analyze and interpret research
Analyze and interpret research results using appropriate means.

Related Measures

M 1: Pass EPSY 636 and 690
• Pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in courses that emphasize this outcome such as EPSY 636; EPSY 690: Theory of Hispanic Populations; qualitative research methods courses chosen by student and approved by the student's advisory committee.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% of graduates will have successfully completed EPSY 636 and EPSY 690 with an A or B.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
90% of graduates have successfully completed EPSY 636 and EPSY 690 with an A or B.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
90% of graduates have successfully completed EPSY 636 and EPSY 690 with an A or B.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
90% of graduates will have successfully completed EPSY 636 and EPSY 690 with an A or B.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This is reviewed every other year and will be in next year's review.
SLO 3: Understand concepts
Understand concepts of bilingualism and biculturalism.

Related Measures

M 3: Pass BIED 611 and 616
Pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in courses such as EPSY 611 and EPSY 616 or course(s) that demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of graduates successfully completed BIED 611 and BIED 616 with an A or B.

SLO 4: Comprehend the process of L1 and L2
Comprehend the process of L1 and L2 language and literacy acquisition.

Related Measures

M 9: Pass BIED 620 and 616
Students will successfully pass BIED 620 and 616 with a B or better.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of students successfully passed BIED 620 and 616 with a B or better.

SLO 5: Explain the foundations of bilingual education
Explain the foundations of bilingual education.

Related Measures

M 10: Pass BIED 613 and 616
Students will successfully pass BIED 620 and 616 with a B or better.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of students successfully passed BIED 620 and 616 with a B or better.

SLO 6: Assessment of literacy in Spanish and English
Develop, implement, and evaluate appropriate assessment (addressing language proficiency and academic achievement) of literacy in Spanish and English.

Related Measures

M 4: Pass BIED 610 and 613
Pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in courses such as BIED 610 and BIED 613, or course(s) that demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of graduates successfully completed BIED 610 and BIED 613 with a B or better.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
90% of students passed with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in courses such as BIED 610 and BIED 613

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of graduates successfully completed BIED 610 and BIED 613 with a B or better

SLO 7: Implement effective content-area instruction
Implement effective content-area instruction (addressing language proficiency and content).

Related Measures

M 5: Pass BIED 612 and 614
Pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in courses such as BIED 612 and BIED 614, or course(s) that demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills.

Target:
90% of students will pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in BIED 612 and BIED 614, or course(s) that demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
90% of students passed BIED 612 and BIED 614 with a B or better

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
90% of students passed BIED 612 and BIED 614 with a B or better.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
90% of students will pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in BIED 612 and BIED 614

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of students made a B or better in BIED 612 and BIED 614.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
90% of students passed BIED 612 and BIED 614 with a B or better

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
90% of students passed BIED 612 and BIED 614 with a B or better.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
90% of students will pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in BIED 612 and BIED 614

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of students made a B or better in BIED 612 and BIED 614.

SLO 8: Apply knowledge to improve practice
Apply conceptual, theoretical, and empirical knowledge to improve practice.

Related Measures

M 6: Pass BIED 614 and EPSY 683
Pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in courses such as BIED 614 and EPSY 683 (Field Practicum)

Target:
90% will successfully complete BIED 614 and EPSY 683 (Field Practicum) with a B or better

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
90% of students successfully completed BIED 614 and EPSY 683 (Field Practicum) with a B or better

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
90% of students successfully completed BIED 614 and EPSY 683 (Field Practicum) with a B or better

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
90% passed with B or better & demonstrated comparable knowledge and skills in courses such as BIED 614 and EPSY 683 (Field Practicum)

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% successfully completed BIED 614 and EPSY 683 (Field Practicum) with B or better

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
90% of students successfully completed BIED 614 and EPSY 683 with a B or better

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
90% of students successfully completed BIED 614 and EPSY 690 with a B or better

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
90% passed with B or better & demonstrated comparable knowledge and skills in courses such as BIED 620 and EPSY 690,

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% successfully completed BIED 620 and EPSY 690 with a B or better

SLO 9: Create environment of respect and rapport
Create a classroom environment of respect and rapport that fosters a positive climate for learning, equity, and excellence.

Related Measures

M 8: Pass EPSY 620 and 690
Pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in courses such as BIED 620 and EPSY 690, or course(s) that demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills.

Target:
90% will successfully complete BIED 620 and EPSY 690 with a B or better

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
90% of students successfully completed BIED 620 and EPSY 690 with a B or better

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
90% of students successfully completed BIED 620 and EPSY 690 with a B or better

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
90% passed with B or better & demonstrated comparable knowledge and skills in courses such as BIED 620 and EPSY 690,

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% successfully completed BIED 620 and EPSY 690 with a B or better

SLO 10: Understand the importance of advocacy for ELLs
Understand the importance of advocacy for ELLs, their families and community.

Related Measures

M 3: Pass BIED 611 and 616
Pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in courses such as EPSY 611 and EPSY 616
or course(s) that demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% of graduates will successfully completed BIED 611 and BIED 616 with an A or B

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
90% of graduates successfully completed BIED 611 and BIED 616 with an A or B
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
90% of graduates successfully completed BIED 611 and BIED 616 with an A or B
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
90% of graduates successfully completed BIED 611 and BIED 616 with an A or B.
Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of graduates successfully completed BIED 611 and BIED 616 with an A or B

M 4: Pass BIED 610 and 613
Pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in courses such as BIED 610 and BIED 613, or course(s) that demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% of students will successfully complete BIED 610 and BIED 613 with B or better

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
90% of graduates have successfully completed BIED 610 and BIED 613 with an A or B.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
90% of students successfully completed BIED 610 and BIED 613 with B or better
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
90% of students passed with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in courses such as BIED 610 and BIED 613.
Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of students successfully completed BIED 610 and BIED 613 with B or better

SLO 11: Ability to communicate and work effectively
Demonstrate the ability to communicate and work effectively with diverse individuals.

Related Measures

M 7: Master's Final Oral Examination
Master's Final Oral Examination will be completed successfully

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
All students will successfully complete their oral examination demonstrating their communication skills.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
All students successfully completed their oral examination demonstrating their communication skills.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students successfully completed their oral examination demonstrating their communication skills.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
100% of the students met this outcome.
Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
All students have successfully completed their oral examination.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Action Plan: New Outcomes and Measures
The Bilingual Education MEd/MS program has condensed and established 4 new outcomes and respective measure. The action plan is to implement the monitoring of those new items during the 2013-2014 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The new outcomes and measures will be entered as soon as the new cycle begins for 2013-2014. And the faculty will monitor student performance based on those outcomes/measures.
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Faculty

Establishing new goals, outcomes and measures for 2014-2015 AY

The faculty will new establish new goals, outcomes, and measures for the academic year of 2014-2015. At this time there are no action plans related to the previous year's findings, since all the outcomes and goals were met, for that cycle. Because the outcomes and goals have been met for the past few years, the faculty will change those goals and outcomes to better inform program development, program assessment, and program instruction.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2015

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.
The Bilingual Program has consistently met goals for the past few years. We will be instituting new goals next year. These were to be in effect this year, but there was confusion as to when the new goals had to be entered in the system for the new cycle.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

The Bilingual Program has consistently met goals for the past few years. We will be instituting new goals next year. These were to be in effect this year, but there was confusion as to when the new goals had to be entered in the system for the new cycle.
Mission / Purpose

The Learning Sciences program, delivered both face-to-face and online, is based on the belief that psychological theory and empirical research can inform and improve education by increasing our understanding of how people learn, develop, think, and solve problems; and how instruction and technology influence these processes. Development and application of measurement and statistical methods to facilitate empirical research on these issues are thus crucial. Central to our mission is promoting human learning and development. To do so, we develop theory, study new approaches made possible by emerging technologies, and use quantitative and qualitative methods to conduct research, all with the goal of developing innovative real-world applications.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Mastery of Degree Requirements
Articulates the foundational concepts, principles, and theories in the discipline; able to synthesize subject matter across courses and experiences.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures

M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target: 90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Mastery of Degree Requirements" rubric component.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% (35/35) students met expectations for degree requirement mastery. Findings are consistent with student performance the last two years.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of graduates met or exceeded expectation in "Mastery of degree requirement" objective. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectation in "Mastery of degree requirement" objective. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Mastery of Degree Requirements Final Examination Review
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
The Division of Learning Sciences will add a new component to the existing action plan by focusing SLO 1 (Mastery of Degree Requ...

SLO 2: Application
Connects ideas or solutions in novel ways and into a coherent whole; uses information to develop arguments and make decisions.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target: 90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Application" rubric component.
Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% (35/35) students met expectations for application in rubric requirement. Students continue to meet or surpass expectations, which is in alignment with performance the last two years.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
90% of graduates met or exceeded expectations for "Application" rubric component.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Application" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 3: Reasoned Arguments
Uses a variety of sources to evaluate multiple points of view; analyzes and integrates information to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences
Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Reasoned Arguments" rubric component.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% (35/35) students met expectations for reasoned arguments. Of those students, one student exceeded expectations. Student performance is consistent with previous years of data.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
90% or graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Reasoned Arguments" rubric component

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Reasoned Arguments" rubric component.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 4: Communication
Communicates well in both written and verbal forms.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.4 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences
Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Communication" rubric component.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% (35/35) students met expectations for communication, as outlined on the rubric. Of those students, one student exceeded expectations. Students performance is consistent with two previous years of data.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
95% of graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Communication" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Communication" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...
SLO 5: Technology
Demonstrates the ability to use appropriate technologies to achieve a variety of tasks, including communicating, collaborating with others, conducting research, and solving problems.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures

M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Technology" rubric component.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% (35/35) students met expectations for technology, as outlined on the rubric. Student performance this year is in alignment with previous performance data.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
95% of graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Technology" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Technology" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 6: Research
Students will develop a research plan and conduct institutionally appropriate research.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.

Related Measures

M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Research" rubric component.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
For Online MED students 2 students met expectations for research and 27 students research performance as not observed. The non applicability is due to the nature of their degree, as most MEd students do not pursue a research track. For MS students, 100% (6/6) students met expectations for research performance. Of those, two students exceeded expectations.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
For only MS/MEd that completed thesis, 95% of students met or exceeded expectations in "Research" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
For only MS/MEd that are doing thesis, we have 90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Research" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 7: Ethics
Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are present in complex, multi-layered context OR can grasp cross-
relationships among the issues.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Ethics" rubric component.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% (35/35) students met expectations for ethics, as outlined in the rubric. 2/35 students scored above expectations. This performance is in alignment with previous data.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Ethics" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Ethics" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Student Colloquium
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will offer students the opportunity to present their research (either critical review of existing research or original research) in a research colloquium.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Thesis Defense | Outcome/Objective: Communication
Reasoned Arguments | Research | Technology

Implementation Description: For all master's students, the colloquium includes (but is not limited to) research-based presentations as part of the EPSY 602 course, one of the core courses for Learning Sciences students.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2017

Mastery of Degree Requirements Final Examination Review
The Division of Learning Sciences will add a new component to the existing action plan by focusing SLO 1 (Mastery of Degree Requirements) for 2017-2018 and initiating conversations amongst Learning Sciences faculty on the format of master's students' final examinations (or exemptions whenever applicable or appropriate). There are 3 distinct but related areas/cognates in Learning Sciences (i.e., CCID, RMS, and Educational Technology). At present, there are multiple formats by which students in Learning Sciences can complete the final examination as part of their degree requirement.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Thesis Defense | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of Degree Requirements

Implementation Description: For 2017-2018, the faculty in Learning Sciences will initiate discussion and begin evaluation of the procedures for students' final examination (or exemption whenever applicable or appropriate) to ensure that there are adequate opportunities and procedures for faculty to adequately assess students’ mastery of degree requirements. It is expected by that 2018, the faculty in Learning Sciences will be able to provide a summary or brief report on their discussions, evaluation, and recommendations for

Responsible Person/Group: Learning Science Program Faculty

Self-assessments

While students continue to meet and surpass target expectations, faculty have observed the need to provide students with more tailored learning and progress beyond course performance. The Division of Learning Sciences will continue to work on being attentive and responsive to students' learning needs by initiating student self-assessments of their academic progress including their perceptions of their progress in the academic program toward graduation and the degree to which they are meeting their learning objectives in their coursework. The student self-assessments will include both quantitative and qualitative response fields to allow students to rate or quantify their progress and also provide their perspectives, feedback, and comments. This will allow faculty to better understand and respond to and meet students’ learning needs.

Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Create self-assessment questionnaire Have students complete self-assessment twice per academic year, initiated through advisor.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2019
Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

Students in Learning Sciences Ms/MEd program continue to surpass targets, as outlined on the program rubric. While our students are performing above expectations, we received feedback from students about the desire to have more specialized coursework relevant for Developmental Sciences. After discussion, faculty decided to reorganize program structure from Cognition, Creativity, Instruction, and Development (CCID) to Developmental Sciences. This restructuring is both in alignment with student requests, allowing for more targeted coursework content that will support learning specific to interpersonal relationships in school settings and social emotional learning, which are two new graduate seminars. In addition, we plan to enhance research training opportunities within the new Developmental Sciences Program.

*Critical* Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

In 2017-2018, the Division of Learning Sciences offered a series of once-a-month open-forum meetings for students called the Division of Learning Sciences Seminar Series. In each two-hour meeting, faculty shared their work with students through a research presentation followed by a one-hour interactive discussion between students and faculty regarding a student-generated professional development topic. Student-generated topics that were discussed included curriculum vitae development, I.R.B. applications and the job search and job interview process. Students' feedback from these once-a-month open-forum meetings were generally positive, and students appreciated getting information regarding important milestones such as the master's final examination because many of them were confused or unsure about these procedures. Despite the success of the Seminar Series, one obstacle that became apparent was that some students (especially online or commuter master's students) were not attending the seminar series due to distance or scheduling issues. In the future, the faculty could find ways to facilitate distance participation in the seminar meetings including video-recording the meetings or including a way for online or conference call participation. This will increase access and participation in the Seminar Series.

Annual Report Section Responses

How is the program ensuring the comparability of the distance education program with traditional, campus-based (i.e., face to face) programs? Specifically, what data are routinely gathered and reviewed to ensure the quality of the distance education program. Metrics could include, but are not limited to:

- comparisons related to assessment of similar student learning outcomes across modes of delivery or campuses;
- comparisons of student achievement metrics such as retention or student satisfaction;
- comparisons of course evaluation data across modes of delivery or campuses.

- Since online and face-to-face programs share many common theoretical foundations, online and face-to-face programs share a good number of core courses that are required in both face-to-face and fully online programs (e.g., EPSY 602, EPSY 622, EPSY 636, EPSY 673).
- Many online courses and face-to-face courses can be taken by students as electives for either face-to-face or online programs.
- For a number of Learning Sciences courses, the same faculty members have taught both face-to-face and online versions of courses in their time as faculty in the Division of Learning Sciences (or elsewhere).
- Courses that are only taught online are also available for the campus-based students to take.
- Online programs often utilize credentialed full-time faculty to teach the courses.
- Both online and face-to-face programs have very similar application requirements (including the same departmental application).
- Academic and faculty advisors are fully accessible to both on-campus and distance students to assist them as they move through the program.

Provide a summary of findings based on the strategies used by the programs (identified in question 1) to ensure comparability. Be sure to provide a summary of findings as well as contextual or interpretive information.

Response: Both online and face-to-face programs routinely monitor student progress in terms of grades and completion of required courses in order to ensure effectiveness. Course requirements and learning outcomes are very similar in online and face-to-face programs. The Division of Learning Sciences meets routinely to discuss curriculum and student issues and review or evaluate student progress data to ensure effectiveness and comparability of programs.

What steps have been taken, if any, to improve/strengthen the distance education program to ensure comparability? (i.e., provide the basic components of an Action Plan)

Response: To ensure academic rigor, faculty members who teach online courses often have completed additional professional development related to the quality of online teaching. Someone faculty who teach online courses have
received TAMU's distinction of 'Exemplary Distance Educator'. Further, any changes to the online program must be brought to the Division of Learning Sciences for discussion and action. Online programs in Learning Sciences typically does not use ad hoc faculty—but full-time campus faculty, many of whom also teach similar courses face-to-face. Data in student grades and completion of coursework in face-to-face and online courses are highly comparable, and suggests no significant differences in student learning, achievement, and completion across face-to-face and online coursework.
Mission / Purpose

The Learning Sciences program is based on the belief that psychological theory and empirical research can inform and improve education by increasing our understanding of how people learn, develop, think, and solve problems; and how instruction and technology influence these processes. Development and application of measurement and statistical methods to facilitate empirical research on these issues are thus crucial. Central to our mission is promoting human learning and development. To do so, we develop theory, study new approaches made possible by emerging technologies, and use quantitative and qualitative methods to conduct research, all with the goal of developing innovative real-world applications.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Mastery of Degree Requirements
Articulates the foundational concepts, principles, and theories in the discipline; able to synthesize subject matter across courses and experiences.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target: 90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Mastery of Degree Requirements" rubric component.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of graduates met or exceeded expectation in "Mastery of degree requirement" objective. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectation in "Mastery of degree requirement" objective. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Mastery of Degree Requirements Final Examination Review
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
The Division of Learning Sciences will add a new component to the existing action plan by focusing SLO 1 (Mastery of Degree Requ...)

SLO 2: Application
Connects ideas or solutions in novel ways and into a coherent whole; uses information to develop arguments and make decisions.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target: 90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Application" rubric component.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
90% of graduates met or exceeded expectations for "Application" rubric component.
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Application" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 3: Re reasoned Arguments
Uses a variety of sources to evaluate multiple points of view, analyzes and integrates information to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Reasoned Arguments" rubric component.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
90% or graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Reasoned Arguments" rubric component.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Reasoned Arguments" rubric component.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 4: Communication
Communicates well in both written and verbal forms.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.4 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Communication" rubric component.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
95% of graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Communication" rubric component.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Communication" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 5: Technology
Demonstrates the ability to use appropriate technologies to achieve a variety of tasks, including communicating, collaborating with others, conducting research, and solving problems.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Target: 90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Technology" rubric component.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**

95% of graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Technology" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**

90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Technology" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Student Colloquium**

*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*

To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

**SLO 6: Research**

Students will develop a research plan and conduct institutionally appropriate research.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Thesis Defense**

Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**

*MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences*

**Target:** 90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Research" rubric component.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**

For only MS/MEd that completed thesis, 95% of students met or exceeded expectations in "Research" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**

For only MS/MEd that are doing thesis, we have 90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Research" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Student Colloquium**

*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*

To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

**SLO 7: Ethics**

Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are present in complex, multi-layered context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Thesis Defense**

Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**

*MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences*

**Target:** 90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Ethics" rubric component.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**

For only MS/MEd that completed thesis, 100% of students met or exceeded expectations in "Ethics" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**

90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Ethics" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Student Colloquium**
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will offer students the opportunity to present their research (either critical review of existing research or original research) in a research colloquium.

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Thesis Defense | Outcome/Objective: Communication
- Measure: Thesis Defense | Research | Technology

**Implementation Description:** For all master's students, the colloquium includes (but is not limited to) research-based presentations as part of the EPSY 602 course, one of the core courses for Learning Sciences students.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2017

**Mastery of Degree Requirements Final Examination Review**
The Division of Learning Sciences will add a new component to the existing action plan by focusing SLO 1 (Mastery of Degree Requirements) for 2017-2018 and initiating conversations amongst Learning Sciences faculty on the format of master's students' final examinations (or exemptions whenever applicable or appropriate). There are 3 distinct but related areas/cognates in Learning Sciences (i.e., CCID, RMS, and Educational Technology). At present, there are multiple formats by which students in Learning Sciences can complete the final examination as part of their degree requirement.

**Established in Cycle:** 2016-2017
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Thesis Defense | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of Degree Requirements

**Implementation Description:** For 2017-2018, the faculty in Learning Sciences will initiate discussion and begin evaluation of the procedures for students' final examination (or exemption whenever applicable or appropriate) to ensure that there are adequate opportunities and procedures for faculty to adequately assess students' mastery of degree requirements. It is expected by that 2018, the faculty in Learning Sciences will be able to provide a summary or brief report on their discussions, evaluation, and recommendations for degree requirements.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Learning Science Program Faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?**

The Division of Learning Sciences will add a new component to the existing action plan by focusing SLO 1 (Mastery of Degree Requirements) for 2017-2018 and initiating conversations amongst Learning Sciences faculty on the format of master's students' final examinations (or exemptions whenever applicable or appropriate). Restructuring final examination processes will ensure that students have an adequate and consistent method by which to demonstrate content mastery of degree requirements.

In addition, the Division of Learning Sciences implemented formal and informal opportunities for students to present their research so students can demonstrate their academic competencies to the broader Learning Sciences faculty members and to their academic peers (i.e., other graduate students). The Division of Learning Sciences believes this action plan should improve future assessment results because this additional form of assessment would allow demonstration of learning objectives and skills in a real-world context.

**Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.**

In 2016, the Division of Learning Sciences implemented several formal and informal opportunities for students to present their research. These forums include research and educational/professional colloquia, as well as online “presentation galleries” (often hosted on ECampus) implemented for students who are enrolled in online coursework or in fully online graduate programs to ensure online students have the similar educational experiences as face-to-face students. In particular, the online “presentation galleries” are particularly used for master’s students to assess students’ competencies on SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research). Multiple master’s level courses include the online “presentation galleries” to allow for adequate assessment of students’ competencies. Students have generally responded very positively to these formal and informal opportunities to communicate and present their research with faculty and with peers. Preliminary data suggests that master’s level students participate primarily in forums such as course-based online “presentation galleries”, and are less likely to participate in face-to-face research and educational/professional colloquia. There may be several reasons for this, particularly given that many master’s students focus primarily on coursework and a portion of master’s level students are fully online students. Further, some master’s level students may feel that they lack the same competencies as doctoral level students and may feel less motivated to participate in forums where majority of the students participating are doctoral level students. Nonetheless, having multiple formal and informal opportunities for students to present their work allow for a good way for students to demonstrate learning objectives and skills with faculty and with peers. It may be somewhat too early to fully see the impact or improvements in assessment results for these targeted outcomes, but preliminary evidence suggests that students are engaged and benefiting from these forums.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**How is the program ensuring the comparability of the distance education program with comparable campus-based (i.e., face to face) programs?**
The Learning Science MS/MED degrees are both offered face-to-face and online.

- Since online and face-to-face programs share many common theoretical foundations, online and face-to-face programs share a good number of core courses that are required in both face-to-face and fully online programs (e.g., EPSY 602, EPSY 622, EPSY 636, EPSY 673).

- Many online courses and face-to-face courses can be taken by students as electives for either face-to-face or online programs.

- For a number of Learning Sciences courses, the same faculty members have taught both face-to-face and online versions of courses in their time as faculty in the Division of Learning Sciences (or elsewhere).

- Courses that are only taught online are also available for the campus-based students to take.

- Online programs often utilize credentialed full-time faculty to teach the courses.

- Both online and face-to-face programs have very similar application requirements (including the same departmental application).

- Academic and faculty advisors are fully accessible to both on-campus and distance students to assist them as they move through the program.

These above responses demonstrate a comparable experience for both online and face-to-face students.

**What data/evidence are used to regularly assess the effectiveness of the distance education program (in comparison to comparable campus-based programs)?**

1. What data are routinely used to assess effectiveness and comparability?
2. What evidence does the program have to support the comparability of the distance education program with similar campus-based program(s)?

Both online and face-to-face programs routinely monitor student progress in terms of grades and completion of required courses in order to ensure effectiveness. Course requirements and learning outcomes are very similar in online and face-to-face programs. The Division of Learning Sciences meets routinely to discuss curriculum and student issues and review or evaluate student progress data to ensure effectiveness and comparability of programs. Data in student grades and completion of coursework in face-to-face and online courses are highly comparable, and suggests no significant differences in student learning, achievement, and completion across face-to-face and online coursework.

**What steps have been taken, if any, for improvement of the distance education program to ensure comparability?** (i.e., provide the basic components of an Action Plan)

To ensure academic rigor, faculty members who teach online courses often have completed additional professional development related to the quality of online teaching. Someone faculty who teach online courses have received TAMU’s distinction of ‘Exemplary Distance Educator’. Further, any changes to the online program must be brought to the Division of Learning Sciences for discussion and action. Online programs in Learning Sciences typically does not use ad hoc faculty—but full-time campus faculty, many of whom also teach similar courses face-to-face.
Mission / Purpose
The Learning Sciences program is based on the belief that psychological theory and empirical research can inform and improve education by increasing our understanding of how people learn, develop, think, and solve problems; and how instruction and technology influence these processes. Development and application of measurement and statistical methods to facilitate empirical research on these issues are thus crucial. Central to our mission is promoting human learning and development. To do so, we develop theory, study new approaches made possible by emerging technologies, and use quantitative and qualitative methods to conduct research, all with the goal of developing innovative real-world applications.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Mastery of Degree Requirements
Articulates the foundational concepts, principles, and theories in the discipline; able to synthesize subject matter across courses and experiences.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Connected Document MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target: 90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Mastery of Degree Requirements" rubric component.
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectation in "Mastery of degree requirement" objective. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 2: Application
Connects ideas or solutions in novel ways and into a coherent whole; uses information to develop arguments and make decisions.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Connected Document MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target: 90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Application" rubric component.
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectation in "Application" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 3: Reasoned Arguments
Uses a variety of sources to evaluate multiple points of view; analyzes and integrates information to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Reasoned Arguments" rubric component.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Reasoned Arguments" rubric component.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 4: Communication
Communicates well in both written and verbal forms.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.4 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures

M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Communication" rubric component.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Communication" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 5: Technology
Demonstrates the ability to use appropriate technologies to achieve a variety of tasks, including communicating, collaborating with others, conducting research, and solving problems.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures

M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Technology" rubric component.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Technology" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 6: Research
Students will develop a research plan and conduct institutionally appropriate research.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.

Related Measures

**M 1: Thesis Defense**
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Research" rubric component.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
For only MS/MEd that are doing thesis, we have 90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Research" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Student Colloquium**
*Established in Cycle*: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

**SLO 7: Ethics**
Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are present in complex, multi-layered context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

**M 1: Thesis Defense**
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Ethics" rubric component.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Ethics" rubric component. Therefore, the target is met.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Student Colloquium**
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Thesis Defense | Outcome/Objective: Communication
| Reasoned Arguments | Research | Technology

Implementation Description: For all master's students, the colloquium includes (but is not limited to) research-based presentations as part of the EPSY 602 course, one of the core courses for Learning Sciences students.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2017

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Based on the analysis of program findings, we are implementing a research colloquium for students to demonstrate SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) to the overall faculty and other students in the Learning Sciences program. This additional form of assessment would allow demonstration of learning objectives and skills in a real-world context.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.
This is the first year we are implementing an Action Plan. We will wait for the data and analyses in the subsequent year to assess the outcomes of this plan.
Mission / Purpose

The Learning Sciences program is based on the belief that psychological theory and empirical research can inform and improve education by increasing our understanding of how people learn, develop, think, and solve problems; and how instruction and technology influence these processes. Development and application of measurement and statistical methods to facilitate empirical research on these issues are thus crucial. Central to our mission is promoting human learning and development. To do so, we develop theory, study new approaches made possible by emerging technologies, and use quantitative and qualitative methods to conduct research, all with the goal of developing innovative real-world applications.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Mastery of Degree Requirements

Articulates the foundational concepts, principles, and theories in the discipline; able to synthesize subject matter across courses and experiences.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Mastery of Degree Requirements" rubric component.

SLO 2: Application

Connects ideas or solutions in novel ways and into a coherent whole; uses information to develop arguments and make decisions.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in "Application" rubric component.

SLO 3: Reasoned Arguments

Uses a variety of sources to evaluate multiple points of view; analyzes and integrates information to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences
Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in “Reasoned Arguments” rubric component.

SLO 4: Communication
Communicates well in both written and verbal forms.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.4 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in “Communication” rubric component.

SLO 5: Technology
Demonstrates the ability to use appropriate technologies to achieve a variety of tasks, including communicating, collaborating with others, conducting research, and solving problems.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in “Technology” rubric component.

SLO 6: Research
Students will develop a research plan and conduct institutionally appropriate research.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in “Research” rubric component.

SLO 7: Ethics
Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are present in complex, multi-layered context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures
M 1: Thesis Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at thesis defense or at end of program (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
MS and MED Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in “Ethics” rubric component.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Online School Counseling Master's program is to prepare exemplary professional school counselors and leaders using a scholar-practitioner approach that integrates the use of current technology, on-site practicum experiences, and intellectual and creative resources to work with an increasingly diverse and global society.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: the profession and ethics
Graduates will acquire knowledge of the school counseling profession and ethical standards of the profession.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures
M 1: school counseling certification
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas. The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
  - Competency 6: Counseling
  - Competency 7: Assessment
- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it. Although this target is connected to profession and ethics competency, the exam is only reported to programs as pass or fail.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Changes to State reporting system prevented us from accessing 2017-2018 certification exam passage rates before the assessment deadline. Therefore, we will not report on this exam this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
This cohort's exam passage rate is 100%. The state pass rate for the same exam is 95%. These findings show that students continue to excel in their performance related to profession and ethics based on successful completion of this exam.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

100% who took the exam passed it.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

school counseling certification
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the...

M 2: Practicum Supervisor Evaluations
The practicum sequence is intended to provide the student with a comprehensive site-based experience characteristic of the tasks that school counselors perform. Students are required to complete a minimum of 200 supervised practicum hours with 100 direct hours for both the fall (CPSY 639) and spring (CPSY 683) totaling 400 hours with 200 direct for the year. Hours do not transfer (roll over) from one semester to another.

Site supervisors provide a multiple evaluations of student performance throughout the course of the academic year. Final supervisor evaluations are included in this assessment.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Connected Document
SC Supervisor Evaluation

Target:
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks (3 or adequate) or higher from on-site school counselor supervisors on all items on the supervisor rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of students (25/25) received passing marks of 3 or higher from on-site school counselor supervisors in all rubric areas. Additionally, 83% (29/35) received 'excellent' as their overall evaluation score. While the overall amount of excellent scores is down 16% in comparison to last year, students are still meeting expectations.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% (n=37) of students received supervisor evaluation marks of a 3 (adequate) or higher on their supervisor evaluation. Of those students, 60% received scores of excellent (4) from supervisor evaluations in each of the 17 categories. Additionally, 97% (36/37) students received an overall evaluation performance score of "excellent" from site supervisors.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students in the practicum sequence received passing marks.

100% of students in the practicum sequence received passing marks.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

supervisor evaluation
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and...

Live Video Conferencing
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
The online school counseling program plans to implement at least three live video conferencing meetings and at least one face-...

SLO 2: counseling skills
Graduates will acquire basic individual, group, career, and multicultural counseling skills.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures
M 1: school counseling certification
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas.
The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains. The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
  - Competency 6: Counseling
  - Competency 7: Assessment
- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it. Although this target is connected to counseling skills competency, the exam is only reported to programs as pass or fail.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Changes to State reporting system prevented us from accessing 2017-2018 certification exam passage rates before the assessment deadline. Therefore, we will not report on this exam this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
This cohort's exam passage rate is 100%. The state pass rate for the same exam is 95%. These findings show that students continue to excel in their performance related to counseling skills based on successful completion of this exam.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

100% who took the exam passed it.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
**school counseling certification**

*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*

Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the...

### M 2: Practicum Supervisor Evaluations

The practicum sequence is intended to provide the student with a comprehensive site-based experience characteristic of the tasks that school counselors perform. Students are required to complete a minimum of 200 supervised practicum hours with 100 direct hours for both the fall (CPSY 639) and spring (CPSY 683) totaling 400 hours with 200 direct for the year. Hours do not transfer (roll over) from one semester to another.

Site supervisors provide a multiple evaluations of student performance throughout the course of the academic year. Final supervisor evaluations are included in this assessment.

**Source of Evidence:** Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Connected Document**

*SC Supervisor Evaluation*

**Target:**

85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks (3 or adequate) or higher from on-site school counselor supervisors on items 2 (individual counseling), 3 (group counseling), 5 (career development guidance), and 8 (academic and job placement) of the supervisor rubric.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**

100% of students (n=35) received a 3 or higher on items 2 (individual counseling), 3 (group counseling), 5 (career development guidance), and 8 (academic and job placement) of the supervisor rubric. 15 of the students received a N/a (not observed) in one or more of the categories, which means that the supervisor could not evaluate their performance as the student did not demonstrate that skill. All targets were met, which is consistent with last year's findings.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**

97% (35/36) of students scored at least a 3 on item 2 of supervision rubrics (individual counseling to students). One student was given an N/A and was excluded from scoring. 100% of students scored at least a 3 on items 3 (group counseling) and 5 (career development) of the supervision rubric. 4 students were given an N/A and were excluded from scoring. 100% of students scored at least a 3 on item 8 (academic and job placement) of the supervision rubric. 11 students were given an N/A/ and were excluded from scoring.

The receipt of an N/A of a score most often occurred for students who participated in a practicum setting where that leaning opportunity was not present due to the type of school (e.g. career development isn’t available in primarily grades).

All targets were met.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**

100% of students in the practicum sequence received passing marks.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**

100% of students in the practicum sequences received passing marks.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

---

**supervisor evaluation**

*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*

Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and...

**Live Video Conferencing**

*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*

The online school counseling program plans to implement at least three live video conferencing meetings and at least one face-...

---

**SLO 3: solution focus counseling skills**

Graduates will acquire knowledge of and utilize solution focus counseling skills in a school practicum

**Relevant Associations:**

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Microskills Evaluation for School Counseling**

Students complete two video recorded counseling sessions with an adult volunteer. Four counseling sessions with an individual client must be video recorded. Each recording should be at least 30 minutes. Student will be evaluated on each session. Subsequent sessions cannot be recorded until university field supervisor evaluation has been received. Evaluation will focus on (but not limited to) counseling microskills and solution focus counseling skills. (no group counseling allowed)

Students must submit multiple video recorded school counseling sessions with a client that demonstrates the following skills:

- Show Interest and Appreciation
- Encouragement and Exploration
Faculty evaluate the video recording using a five-point rubric scale from Highly Developed (5) to Major Adjustments Needed (1). The findings represent a sample of the final submitted video recorded counseling session.

Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

Connected Document
Microskills Evaluation for School Counseling Students Rubric

Target:
85% of students will receive a 'well developed skills' (3) or higher on all three areas of the microskill evaluation rubric. Target set at 3 or higher for sections 1-3 of the rubric (see attached for 2017-2018 finding), thus indicating students are ready to enter their field.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
89% (31/35) students scored a mean of 3 or higher on microskills (Sections 1-3 on attached rubric). section 1-3 of rubric (updated Fall 2017) reflect Microskills, which students must demonstrate at a level of proficiency in order to enter the field. Section 4-5 of the rubric are solution focused counseling skills, which are beyond the expectations of their performance at this level in the program. Please note that some scores are excluded from section 1 as some students skills were not observed by faculty. Overall, findings show that the vast majority of students are performing at expectations. Findings cannot be compared with the previous year as the rubric has been updated to reflect more accurate skills.

Connected Document
School Counseling Skills Evaluation w Microskills and Solution Focused

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
35 students completed the microskills evaluation video assignment. Of those students, 94% of students will have met the target for this outcome by scoring at least a 3 'developing skills' in all areas. (33/35).

In reviewing the aggregated scores, the highest level of demonstrated student performance as is relations to microskill evaluation lies in the "Shows Interest and Appreciation" Category, with a mean of 4.14. This is followed by "Encourages Exploration" with a mean of 3.98, and lastly "Encourages Change", which at mean of 3.89.

SLO 4: counseling theory
Graduates will acquire knowledge of basic counseling theories.

Relevant Associations:
1. Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures
M 1: school counseling certification
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas. The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:

- Understanding Students
- Competency 1: Human Development
- Competency 2: Student Diversity
- Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
- Competency 4: Program Management
- Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
- Competency 6: Counseling
- Competency 7: Assessment
- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
- Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
- Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
- Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it. Although this target is connected to counseling theory competency, the exam is only reported to programs as pass or fail.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Changes to State reporting system prevented us from accessing 2017-2018 certification exam passage rates before the assessment deadline. Therefore, we will not report on this exam this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
This cohort's exam passage rate is 100%. The state pass rate for the same exam is 95%. These findings show that students continue to excel in their performance related to counseling theory based on successful completion of this exam.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

100% who took the exam passed it.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the...

### School Counseling Certification

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015

Graduates will learn how to develop, implement and evaluate a comprehensive school counseling guidance program.

### Relevant Associations

#### Graduate Outcome Associations

1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

### Related Measures

#### M 1: School Counseling Certification

The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas. The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students

- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
  - Competency 6: Counseling
  - Competency 7: Assessment

- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

**Source of Evidence:** Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it. Although this target is connected to guidance programs competency, the exam is only reported to programs as pass or fail.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Changes to State reporting system prevented us from accessing 2017-2018 certification exam passage rates before the assessment deadline. Therefore, we will not report on this exam this cycle.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
This cohort's exam passage rate is 100%. The state pass rate for the same exam is 95%. These findings show that students continue to excel in their performance related to the development and evaluation of guidance programs based on successful completion of this exam.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% who took the exam passed it.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

#### M 2: Practicum Supervisor Evaluations

The practicum sequence is intended to provide the student with a comprehensive site-based experience characteristic of the tasks that school counselors perform. Students are required to complete a minimum of 200 supervised practicum hours with 100 direct hours for both the fall (CPSY 639) and spring (CPSY 683) totaling 400 hours with 200 direct for the year. Hours do not transfer (roll over) from one semester to another.

Site supervisors provide multiple evaluations of student performance throughout the course of the academic year. Final supervisor evaluations are included in this assessment.

**Source of Evidence:** Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Connected Document**

**SC Supervisor Evaluation**

**Target:**
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks (3 or above) from on-site school counselor supervisors on item 10 on the supervisor evaluation related to school guidance program evaluation

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
100% of students (n=30) received a 3 or higher on items guidance program evaluation section of the supervisor rubric. Five students received a n/a due to supervisors not observing those skills. All targets were met, which is consistent with last year’s findings.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
Data reflects a total of 35 students, as two evaluations noted N/A on results. 97% (34/35) of students evaluated scored at least a three on item 10 of the supervisor evaluation related to school guidance program evaluation.
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students in the practicum sequence received passing marks.

100% of students in the practicum sequences received passing marks.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

supervisor evaluation
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and ...

Live Video Conferencing
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
The online school counseling program plans to implement at least three live video conferencing meetings and at least one face-...

SLO 6: special education knowledge
Graduates will acquire the knowledge and skill to assess students with disabilities and make data based decisions for students and schools as well as provide consultation to school staff and parents.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1  Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2  Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures
M 1: school counseling certification
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas.
The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:
  - Understanding Students
    - Competency 1: Human Development
    - Competency 2: Student Diversity
    - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
  - Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
    - Competency 4: Program Management
    - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
    - Competency 6: Counseling
    - Competency 7: Assessment
  - Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
    - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
    - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
    - Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state
Target:
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it. Although this target is connected to counseling skills competency, the exam is only reported to programs as pass or fail.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Changes to State reporting system prevented us from accessing 2017-2018 certification exam passage rates before the assessment deadline. Therefore, we will not report on this exam this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
This cohort's exam passage rate is 100%. The state pass rate for the same exam is 95%. These findings show that students continue to excel in their performance related special education knowledge based on successful completion of this exam.

SLO 7: critical use of scholarly work
Graduates will acquire knowledge of basic research methods in education, make critical use of assessment data, use data for decision making, and critically assess standardized assessment tools and interventions.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.6  Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.

Related Measures
M 1: school counseling certification
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas.
The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:
  - Understanding Students
    - Competency 1: Human Development
    - Competency 2: Student Diversity
    - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program

- Competency 4: Program Management
- Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
- Competency 6: Counseling
- Competency 7: Assessment

- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it. Although this target is connected to critical use of scholarly work competency, the exam is only reported to programs as pass or fail.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Changes to State reporting system prevented us from accessing 2017-2018 certification exam passage rates before the assessment deadline. Therefore, we will not report on this exam this cycle.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
This cohort's exam passage rate is 100%. The state pass rate for the same exam is 95%. These findings show that students continue to excel in their performance related to use of scholarly work based on successful completion of this exam.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% who took the exam passed it.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**school counseling certification**
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the TEA school counselor certification exam.

- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: school counseling certification | Outcome/Objective: counseling skills | counseling theory | critical use of scholarly work | guidance programs | the profession and ethics

Implementation Description: Continue to monitor courses on an annual basis.

- Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
- Responsible Person/Group: school counseling director

**supervisor evaluation**
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and breadth of school counselor roles.

- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Practicum Supervisor Evaluations | Outcome/Objective: counseling skills | guidance programs | the profession and ethics

Implementation Description: Continue to monitor courses align with school counselor roles.

- Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
- Responsible Person/Group: school counseling director

**school counseling certification**
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the TEA school counselor certification exam.

- Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 06/2017

**supervisor evaluation**
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and breadth of school counselor roles.

- Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2017

**Live Video Conferencing**

The online school counseling program plans to implement at least three live video conferencing meetings and at least one face-to-face meeting with each student enrolled in the practicum sequence. "This will improve student learning in that the instructor will be able to provide verbal feedback in addition to written feedback on counseling skills performance. This will also allow the students to ask follow up questions for clarification on feedback. This will also improve student learning in that live conferencing will allow for role plays to occur to demonstrate examples of how a student can improve their counseling skills.”

**Established in Cycle:** 2016-2017  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Practicum Supervisor Evaluations  
**Outcome/Objective:** counseling skills  
| guidance programs | the profession and ethics

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2018  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

**More MicroSkills Training in CPSY 602**

While students are meeting expectations for their microskills evaluation, we will provide more microskills training in CPSY 602 Techniques and Theories course in Fall 2018. Also, in an effort to meet the enhanced learning that outcome, the course will also be divided into two separate courses: 1) CPSY 600 Counseling Theories for School Counselors and CPSY 602 Counseling Techniques for School Counselors. Currently the course includes too much content, and instructors experience challenges covered all required skills. This change will take place in Fall 2018, thus allowing for more in-depth microskills training, which are integral to students' learning as a school counselor.

**Established in Cycle:** 2017-2018  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  

**Implementation Description:** The next academic year, program faculty will convene and develop new course CPSY 600 Counseling Theories for School Counselors, which will be available for students to enroll in Fall 2018. Program faculty will compare microskills training performance in the new course, with the goal of having students perform at a higher level since they will have training and curriculum to gain these skills.

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2019  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Linda Castillo,

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

Based on the findings, students continue to meet and exceed program expectations. By creating a separate course, CPSY 600 Counseling Theories for School Counselors and CPSY 602 Counseling Techniques for School Counselors, we as program faculty plan to increase the amount and depth of microskills training. This will include allowing students to conduct more practice and obtain instructor feedback across several observations. These sustained points of contact throughout an entire course, in comparison to completing one observation for assignment, should enhance student skills and competencies for the integral skill. We plan to implement the new courses in Fall 2019.

**CRITICAL** Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

The program implemented live video conferencing supervision meetings. Students met with the instructor or co-instructor [graduate teaching assistant] to review counseling skills evaluations. There were six meetings that were done face-to-face via video conferencing across the two-semester practicum sequence. The students reacted well to this format and appreciated the one-on-one assistance in developing their microskills.
Mission / Purpose

To prepare exemplary professional school counselors and leaders using a scholar-practitioner approach that integrates the use of current technology, on-site practicum experiences, and intellectual and creative resources to work with an increasingly diverse and global society.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: the profession and ethics
Graduates will acquire knowledge of the school counseling profession and ethical standards of the profession.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 1: school counseling certification
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas. The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
  - Competency 6: Counseling
  - Competency 7: Assessment
- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it. Although this target is connected to profession and ethics competency, the exam is only reported to programs as pass or fall.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
This cohort’s exam passage rate is 100%. The state pass rate for the same exam is 95%. These findings show that students continue to excel in their performance related to profession and ethics based on successful completion of this exam.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

100% who took the exam passed it.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 2: Practicum Supervisor Evaluations
The practicum sequence is intended to provide the student with a comprehensive site-based experience characteristic of the tasks that school counselors perform. Students are required to complete a minimum of 200 supervised practicum hours with 100 direct hours for both the fall (CPSY 639) and spring (CPSY 683) totaling 400 hours with 200 direct for the year. Hours do not transfer (roll over) from one semester to another.

Site supervisors provide a multiple evaluations of student performance throughout the course of the academic year. Final supervisor evaluations are included in this assessment.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Connected Document
SC Supervisor Evaluation

Target:
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks (3 or adequate) or higher from on-site school counselor supervisors on all items on the supervisor rubric.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
100% (n=37) of students received supervisor evaluation marks of a 3 (adequate) or higher on their supervisor evaluation. Of those students, 60% received scores of excellent (4) from supervisor evaluations in each of the 17 categories. Additionally, 97% (36/37) students received an overall evaluation performance score of "excellent" from site supervisors.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of students in the practicum sequence received passing marks.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% of students in the practicum sequence received passing marks.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**supervisor evaluation**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and ...

**Live Video Conferencing**
*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*
The online school counseling program plans to implement at least three live video conferencing meetings and at least one face-...

**SLO 2: counseling skills**
Graduates will acquire basic individual, group, career, and multicultural counseling skills.

**Related Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: school counseling certification**
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas. The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
  - Competency 6: Counseling
  - Competency 7: Assessment
- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

**Source of Evidence:** Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it. Although this target is connected to counseling skills competency, the exam is only reported to programs as pass or fail.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
This cohort's exam passage rate is 100%. The state pass rate for the same exam is 95%. These findings show that students continue to excel in their performance related to counseling skills based on successful completion of this exam.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% who took the exam passed it.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**school counseling certification**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the...

**M 2: Practicum Supervisor Evaluations**
The practicum sequence is intended to provide the student with a comprehensive site-based experience characteristic of the tasks that school counselors perform. Students are required to complete a minimum of 200 supervised practicum hours with 100 direct hours for both the fall (CPSY 639) and spring (CPSY 683) totaling 400 hours with 200 direct for the year. Hours do not transfer (roll over) from one semester to another.
Site supervisors provide a multiple evaluations of student performance throughout the course of the academic year. Final supervisor evaluations are included in this assessment.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Connected Document**

**SC Supervisor Evaluation**

**Target:**
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks (3 or adequate) or higher from on-site school counselor supervisors on items 2 (individual counseling), 3 (group counseling), 5 (career development guidance), and 8 (academic and job placement) of the supervisor rubric.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
97% (35/36) of students scored at least a 3 on item 2 of supervision rubrics (individual counseling to students). One student was given an N/A and was excluded from scoring.
100% of students scored at least a 3 on items 3 (group counseling) and 5 (career development) of the supervision rubric. 4 students were given an N/A and were excluded from scoring.
100% of students scored at least a 3 on item 8 (academic and job placement) of the supervision rubric. 11 students were given an N/A/ and were excluded from scoring.

The receipt of an N/A of a score most often occurred for students who participated in a practicum setting where that leaning opportunity was not present due to the type of school (e.g. career development isn’t available in primarily grades). All targets were met.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of students in the practicum sequence received passing marks.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% of students in the practicum sequences received passing marks.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**supervisor evaluation**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and ...

**Live Video Conferencing**
*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*
The online school counseling program plans to implement at least three live video conferencing meetings and at least one face-...

**SLO 3: solution focus counseling skills**
Graduates will acquire knowledge of and utilize solution focus counseling skills in a school practicum

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Microskills Evaluation for School Counseling**

Students complete two video recorded counseling sessions with an adult volunteer. Four counseling sessions with an individual client must be video recorded. Each recording should be at least 30 minutes. Student will be evaluated on each session. Subsequent sessions cannot be recorded until university field supervisor evaluation has been received. Evaluation will focus on (but not limited to) counseling microskills and solution focus counseling skills. (no group counseling allowed)
Students must submit multiple video recorded school counseling sessions with a client that demonstrates the following skills:
Show Interest and Appreciation
Encouragement and Exploration
Encourages Change.

Faculty evaluate the video recording using a five-point rubric scale from Highly Developed (5) to Major Adjustments Needed (1). The findings represent a sample of the final submitted video recorded counseling session.

Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

**Connected Document**

**Microskills Evaluation for School Counseling Students Rubric**

**Target:**
85% of students will receive a ‘Developing skills’ (3) or higher on all three areas of the microskill evaluation rubric.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
35 students completed the microskills evaluation video assignment. Of those students, 94% of students will have met the target for this outcome by scoring at least a 3 ‘developing skills’ in all areas. (33/35).
In reviewing the aggregated scores, the highest level of demonstrated student performance as is relations to microskill evaluation lies in the "Shows Interest and Appreciation" Category, with a mean of 4.14. This is followed by "Encourages Exploration" with a mean of 3.98, and lastly "Encourages Change", which at mean of 3.89.
SLO 4: counseling theory
Graduates will acquire knowledge of basic counseling theories.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures

M 1: school counseling certification
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas. The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
  - Competency 6: Counseling
  - Competency 7: Assessment
- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it. Although this target is connected to counseling theory competency, the exam is only reported to programs as pass or fail.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
This cohort's exam passage rate is 100%. The state pass rate for the same exam is 95%. These findings show that students continue to excel in their performance related to counseling theory based on successful completion of this exam.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

100% who took the exam passed it.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

SLO 5: guidance programs
Graduates will learn how to develop, implement and evaluate a comprehensive school counseling guidance program.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures

M 1: school counseling certification
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas. The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
  - Competency 6: Counseling
  - Competency 7: Assessment
- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state
Target:
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it. Although this target is connected to guidance programs competency, the exam is only reported to programs as pass or fail.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
This cohort's exam passage rate is 100%. The state pass rate for the same exam is 95%. These findings show that students continue to excel in their performance related to the development and evaluation of guidance programs based on successful completion of this exam.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

100% who took the exam passed it.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

school counseling certification
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the...

M 2: Practicum Supervisor Evaluations
The practicum sequence is intended to provide the student with a comprehensive site-based experience characteristic of the tasks that school counselors perform. Students are required to complete a minimum of 200 supervised practicum hours with 100 direct hours for both the fall (CPSY 639) and spring (CPSY 683) totaling 400 hours with 200 direct for the year. Hours do not transfer (roll over) from one semester to another.

Site supervisors provide a multiple evaluations of student performance throughout the course of the academic year. Final supervisor evaluations are included in this assessment.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Connected Document
SC Supervisor Evaluation

Target:
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks (3 or above) from on-site school counselor supervisors on item 10 on the supervisor evaluation related to school guidance program evaluation

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Data reflects a total of 35 students, as two evaluations noted N/A on results. 97% (34/35) of students evaluated scored at least a three on item 10 of the supervisor evaluation related to school guidance program evaluation.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students in the practicum sequence received passing marks.

100% of students in the practicum sequences received passing marks.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

supervisor evaluation
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and ...

Live Video Conferencing
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
The online school counseling program plans to implement at least three live video conferencing meetings and at least one face-....

SLO 6: special education knowledge
Graduates will acquire the knowledge and skill to assess students with disabilities and make data based decisions for students and schools as well as provide consultation to school staff and parents.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 1: school counseling certification
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas.
The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students

- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
Competency 6: Counseling
Competency 7: Assessment

Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it. Although this target is connected to counseling skills competency, the exam is only reported to programs as pass or fail.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
This cohort's exam passage rate is 100%. The state pass rate for the same exam is 95%. These findings show that students continue to excel in their performance related special education knowledge based on successful completion of this exam.

SLO 7: critical use of scholarly work
Graduates will acquire knowledge of basic research methods in education, make critical use of assessment data, use data for decision making, and critically assess standardized assessment tools and interventions.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.

Related Measures
M 1: school counseling certification
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas.
The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains. The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
  - Competency 6: Counseling
  - Competency 7: Assessment
- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it. Although this target is connected to critical use of scholarly work competency, the exam is only reported to programs as pass or fail.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
This cohort's exam passage rate is 100%. The state pass rate for the same exam is 95%. These findings show that students continue to excel in their performance related to use of scholarly work based on successful completion of this exam.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

100% who took the exam passed it.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

school counseling certification
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the...

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

school counseling certification
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the TEA school counselor certification exam.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: school counseling certification | Outcome/Objective: counseling skills
counseling theory | critical use of scholarly work | guidance programs | the profession and ethics

Implementation Description: Continue to monitor courses on an annual basis.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
supervisor evaluation
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and breadth of school counselor roles.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Practicum Supervisor Evaluations | Outcome/Objective: counseling skills | guidance programs | the profession and ethics

Implementation Description: Continue to monitor courses align with school counselor roles.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
Responsible Person/Group: school counseling director.

school counseling certification
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the TEA school counselor certification exam.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 06/2017

supervisor evaluation
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and breadth of school counselor roles.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 06/2017

Live Video Conferencing
The online school counseling program plans to implement at least three live video conferencing meetings and at least one face-to-face meeting with each student enrolled in the practicum sequence. "This will improve student learning in that the instructor will be able to provide verbal feedback in addition to written feedback on counseling skills performance. This will also allow the students to ask follow up questions for clarification on feedback. This will also improve student learning in that live conferencing will allow for role plays to occur to demonstrate examples of how a student can improve their counseling skills."

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Practicum Supervisor Evaluations | Outcome/Objective: counseling skills | guidance programs | the profession and ethics

Projected Completion Date: 04/2018
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

The findings established during this cycle show that the program is doing extremely well. Per TEA training requirements, the new action plan is to implement video conferencing meetings and at least one face-to-face meeting with each student enrolled in the practicum sequence. This new video conference requirement was developed to improve student learning so that instructors provide live verbal feedback in addition to written performance. This enhanced communication throughout the program will also allow students to engage with faculty by asking follow-up questions on the insight into their performance.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

The completed action plan from 2015-2016 was successful. The challenge was to acquire and compiling certification exam data. In regards to meeting the objectives of students passing the certification exam and supervisor evaluations. This was no problem due to the high quality of the courses in the program's curriculum.

Annual Report Section Responses
How is the program ensuring the comparability of the distance education program with comparable campus-based (i.e., face to face) programs?

Although the Counseling Psychology PhD is not the same degree level to the Masters in School Counseling, both program programs complete many of the same courses, which make major difference being that the Counseling Psychology PhD students' progress to more advanced coursework and complete research requirements once the first two years of
coursework are completed. Program faculty decided this parallel degree structure when the Masters in School Counseling Program was initially being developed.

The program is comparable to the master's level counseling training done in the Counseling Psychology Ph.D. program in the following ways:

- Master's level counseling curricula for both programs (with school counseling course emphasizing working with children and adolescents) are as follows:
  - Counseling Techniques
  - Counseling Theories
  - Multicultural Counseling
  - Career Counseling
  - Assessment
  - Practicum
  - Research Methods
- Both programs have course instructors who are licensed or certified mental health practitioners.
- Both programs require a two-semester practicum sequence supervised by a university faculty member who is a licensed or certified mental health practitioner.
- Both programs have faculty who are tenured or tenure-track.

**What data/evidence are used to regularly assess the effectiveness of the distance education program (in comparison to comparable campus-based programs)?**

1. **What data are routinely used to assess effectiveness and comparability?**
2. **What evidence does the program have to support the comparability of the distance education program with similar campus-based program(s)?**

Students in the online school counseling program follow a two-year course sequence. Students progress through the sequence and grades are monitored each semester. Students failing any courses in the curriculum are notified. This is similar (and exceeds) the master's level counseling training done in the face-to-face Counseling Psychology Ph.D. program that meets and monitors students on an annual basis.

The program coordinator compiles student progress data at the end of each semester to ensure adequate progress. Supervisor evaluations as well as counseling skill evaluations are conducted during the practicum sequence. The counseling skills evaluations are comparable between the two programs in that video observations of counseling skills are conducted throughout the practicum sequence. Additionally, Counseling Psychology Ph.D program also collects annual evaluations from faculty member to ensure progress.

**What steps have been taken, if any, for improvement of the distance education program to ensure comparability? (i.e., provide the basic components of an Action Plan)**

The online school counseling program plans to implement video conferencing meetings and at least one face-to-face meeting with each student enrolled in the practicum sequence.
Mission / Purpose

To prepare exemplary professional school counselors and leaders using a scholar-practitioner approach that integrates the use of current technology, on-site practicum experiences, and intellectual and creative resources to work with an increasingly diverse and global society.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: the profession and ethics

Graduates will acquire knowledge of the school counseling profession and ethical standards of the profession.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 1: school counseling certification

The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas.

The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
  - Competency 6: Counseling
  - Competency 7: Assessment
- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:

85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.


100% who took the exam passed it.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 2: supervisor evaluations

85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks from on-site school counselor supervisors.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Connected Document

SC Supervisor Evaluation

Target:

85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks from on-site school counselor supervisors.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

100% of students in the practicum sequence received passing marks.


100% of students in the practicum sequence received passing marks.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and ...

SLO 2: counseling skills
Graduates will acquire basic individual, group, career, and multicultural counseling skills.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures

M 1: school counseling certification
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas. The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
  - Competency 6: Counseling
  - Competency 7: Assessment
- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

100% who took the exam passed it.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks from on-site school counselor supervisors.

Connected Document
SC Supervisor Evaluation

Target:
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks from on-site school counselor supervisors.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students in the practicum sequence received passing marks.

100% of students in the practicum sequences received passing marks.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

SLO 3: solution focus counseling skills
Graduates will acquire knowledge of and utilize solution focus counseling skills in a school practicum

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

SLO 4: counseling theory
Graduates will acquire knowledge of basic counseling theories.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: school counseling certification**
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas. The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
  - Competency 6: Counseling
  - Competency 7: Assessment
- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% who took the exam passed it.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**school counseling certification**

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015

Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the...

**SLO 5: guidance programs**
Graduates will learn how to develop, implement and evaluate a comprehensive school counseling guidance program.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: school counseling certification**
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas. The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
  - Competency 6: Counseling
  - Competency 7: Assessment
- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% who took the exam passed it.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**school counseling certification**
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the...

**M 2: supervisor evaluations**
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks from on-site school counselor supervisors.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Connected Document**
SC Supervisor Evaluation

**Target:**
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks from on-site school counselor supervisors.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of students in the practicum sequence received passing marks.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% of students in the practicum sequences received passing marks.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**SLO 6: special education knowledge**
Graduates will acquire the knowledge and skill to assess students with disabilities and make data based decisions for students and schools as well as provide consultation to school staff and parents.

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

**SLO 7: critical use of scholarly work**
Graduates will acquire knowledge of basic research methods in education, make critical use of assessment data, use data for decision making, and critically assess standardized assessment tools and interventions.

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations

1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: school counseling certification**
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas.
The exam measures 10 competences across 3 domains: The domains include:

- Understanding Students
  - Competency 1: Human Development
  - Competency 2: Student Diversity
  - Competency 3: Factors Affecting Students
- Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program
  - Competency 4: Program Management
  - Competency 5: Developmental Guidance Program
  - Competency 6: Counseling
  - Competency 7: Assessment
- Collaboration, Consultation and Professionalism
  - Competency 8: Collaboration with Families
  - Competency 9: Collaboration with others in the School and Community
  - Competency 10: Professionalism

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of students who took the TExES School Counselor (152) exam passed it.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% who took the exam passed it.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
school counseling certification

Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the TEA school counselor certification exam.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: school counseling certification | Outcome/Objective: counseling skills
| counseling theory | critical use of scholarly work | guidance programs | the profession and ethics

Implementation Description: Continue to monitor courses on an annual basis.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
Responsible Person/Group: school counseling director

supervisor evaluation

Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and breadth of school counselor roles.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: supervisor evaluations | Outcome/Objective: counseling skills
| guidance programs | the profession and ethics

Implementation Description: Continue to monitor courses align with school counselor roles.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
Responsible Person/Group: school counseling director

school counseling certification

Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the TEA school counselor certification exam.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 06/2017

supervisor evaluation

Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and breadth of school counselor roles.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 06/2017

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Students are exceeding achieving targets at a high level. Based on success of findings, no changes are currently in place. Will keep track with TEA of any changes in school counseling certification requirements.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.
Action plans remain the same in focusing on school counselor certification needs and making sure courses align with certification. Also, worked with school counselor supervisors in regards to school counselor training needs.
Graduates will acquire the knowledge and skill to assess students with disabilities and make data based decisions for students and schools as well as provide consultation to school staff and parents.

**SLO 7: critical use of scholarly work**
Graduates will acquire knowledge of basic research methods in education, make critical use of assessment data, use data for decision making, and critically assess standardized assessment tools and interventions.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: school counseling certification**
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% who took the exam passed it.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**school counseling certification**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the...

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**school counseling certification**
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the TEA school counselor certification exam.

*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
*Implementation Status: Planned*
*Priority: High*

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** school counseling certification | **Outcome/Objective:** counseling skills | counseling theory | critical use of scholarly work | guidance programs | the profession and ethics

**Implementation Description:** Continue to monitor courses on an annual basis.

**Responsible Person/Group:** school counseling director

**supervisor evaluation**
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and breadth of school counselor roles.

*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
*Implementation Status: Planned*
*Priority: High*

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** supervisor evaluations | **Outcome/Objective:** counseling skills | guidance programs | the profession and ethics

**Implementation Description:** Continue to monitor courses align with school counselor roles.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2016

**Responsible Person/Group:** school counseling director

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program?

Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Based on the analysis of the findings, there are no specific changes that are being taken.

**Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.**

This is a new program; therefore there or now ongoing action plans from previous years.
Mission / Purpose
To prepare exemplary professional school counselors and leaders using a scholar-practitioner approach that integrates the use of current technology, on-site practicum experiences, and intellectual and creative resources to work with an increasingly diverse and global society.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

**SLO 1: the profession and ethics**
Graduates will acquire knowledge of the school counseling profession and ethical standards of the profession.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: school counseling certification**
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% who took the exam passed it.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**school counseling certification**

Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the...

**M 2: supervisor evaluations**
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks from on-site school counselor supervisors.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks from on-site school counselor supervisors.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% of students in the practicum sequence received passing marks.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**supervisor evaluation**

Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and ...

**SLO 2: counseling skills**
Graduates will acquire basic individual, group, career, and multicultural counseling skills.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: school counseling certification**
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% who took the exam passed it.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**school counseling certification**

Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the...

**M 2: supervisor evaluations**
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks from on-site school counselor supervisors.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks from on-site school counselor supervisors.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% of students in the practicum sequences received passing marks.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**supervisor evaluation**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and ...

**SLO 3: solution focus counseling skills**
Graduates will acquire knowledge of and utilize solution focus counseling skills in a school practicum.

**SLO 4: counseling theory**
Graduates will acquire knowledge of basic counseling theories.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: school counseling certification**
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% who took the exam passed it.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**school counseling certification**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the...

**SLO 5: guidance programs**
Graduates will learn how to develop, implement and evaluate a comprehensive school counseling guidance program.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: school counseling certification**
The TExES School Counselor (152) test is designed to assess whether an individual has the required knowledge and skills of the school counseling profession in the state of Texas.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
85% of students who take the TExES School Counselor (152) exam will pass it.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% who took the exam passed it.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**school counseling certification**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses are aligned with the...

**M 2: supervisor evaluations**
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks from on-site school counselor supervisors.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**
85% of students in the practicum sequences will receive passing marks from on-site school counselor supervisors.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% of students in the practicum sequences received passing marks.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**supervisor evaluation**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
Based on our findings that 100% of the students met the objective, we will continue to monitor that courses cover the depth and ...

**SLO 6: special education knowledge**
Mission / Purpose

The online Educational Technology masters program prepares educators to design, develop, implement, and evaluate technology-based educational materials and methods, as well as to conduct research on the effectiveness of specific design features of educational materials and methods. Our courses emphasize students' development of a) skills necessary for developing instructional and research resources utilizing current and emerging technologies, b) abilities to apply instructional design models to the development of effective instruction, and c) an understanding of how people learn in these interactive environments. Courses typically employ a project-based approach in which students design media-rich resources that are evaluated through feedback from both peers and faculty. Graduates of the masters degree program are employed in a wide variety of settings, frequently serving as instructional designers in corporations or as technology leaders in K-12 school districts and higher education institutions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 2: Problem Solving

Students will apply instructional design techniques to design and develop an instructional intervention for a meaningful problem in a discipline/subject matter of their choosing.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 2: Problem Solving: Design Document from EDTC 654

Students will work in teams to develop an instructional design document over the course of a semester. Design Document will be assessed according to attached rubric. (EDTC 654 Design Doc rubric)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Connected Document: EDTC 654 Design Document Rubric

Target:
85% of student teams will score a total of 35 points or higher (out of 40) on the Design Document submitted in EDTC 654.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
Not measured this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
74% of 2016-2017 students in EDTC M.Ed. program earned a total of 35/40 points on the Design Document submitted in EDTC 654. The target was not met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Instructional Design Curricular Improvements

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
The data for Outcome 2 demonstrates that students are approaching, but not quite meeting the target. Over the summer, instructor...

SLO 3: Critical Thinking and Argumentation

Students will analyze a current instructional problem in their field.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.4 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures

M 3: Critical Thinking: Final Paper from EDTC 602

Using appropriate outside sources to support their arguments, students will write a critical analysis paper. Paper will be assessed according to attached rubric. (EDTC 602 Final Paper rubric)

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target: 85% of students will score a total of 17 points or higher (out of 20) on the Critical Analysis paper submitted in EDTC 602.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
89% of students scored a total of 17 out of 20 points on the Critical Analysis paper. As this is the first year findings were reported, we cannot provide any contextual comparisons for previous years.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

SLO 4: Utilize technology
Students will evaluate technology tools according to the tool's ability to support various instructional objectives and contexts.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures

M 4: Technology: Collaborative Toolkit assignment from EDTC 645
Students will work in teams to review, conduct hands-on tests, and produce/present an electronic reference describing the potential of various technology tools to support teaching and learning. Presentation will be assessed according to the attached rubric. (EDTC 645 rubric)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Connected Document
EDTC 645 Collaborative Toolkit Rubric

Target: 85% of students will score a total of 26 points or higher (out of 30) on the Collaborative Toolkit assignment in EDTC 645.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of 2017-2018 students in EDTC M.Ed. program earned a total of 26/30 points on the Collaborative Toolkit submitted in EDTC 645. Target met.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

SLO 5: Develop Research or Evaluation Plan
Students will develop a formal research proposal in the area of educational technology.

Connected Document
EPSY 636 Research Proposal Rubric - Part 1

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.

Related Measures

M 5: Research Plan: Research Proposal from EPSY 636
Students will apply educational and social science research methods to develop the Introduction and Methods section of a research proposal. Proposal will be assessed according to the attached rubrics.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Documents
EPSY 636 Research Proposal Rubric - Part 1
EPSY 636 Research Proposal Rubric - Part 2

Target: 85% of students will score a total of 170 points or higher (out of 200) on the Research Proposal submitted in EPSY 636.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.
Not reported this cycle.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

**SLO 6: Ethical Course of Action**
Students will design a lesson plan integrating technology that is aligned with the International Society for Teacher Education Standards for Students (ISTE Standards-S).

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**
1.7  Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Related Measures**

**M 6: Ethics: Standards-aligned Lesson Plan from EDTC 613**
Students will apply the ISTE Standards for Students (Standards-S) to the design of a lesson plan in their respective content area. (EDTC 613 Lesson Plan rubric)

Source of Evidence:  Project, either individual or group

**Connected Document**
EDTC 613 Lesson Plan Rubric

**Target:**
85% of students will score a total of 17 points or higher (out of 20) on the Lesson Plan assignment submitted in EDTC 613

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Not measured this cycle.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Not reported this cycle.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

**Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

**Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met**
90% of student portfolios received a passing grade

**Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O/O 1: Program Requirements**
Graduates will have completed 36 hours of required and elective coursework relevant to the theories, concepts, principles and practices of the field of Educational Technology with a GPA of 3.0 or higher

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**
1.1  Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: GPA**
Overall Program GPA. Data obtained from College-level data analyst.

Source of Evidence:  Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
100% of graduates will earn a GPA of 3.0 or higher.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Not measured this cycle.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
100% of 2016-2017 graduates in EDTC M.Ed. program earned a GPA of 3.0 or higher.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

**Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

**Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Partially Met**
82% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 602 with a b or better
95% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 654 with a b or better

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

**GPA Program Requirement Target**
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
For Learning Outcome 1, overall g.p.a. of 2016-2017 graduates in the M.Ed. program indicate appropriate academic progress and su...
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**GPA Program Requirement Target**

For Learning Outcome 1, overall g.p.a. of 2016-2017 graduates in the M.Ed. program indicate appropriate academic progress and successful completion of course requirements. To analyze data trends in more detail, however, we will examine g.p.a. specifically for the ‘required’ or ‘core’ courses in our program to ensure that the foundational concepts are being mastered. New target for Learning Outcome 1: 90% of graduates will earn a grade of ‘B’ or higher in all required courses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2016-2017  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** GPA  | **Outcome/Objective:** Program Requirements

**Instructional Design Curricular Improvements**

The data for Outcome 2 demonstrates that students are approaching, but not quite meeting the target. Over the summer, instructors will update course design to provide enhanced instruction on instructional design techniques and instructional intervention course content.  
(see Analysis Question 1).

**Established in Cycle:** 2016-2017  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Problem Solving: Design Document from EDTC 654  | **Outcome/Objective:** Problem Solving

**Outcome 3: Analysis of instructional problems**

While faculty are pleased to see that students are meeting both targets for Learning Outcomes 3, course design features will be implemented to ensure that targets continue to be met. For those students who fell short of the target for Learning Outcome 3 (analysis of instructional problems), one common problem was a shortage (but not a complete lack) of specific research-based evidence to support a claim. The use of evidence to support claims is a goal of this project and is addressed through instruction and a cycle of feedback. The instructor will include an additional reminder with example about adequately supporting a claim prior to students’ submission of the assignment to strengthen learning reinforcement.

**Established in Cycle:** 2017-2018  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2019  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Course Faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

For those students who fell short of the target for Learning Outcome 3 (analysis of instructional problems), one common problem was a shortage (but not a complete lack) of specific research-based evidence to support a claim. The use of evidence to support claims is a goal of this project and is addressed through instruction and a cycle of feedback. The instructor will include an additional reminder with example about adequately supporting a claim prior to students’ submission of the assignment to strengthen learning reinforcement.

**CRITICAL** Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

**GPA Program Requirement:** This action plan is still in progress. We are still collecting data from the first and second cohort of graduates. Once those cohorts have successfully completed the program, we will review the two sets of data to identify trends within required course performance. We plan to examine g.p.a. specifically for the ‘required’ or ‘core’ courses in our program to ensure that the foundational concepts are being mastered. We will request these grades during next year’s assessment period so that we have data across two cycles. For Learning Outcome 2, the instructor included additional examples, resources, and small-group meetings with the teaching assistant to assist students in writing proper instructional objectives. These course additions corresponded with overall improvement by the students.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

How is the program ensuring the comparability of the distance education program with traditional, campus-based (i.e., face to face) programs? Specifically, what data are routinely gathered and reviewed to ensure the quality of the distance education program. Metrics could include, but are not limited to:

- comparisons related to assessment of similar student learning outcomes across modes of delivery or campuses;
comparison of student achievement metrics such as retention or student satisfaction;
comparison of course evaluation data across modes of delivery or campuses.

- Since online and face-to-face programs share many common theoretical foundations, online and face-to-face programs share a good number of core courses that are required in both face-to-face and fully online programs (e.g., EPSY 602, EPSY 622, EPSY 636, EPSY 673).
- Many online courses and face-to-face courses can be taken by students as electives for either face-to-face or online programs.
- Courses that are only taught online are also available for the campus-based students to take.
- Online programs often utilize credentialed full-time faculty to teach the courses.
- Both online and face-to-face programs have very similar application requirements (including the same departmental application).
- Academic and faculty advisors are fully accessible to both on-campus and distance students to assist them as they move through the program.

Provide a summary of findings based on the strategies used by the programs (identified in question 1) to ensure comparability. Be sure to provide a summary of findings as well as contextual or interpretive information.

Throughout the learning sciences division (of which Educational Technology is housed), both online and face-to-face programs routinely monitor student progress in terms of grades and completion of required courses in order to ensure effectiveness. Course requirements and learning outcomes are very similar in online and face-to-face programs. The Division of Learning Sciences meets routinely to discuss curriculum and student issues and review or evaluate student progress data to ensure effectiveness and comparability of programs.

What steps have been taken, if any, to improve/strengthen the distance education program to ensure comparability? (i.e., provide the basic components of an Action Plan)

To ensure academic rigor, faculty members who teach online courses often have completed additional professional development related to the quality of online teaching. Someone faculty who teach online courses have received TAMU’s distinction of Exemplary Distance Educator. Further, any changes to the online program must be brought to the Division of Learning Sciences for discussion and action. Online programs in Learning Sciences typically does not use ad hoc faculty—but full-time campus faculty, many of whom also teach similar courses face-to-face. Data in student grades and completion of coursework in face-to-face and online courses are highly comparable, and suggests no significant differences in student learning, achievement, and completion across face-to-face and online coursework.
Mission / Purpose

The Educational Technology program prepares educators to design, develop, implement, and evaluate technology-based educational materials and methods, as well as to conduct research on the effectiveness of specific design features of educational materials and methods. Our courses emphasize students’ development of a) skills necessary for developing instructional and research resources utilizing current and emerging technologies, b) abilities to apply instructional design models to the development of effective instruction, and c) an understanding of how people learn in these interactive environments. Courses typically employ a project-based approach in which students design media-rich resources that are evaluated through feedback from both peers and faculty. Graduates of the masters degree program are employed in a wide variety of settings, frequently serving as instructional designers in corporations or as technology leaders in K-12 school districts and higher education institutions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 2: Problem Solving
Students will apply instructional design techniques to design and develop an instructional intervention for a meaningful problem in a discipline/subject matter of their choosing.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures
M 2: Problem Solving: Design Document from EDTC 654
Students will work in teams to develop an instructional design document over the course of a semester. Design Document will be assessed according to attached rubric. (EDTC 654 Design Doc rubric)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Connected Document
EDTC 654 Design Document Rubric

Target:
85% of student teams will score a total of 35 points or higher (out of 40) on the Design Document submitted in EDTC 654.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
74% of 2016-2017 students in EDTC M.Ed. program earned a total of 35/40 points on the Design Document submitted in EDTC 654. The target was not met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it’s not reported.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Instructional Design Curricular Improvements
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
The data for Outcome 2 demonstrates that students are approaching, but not quite meeting the target. Over the summer, instructor...

SLO 3: Critical Thinking and Argumentation
Students will analyze a current instructional problem in their field.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.4 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures
M 3: Critical Thinking: Final Paper from EDTC 602
Using appropriate outside sources to support their arguments, students will write a critical analysis paper. Paper will be assessed according to attached rubric. (EDTC 602 Final Paper rubric)

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
EDTC 602 Final Paper Rubric
Target:
85% of students will score a total of 17 points or higher (out of 20) on the Critical Analysis paper submitted in EDTC 602.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

SLO 4: Utilize technology
Students will evaluate technology tools according to the tool's ability to support various instructional objectives and contexts.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures

M 4: Technology: Collaborative Toolkit assignment from EDTC 645
Students will work in teams to review, conduct hands-on tests, and produce/present an electronic reference describing the potential of various technology tools to support teaching and learning. Presentation will be assessed according to the attached rubric. (EDTC 645 rubric)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Connected Document
EDTC 645 Collaborative Toolkit Rubric

Target:
85% of students will score a total of 26 points or higher (out of 30) on the Collaborative Toolkit assignment in EDTC 645.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

SLO 5: Develop Research or Evaluation Plan
Students will develop a formal research proposal in the area of educational technology.

Connected Document
EPSY 636 Research Proposal Rubric - Part 1

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.

Related Measures

M 5: Research Plan: Research Proposal from EPSY 636
Students will apply educational and social science research methods to develop the Introduction and Methods section of a research proposal. Proposal will be assessed according to the attached rubrics.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Documents
EPSY 636 Research Proposal Rubric - Part 1
EPSY 636 Research Proposal Rubric - Part 2

Target:
85% of students will score a total of 170 points or higher (out of 200) on the Research Proposal submitted in EPSY 636.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

SLO 6: Ethical Course of Action
Students will design a lesson plan integrating technology that is aligned with the International Society for Teacher Education Standards for Students (ISTE Standards-S).

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures
M 6: Ethics: Standards-aligned Lesson Plan from EDTC 613

Students will apply the ISTE Standards for Students (Standards-S) to the design of a lesson plan in their respective content area. (EDTC 613 Lesson Plan rubric)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Connected Document
EDTC 613 Lesson Plan Rubric

Target:
85% of students will score a total of 17 points or higher (out of 20) on the Lesson Plan assignment submitted in EDTC 613

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of student portfolios received a passing grade

Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O/O 1: Program Requirements
Graduates will have completed 36 hours of required and elective coursework relevant to the theories, concepts, principles and practices of the field of Educational Technology with a GPA of 3.0 or higher

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures

M 1: GPA
Overall Program GPA. Data obtained from College-level data analyst.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
100% of graduates will earn a GPA of 3.0 or higher.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of 2016-2017 graduates in EDTC M.Ed. program earned a GPA of 3.0 or higher.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Partially Met
82% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 602 with a b or better
95% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 654 with a b or better

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
GPA Program Requirement Target
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
For Learning Outcome 1, overall g.p.a. of 2016-2017 graduates in the M.Ed. program indicate appropriate academic progress and su...

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

GPA Program Requirement Target
For Learning Outcome 1, overall g.p.a. of 2016-2017 graduates in the M.Ed. program indicate appropriate academic progress and successful completion of course requirements. To analyze data trends in more detail, however, we will examine g.p.a. specifically for the 'required' or 'core' courses in our program to ensure that the foundational concepts are being mastered. New target for Learning Outcome 1: 90% of graduates will earn a grade of 'B' or higher in all required courses.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: GPA | Outcome/Objective: Program Requirements

Instructional Design Curricular Improvements
The data for Outcome 2 demonstrates that students are approaching, but not quite meeting the target. Over the summer, instructors will update course design to provide enhanced instruction on instructional design techniques and instructional intervention course content. (see Analysis Question 1).

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Problem Solving: Design Document from EDTC 654 | Outcome/Objective: Problem Solving

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

After examining the data, EDTC faculty decided that looking specifically at g.p.a. for required courses would give us more targeted data related to students' mastery of core concepts in our program. Students' mastery of core concepts should have a positive correlation with Learning Outcomes 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 since the application, integration, and synthesis of concepts learned in the core courses should improve each of these measures. In terms of Learning Outcome 2, for those students falling short of the target, the instructor noticed gaps in knowledge related to specific areas (i.e. writing proper instructional objectives and aligning them with instructional strategies). Addressing these through course design should be an effective strategy to strengthen the students' knowledge and improve the learning outcome.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

This is the first year our program has submitted data within the assessment plan. We have no previous action plans from which to discuss at this point.

Annual Report Section Responses

How is the program ensuring the comparability of the distance education program with comparable campus-based (i.e., face to face) programs?

Educational Technology is credentialed under the Learning Sciences MEd degree, and thus the responses will reflect comparisons to the face-to-face Learning Sciences MS/MEd programs.

- Since online and face-to-face programs share many common theoretical foundations, online and face-to-face programs share a good number of core courses that are required in both face-to-face and fully online programs (e.g., EPSY 602, EPSY 622, EPSY 636, EPSY 673).
- Many online courses and face-to-face courses can be taken by students as electives for either face-to-face or online programs.
- For a number of Learning Sciences courses, the same faculty members have taught both face-to-face and online versions of courses in their time as faculty in the Division of Learning Sciences (or elsewhere).
- Courses that are only taught online are also available for the campus-based students to take.
- Online programs often utilize credentialed full-time faculty to teach the courses.
- Both online and face-to-face programs have very similar application requirements (including the same departmental application).
- Academic and faculty advisors are fully accessible to both on-campus and distance students to assist them as they move through the program.

What data/evidence are used to regularly assess the effectiveness of the distance education program (in comparison to comparable campus-based programs)?

1. What data are routinely used to assess effectiveness and comparability?
2. What evidence does the program have to support the comparability of the distance education program with similar campus-based program(s)?

Both online and face-to-face programs routinely monitor student progress in terms of grades and completion of required courses in order to ensure effectiveness. Course requirements and learning outcomes are very similar in online and face-to-face programs. The Division of Learning Sciences meets routinely to discuss curriculum and student issues and review or evaluate student progress data to ensure effectiveness and comparability of programs.

What steps have been taken, if any, for improvement of the distance education program to ensure comparability? (i.e., provide the basic components of an Action Plan)

To ensure academic rigor, faculty members who teach online courses often have completed additional professional development related to the quality of online teaching. Someone faculty who teach online courses have received TAMU's distinction of 'Exemplary Distance Educator'. Further, any changes to the online program must be brought to the Division of Learning Sciences for discussion and action. Online programs in Learning Sciences typically does not use ad hoc
faculty—but full-time campus faculty, many of whom also teach similar courses face-to-face. Data in student grades and completion of coursework in face-to-face and online courses are highly comparable, and suggests no significant differences in student learning, achievement, and completion across face-to-face and online coursework.
Mission / Purpose

The Educational Technology program prepares educators to design, develop, implement, and evaluate technology-based educational materials and methods, as well as to conduct research on the effectiveness of specific design features of educational materials and methods. Our courses emphasize students’ development of a) skills necessary for developing instructional and research resources utilizing current and emerging technologies, b) abilities to apply instructional design models to the development of effective instruction, and c) an understanding of how people learn in these interactive environments. Courses typically employ a project-based approach in which students design media-rich resources that are evaluated through feedback from both peers and faculty. Graduates of the masters degree program are employed in a wide variety of settings, frequently serving as instructional designers in corporations or as technology leaders in K-12 school districts and higher education institutions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 2: Problem Solving

Students will apply instructional design techniques to design and develop an instructional intervention for a meaningful problem in a discipline/subject matter of their choosing.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.2  Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 2: Problem Solving: Design Document from EDTC 654

Using appropriate outside sources to support their arguments, students will write a critical analysis paper. Paper will be assessed according to attached rubric. (EDTC 654 Final Paper rubric)

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document

EDTC 654 Design Document Rubric

Target:
85% of student teams will score a total of 35 points or higher (out of 40) on the Design Document submitted in EDTC 654.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

SLO 3: Critical Thinking and Argumentation

Students will analyze a current instructional problem in their field.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.3  Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

1.4  Communicate effectively.

Related Measures

M 3: Critical Thinking: Final Paper from EDTC 602

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document

EDTC 602 Final Paper Rubric

Target:
85% of students will score a total of 17 points or higher (out of 20) on the Critical Analysis paper submitted in EDTC 602.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

SLO 4: Utilize technology

Students will evaluate technology tools according to the tool's ability to support various instructional objectives and
Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures

M 4: Technology: Collaborative Toolkit assignment from EDTC 645
Students will work in teams to review, conduct hands-on tests, and produce/present an electronic reference describing the potential of various technology tools to support teaching and learning. Presentation will be assessed according to the attached rubric. (EDTC 645 rubric)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Connected Document
EDTC 645 Collaborative Toolkit Rubric

Target:
85% of students will score a total of 26 points or higher (out of 30) on the Collaborative Toolkit assignment in EDTC 645.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

SLO 5: Develop Research or Evaluation Plan
Students will develop a formal research proposal in the area of educational technology.

Connected Document
EPSY 636 Research Proposal Rubric - Part 1

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.

Related Measures

M 5: Research Plan: Research Proposal from EPSY 636
Students will apply educational and social science research methods to develop the Introduction and Methods section of a research proposal. Proposal will be assessed according to the attached rubrics.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Documents
EPSY 636 Research Proposal Rubric - Part 1
EPSY 636 Research Proposal Rubric - Part 2

Target:
85% of students will score a total of 170 points or higher (out of 200) on the Research Proposal submitted in EPSY 636.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

SLO 6: Ethical Course of Action
Students will design a lesson plan integrating technology that is aligned with the International Society for Teacher Education Standards for Students (ISTE Standards-S).

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 5: Ethics: Standards-aligned Lesson Plan from EDTC 613
Students will apply the ISTE Standards for Students (Standards-S) to the design of a lesson plan in their respective content area. (EDTC 613 Lesson Plan rubric)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Connected Document
EDTC 613 Lesson Plan Rubric

Target:
85% of students will score a total of 17 points or higher (out of 20) on the Lesson Plan assignment submitted in EDTC 613.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.
Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O/O 1: Program Requirements
Graduates will have completed 36 hours of required and elective coursework relevant to the theories, concepts, principles and practices of the field of Educational Technology with a GPA of 3.0 or higher

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures
M 1: Course Grades
GPA
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
100% of graduates will earn a grade of B or higher in all required and elective courses

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it’s not reported.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Partially Met
82% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 602 with a b or better
95% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 654 with a b or better

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

No Data Collected
No data is collected for this year cycle because it was only last year students were admitted into this program. Therefore, no action plan for this year.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

No Data this cycle
Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

Since program was recently re-opened, no data was collected this cycle due to small number of graduates.
Mission / Purpose
The Educational Technology program prepares educators to design, develop, implement, and evaluate technology-based educational materials and methods, as well as to conduct research on the effectiveness of specific design features of educational materials and methods. Our courses emphasize students' development of a) skills necessary for developing instructional and research resources utilizing current and emerging technologies, b) abilities to apply instructional design models to the development of effective instruction, and c) an understanding of how people learn in these interactive environments. Courses typically employ a project-based approach in which students design media-rich resources that are evaluated through feedback from both peers and faculty. Graduates of the masters degree program are employed in a wide variety of settings, frequently serving as instructional designers in corporations or as technology leaders in K-12 school districts and higher education institutions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Program Requirements
Masters Degree Program Requirements: • Graduates will have completed 36 hours of required and elective coursework relevant to the theories, concepts, principles and practices of the field of Educational Technology with a GPA of 3.0 or higher

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures
M 1: Course Grades
100% of graduates will achieve a grade point average of 3.0 or higher.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
90% of students will complete specific courses with b or better.
Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.
Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.
Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Partially Met
82% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 602 with a b or better
95% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 654 with a b or better

SLO 2: Problem Solving
Problem Solving: Graduates will provide a written document illustrating a proposed instructional intervention for a meaningful problem in a discipline/subject matter of their choosing.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures
M 2: Design Document from EDTC 654
Students will provide a written document illustrating a proposed instructional intervention for a meaningful problem in their discipline.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
Target:
100% of graduates will submit design document in EDTC 654.
Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

SLO 3: Critical Thinking and Argumentation
Graduates will be able to develop critical, reasoned arguments on topics relevant to the field of educational technology supported by evidence drawn from research.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
Related Measures

M 3: Final Paper from EDTC 602
Students will provide a written document focusing on a critical analysis of a current problem in the field of education relevant to educational technology.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target:
100% of graduates will submit research paper in EDTC 602.
Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

SLO 4: Utilize technology
Utilize technology in solving instructional problems.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures

M 4: Project from any Ed Tech elective course
Students will provide material from a class project demonstrating current technological expertise in developing instructional materials.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
100% of graduates will submit an instructional materials project from any EDTC course.
Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.

SLO 5: Develop Research or Evaluation Plan
Graduates will be able to develop a research or evaluation plan relevant to instructional materials or a learning environment.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.

SLO 6: Ethical Course of Action
Graduates will be able to explain policies that promote equitable, ethical, and legal use of computer/technology resources.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 5: Ethics materials from EDTC 654
Students will provide a written document focusing on copyright and fair use when creating instructional materials

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target:
100% of graduates will submit paper/website outlining copyright and fair use issues in EDTC 654.
Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data is available for this cycle. Therefore, it's not reported.
Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.
Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of student portfolios received a passing grade

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

No Data Collected
No data is collected for this year cycle because it was only last year students were admitted into this program. Therefore, no action plan for this year.
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

The first cohort of the revised program was admitted Fall 2014. No data will be available until 2016.
Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

No data has been yet collected for any changes.
Mission / Purpose

The Educational Technology program prepares educators to design, develop, implement, and evaluate technology-based educational materials and methods, as well as to conduct research on the effectiveness of specific design features of educational materials and methods. Our courses emphasize students’ development of a) skills necessary for developing instructional and research resources utilizing current and emerging technologies, b) abilities to apply instructional design models to the development of effective instruction, and c) an understanding of how people learn in these interactive environments. Courses typically employ a project-based approach in which students design media-rich resources that are evaluated through feedback from both peers and faculty. Outside of courses, students engage in apprentice-like activities with practitioners. Graduates of the masters degree program are employed in a wide variety of settings, frequently serving as instructional designers in corporations or as technology leaders in K-12 school districts and higher education institutions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Define/summarize and explain the following

Define/summarize and explain the following: • The role of media in the field; • The relevant instructional design models; • Trends and developments in educational technology during the 20th Century; • The major leaders in the field and their contributions to the field; • The major professional organizations and publications; • The relevant learning theories and discuss how each influences instructional design decisions; • The major professions associated with the field

Related Measures

M 1: Pass identified courses
Pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in the following courses that emphasize this outcome: EDTC 602 & 654; and selected elective courses as approved by the student's advisory committee e.g. EDTC 656

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% of students will complete specific courses with b or better.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Partially Met
82% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 602 with a b or better
95% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 654 with a b or better

SLO 2: Retrieve Information about educational technology

Explore and retrieve information from a variety of resources, including the Internet, about educational technology.

Related Measures

M 3: Final Oral Examination
Relate personal development to the field of Educational Technology and adequately discuss the relevant topics in a final oral examination as approved by the student’s advisory committee

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90% of students will pass oral exams on the first try.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
all students have passed the oral exams on the first try.

SLO 3: Retrieve information related to level or area

Explore and retrieve information from a variety of resources, including the Internet, related to content in their grade level, subject areas, or training environment.

Related Measures

M 4: Pass related courses with B or better
Pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in the following courses that emphasize this outcome: EDTC 602, 645, & 654 and selected elective courses as approved by the student’s advisory committee e.g. EDTC 613, 621, 631, 646, 651, 655, 656, 660, & 662

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% of students will pass appropriate courses with a B or better

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Partially Met
82% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 602 with a b or better
95% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 654 with a b or better
92% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 645 with a b or better

**SLO 4: Utilize technology**
Utilize technology in communicating, collaborating, conducting research, and solving problems.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Interact in discussions and projects**
Interact with faculty and peers in direct or electronic discussions and collaborative projects related to the topics.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
Students will significantly participate in 70% of appropriate discussions and online interactions

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This measure not evaluated this year.

**SLO 5: Use common and specialized software utilities**
Use common and specialized software utilities for everyday communication, management, and personal productivity.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Pass courses that emphasize this outcome**
Pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in the following courses that emphasize this outcome: EDTC 645, 654, & EPSY 602/EDCI 675; and selected elective courses as approved by the student's advisory committee e.g. EDTC 646, 655, 656

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% of students will complete projects in courses listed and receive B or better

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Partially Met
82% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 602 with a b or better
95% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 654 with a b or better
92% of all students over the past two year cycle passed 645 with a b or better

**SLO 6: Encourage lifelong learning**
Plan and participate in activities that encourage lifelong learning and will promote equitable, ethical, and legal use of computer/technology resources.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Pass courses related to career goals**
Pass with B or better or demonstrate comparable knowledge and skills in the elective and support area courses (as approved by the student's advisory committee) that relate to specific student selected areas of content or career goal settings. e.g. EDTC 613, 621, 631, 646, 651, 655, 656, 660, & 662

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% of students will demonstrate through these courses their development of lifelong learning skills.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This measure was not taken this cycle.

**SLO 7: Apply technology to support instruction**
Apply computers and related technologies to support instruction in their grade level, subject areas, or training environment. More specifically: • Plan and design an instruction that integrates a variety of software, applications, theory, and learning tools, manage all phases of the instructional systems design process; • conduct a needs assessment; • analyze learner, task, and situational characteristics; • prepare appropriate testing instruments and procedures; • apply rapid prototyping strategies for design and development; • design learning objects; • design instruction appropriate to the necessary delivery format (face-to-face or distance); • design instruction for diverse and international learners; • understand the rationale and apply procedures necessary for meaningful formative and summative evaluation.

**Related Measures**

**M 6: Develope mediated portfolio**
Develop mediated portfolio that represents student's personal/professional growth and abilities; present and defend content and structure of portfolio in oral exam.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
90% of student Portfolios will receive passing grade

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of student portfolios received a passing grade

**SLO 8: Proficiency in creating meaningful instruction**
Become proficient with relevant resources and techniques for creating meaningful instruction for face-to-face or distance
delivery formats: • Critique existing instructional programs for the effectiveness of the media they use; • Determine which media options are appropriate for a given learning goal and context; • Use current hardware and software to develop original computer and video-based instructional materials; • Develop and integrate interactive media into meaningful instructional contexts with means of tracking learner interaction and performance; • Explore and develop resources in Instructional Management Systems and current networking resources; • Develop web-based instructional systems that integrate appropriate theory and interactive media.

Related Measures

M 6: Develop mediated portfolio
Develop mediated portfolio that represents student's personal/professional growth and abilities; present and defend content and structure of portfolio in oral exam.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
90% of student portfolios will be graded passing in the instructional portion.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Met
90% of student portfolios received a passing grade

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

No students in the program this year. Therefore, no information is reported in this cycle.
Mission / Purpose

The Master's of Education (M.Ed.) and Master's of Science (M.S.) program in Special Education at Texas A&M University prepares the highest quality professionals to meet the diverse educational and behavioral needs of students with disabilities. We prepare leaders, expert-level practitioners, and advocates in educational fields. Our greater goal is to enhance equity by improving the quality of education and treatment services for children and youth with disabilities including their families.

The purpose of this program is to prepare expert-leaders who are well-equipped to implement high quality academic and behavioral interventions and programming for students with disabilities in the state, nation, and world.

This online program is currently offered as an M.Ed.* in Special Education consisting of 36 semester credit hours. A M.S. in Special Education is also available and may be discussed with an advisor for students interested in a thesis option. Courses are offered in synchronous and asynchronous fashion.

Goals

G 1: Improve the quality of life for individuals with disabilities.
Improve the quality of life for individuals with disabilities (and their families) through greater equity in the provision of educational and treatment services in schools and clinics.

G 2: Improve educational outcomes & decrease disparity
We desire to improve the educational outcomes for students with disabilities and decrease the disparity in academic, behavioral, and social achievement.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Demonstrate knowledge of Applied Behavior Analysis
Graduates will have a deep understanding of the principles, foundations, and practices of Applied Behavior Analysis.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
5 Build on the tradition of the professional education.
6 Diversify and globalize the A&M community.
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 60 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred. The questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt in graduation semester

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
93% of students passed the comprehensive examination on their first attempt in their graduation semester. This finding reflects increased rigor of the exam, following faculty review and improvement of current test items and the addition of two additional tested items per course and a range of 5-20 additional items added to the test bank per course.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of students passed comprehensive exam. Scores and ranges were commensurate with previous years.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Met. 100% of graduating students met or exceeded criteria for program using mean scores and standard deviations as the unit of measure.

39 Students took exam in year one of program, 31 end of year one; 32 final exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>18.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>19.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>22.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate students passed at a rate of 100%, given criterion benchmark.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

edit to exam questions
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Exam questions need to be edited to reflect dates of exam. SCR content taught after exam should be removed. Assessment content...

Certified Behavioral Analysis Exam
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
To support our students in their ability to demonstrate knowledge of Applied Behavior Analysis, and given that approximately 90%...

M 2: Single Case Study End of year 2
A capstone research project is completed, presented and evaluated at the end of year two of the program
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target:
75% of students earn a score of 90% or higher as evaluated by teacher graded rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
More than 75% of students earned a score of 90% or better.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
all students earned above a 90 on this project in 2016

75% of students earned 90% or higher

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
In excess of 75% of students earned greater than 90 on final project.
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% students earned higher than 90%
75% of students score above 90

SLO 3: Demonstrate retention and integration of knowledge across program
Students will demonstrate retention and integration of knowledge across the program by demonstrating growth across three formative measures and achieving competency level completion rates in the final comprehensive exam.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1. Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
9 Build community and metropolitan connections.
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures
M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 60 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred. The questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target: 90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.
Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
93% of students passed the comprehensive examination on their first attempt. This finding reflects increased rigor of the exam, following faculty review and improvement of current test items and through the addition of two additional tested items per course and a range of 5-20 additional items added to the test bank per course.
Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of students passed comp exam on first attempt
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students passed comp exam on first attempt
100% of students passed

M 2: Single Case Study End of year 2
A capstone research project is completed, presented and evaluated at the end of year two of the program
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery
Target: 75% of students earn a score of 90% or higher as evaluated by teacher graded rubric.
Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.
Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
More than 75% of students earned greater than 90% on evaluation of SCR project
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% students earned higher than 90%
75% of students scored above 90%

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Need new rubric to reflect full 2 year program competencies
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
SCR final project evaluation editing to align with full program retention, include all faculty in revision of rubric

SLO 4: Demonstrate bilingual special education competency
Students will demonstrate bilingual special education competency through successful completion of readings and assignments, assessments, and collaborative activities. Sub outcomes include demonstrate an understanding of being able to distinguish the difference between a learning disability and the process of learning a second language and (b) be able to identify effective instructional strategies for ELL with or at risk for disabilities (e.g., reading disabilities).

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1. Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
2 Strengthen our graduate programs.
6 Diversify and globalize the A&M community.
9 Build community and metropolitan connections.
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 60 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred. The questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target: 90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.
Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
93% of students passed the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. This finding reflects increased rigor of the exam, following faculty review and improvement of current test items and through the addition of two additional tested items over Bilingual Special Education and 10 additional Bilingual Special Education items added to the test bank.
Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% students passed comp exam on first attempt
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% students passed on first attempt
100% of students passed comp exam

M 3: Bilingual Special Education Assessment
Knowledge and skills in Bilingual special education will be determined by passing grade on SPED 620 research paper on one of several topics related to English language learners (ELL), including distinguishing a learning disability from a language difference for ELL.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target: 90% of Students will score above 80% on target assignment.
Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of students scored 80% or above on the targeted assignment. 94% scored 90% or above. This finding is consistent with previous years.
Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
93% of students met the target of 80% or higher on assignment.
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
For the SPED 620 research project last summer, the average score/grade was 27.75 out of 30 possible points (N=62; range=19 to 30 points).
96% of students met this target. 1 student scored between 70-79

SLO 5: Demonstrate abilities in assessment and consultation across disabilities and cultures
Students will apply knowledge and skills to demonstrate cultural and diversity competencies within assessment and evaluation processes.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 60 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred. The questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target: 90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.
Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
93% of students passed the comprehensive examination on the first attempt. This finding reflects increased rigor of the exam, following faculty review and improvement of current test items and through the addition of two additional tested items related to assessment, two additional tested items related to consultation, and 10 additional items added to the test bank related to both assessment and consultation.
Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% students passed comp exam on first attempt
Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% students passed comp exam on first attempt
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% students passed on first attempt
100% students passed.
M 4: Assessment and Collaboration

Students will demonstrate knowledge and skill in assessment and collaboration that is legally compliant, culturally and person sensitive, valid and reliable in conclusions by presenting summative assessment materials for fictitious cases and clients as scored by the faculty using in-class rubrics. The rubric measures an assignment with multiple written and presentation based components.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Connected Document: SPED MS rubric for ABC analog case 2016-2017

Target:
80% of students will score meet expectations which is 85% or higher on rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
84% of students met expectations of 85% or higher on the grading rubric. This finding is consistent with previous years.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Greater than 80% of students met expectations (above 85% on rubric)

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students scored meet expectations based on rubric scoring, therefore this target was met.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Above Expectations (96% of better)</th>
<th>Meets Expectations (85-95%)</th>
<th>Below Expectations (84% or lower)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application of Ethical Principles</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Service Communication</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Analysis with Literature Review</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLO 6: Demonstrate skills and abilities in successful transition planning

Students will demonstrate abilities to assess, plan, and implement transition plans for individuals with disabilities.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
2 Strengthen our graduate programs.
6 Diversify and globalize the A&M community.
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures
M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 60 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred. The questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
93% of students passed the comprehensive examination on the first attempt. This finding reflects increased rigor of the exam, following faculty review and improvement of current test items and through the addition of two additional tested related to transition and 10 additional items added to the test bank over transition.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of students passed comp exam on first attempt

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% students passed on 1st attempt

100% passed.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Continuing old action plans
We will continue to work on old action plans for upcoming year.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2015

Assess 2015 course sequence change
Based on a review of BCBA pass rates for first time test takers (50%), and scores on the comprehensive exam (49% correct), and capstone project scores (%< 70), the data indicate students in the distance program may not be accessing new knowledge and / or retaining content and / or applying knowledge to the degree we desire. Therefore beginning Fall 2015 we will implement a course re-alignment and the change of course sequence will be evaluated post-hoc through faculty feedback, formative comprehensive exam for year one and student survey at the end of the year.
Masters committee members, and faculty vote responsible for move of Advanced ABA to spring to follow ABA in the fall. Student learning will be assessed through comprehensive exam to see if this improves scores and social validity will be assessed through student survey. Faculty from each course will review progress and differences in outcomes of the second advance class together.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: May 2016, Instructor of Advanced ABA will meet with instructor of ABA to review student comprehension and final student performance. Masters Committee will review student performance on comprehensive exam in (May 2015 or when released and May 2016). Student learning will be assessed through comprehensive exam to see if this improves scores and social validity will be assessed through
Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty in two courses. Masters Committee, Masters Chair
Additional Resources: none

Increase Diversity
Based on a review of demographic data for current students (<5% diverse), we will revise admissions process and plan for recruitment of a more diverse applicant pool.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Identify communities with historically minority serving institutions. Revise recruitment materials to represent a more diverse student group. Target institutions with recruitment materials through mail and email. Provide more explicit detail about how to complete a competitive application. Announce priority to advisors Consider creating leveling coursework of interested applicants to increase opportunity for competitive applications/portfolio
Projected Completion Date: 04/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Masters Chair and GA

Set new criteria for masters exam
Masters exam has been edited to increase rigor, new cohort of students will establish new baseline for their graduation scores in 2018

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Meet with faculty to review scores and determine benchmark criteria
Projected Completion Date: 06/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Masters chair, assessment team, masters committee

Change National Exam Measure.
Currently our assessment plan relies on the National Exam results to demonstrate performance in all learning outcomes. However, there is no way to individually identify or track students taking the national exam against which program, course sequence, or instructional changes. Team will identify new or different direct measure of outcomes from within the existing program to determine performance.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: consider comp exam or follow up survey and write items as needed, work on this at monthly committee meetings.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2018
Responsible Person/Group: masters committee
Additional Resources: none

edit to exam questions
Exam questions need to be edited to reflect dates of exam. SCR content taught after exam should be removed. Assessment content taught before exam should be removed. Faculty review and revision of questions needs annual review.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge of Applied Behavior Analysis
Implementation Description: Masters chair will distribute questions to SPED division head for follow up with faculty rather than through masters committee.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2018
Responsible Person/Group: masters committee
Additional Resources: none

Identify appropriate measure
Team will identify or create measure of graduates, the national exam does not track when individuals graduated.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Implementation Description: all faculty work to align curriculum to assignment and vice versa

Need new rubric to reflect full 2 year program competencies
SCR final project evaluation editing to align with full program retention, include all faculty in revision of rubric

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Single Case Study End of year 2 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate retention and integration of knowledge across program
Implementation Description: all faculty work to align curriculum to assignment and vice versa
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

A review of outcomes reflects that the program met, and will continue to meet prior objectives through the institutionalization of several processes for Quality Matters, supervision and training of GAs, and recruitment of a diverse student applicant pool.

Given the need for a reliable cumulative measure of student performance within a particular cohort, the Master's Committee has developed an electronic portfolio (eFolio) measure for student to demonstrate competency in applied behavior analysis. Students in the incoming cohort of summer 2018 will be the first group to develop an eFolio. It is anticipated that faculty will be able to measure student performance and proficiency more closely through this product.

Next steps for action include the alignment of the comprehensive examination items with the Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA) task list items. Upon review of the applicants to the program for the 2018 cohort, the Master's Committee found that approximately 90% of applicants intend to pursue BCBA certification. As a Behavior Analyst Certification Board certified course sequence, we want to ensure students have competency and skills needed to meet certification standards. Through the combined efforts of the eFolio and improved comprehensive examination, we anticipate that students will be fully prepared for certification testing and demonstration of professional skill in applied behavior analysis.

"CRITICAL" Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

The program has seen no dramatic changes in assessment results, students are typically high performing and demonstration of student learning outcomes for the distance masters program involves high-achieving students maximizing points and scores.

Through work to improve the comprehensive examination, we have seen that the examination is more challenging for students. 93% of students passed on the first attempt, rather than 100% (which has been standard over the past few years).

Development of the eFolio measure was the result of much collaboration and discussion through Master's Committee meetings. It is anticipated that this new approach to assessment is expected to provide additional insight in student proficiency in applied behavior analysis.

Change National Exam Measure: The National Exam Measure has been replaced with an electronic portfolio (eFolio) measure. This portfolio of work allows for students to demonstrate competency in applying knowledge and skills of applied behavior analysis through a series of three or more practical applications in several courses, across the program. The professional e-folio development process begins early in the program and should be updated regularly. Following completion of assignments that demonstrate competency in ABA, students will review feedback from faculty, make needed updates and revisions, and post the products to their eFolio site.

Edit to exam questions: Special education faculty reviewed Single Case Research comprehensive exam items and ensured that all items included are ones that are covered prior to students taking the exam. Additionally, annual review of the entire comprehensive exam was completed. A consistent format was ensured throughout, with a question stem and four answer choice options. The bulk of the question was placed in the stems, with answer choices being shorter. Exam items focused on most important information from each course. Questions that were reviewed from rigor and improved upon. Five to twenty additional exam items were developed for each of the courses in the program. These questions were added to the test bank.

Identify appropriate measure: The National Exam Measure has been replaced with an electronic portfolio (eFolio) measure. This portfolio of work allows for students to demonstrate competency in applying knowledge and skills of applied behavior analysis through a series of three or more practical applications in several courses, across the program. The professional e-folio development process begins early in the program and should be updated regularly. Following
completion of assignments that demonstrate competency in ABA, students will review feedback from faculty, make needed updates and revisions, and post the products to their eFolio site.

Single Case Research capstone project evaluation rubric was edited and elaborated to reflect full 2-year program competencies. Faculty reviewed, provided feedback, and accepted rubric for program use.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

How is the program ensuring the comparability of the distance education program with traditional, campus-based (i.e., face to face) programs? Specifically, what data are routinely gathered and reviewed to ensure the quality of the distance education program. Metrics could include, but are not limited to:

- comparisons related to assessment of similar student learning outcomes across modes of delivery or campuses;
- comparisons of student achievement metrics such as retention or student satisfaction;
- comparisons of course evaluation data across modes of delivery or campuses.

Special Education MS/MED is an online only degree, and thus was compared to the Educational Psychology MS/MED (Learning Sciences) face-to-face degree, as both degrees are geared towards professional students.

SPED utilizes credentialed full-time faculty to teach courses. Courses adhere to TEA standards for teacher preparation and certification, regardless of course content delivery.

SPED has the same application requirements regardless of degree delivery since they are standardized by the department. Academic and faculty advisors are fully accessible to distance students to assist them as they move through the program.

Provide a summary of findings based on the strategies used by the programs (identified in question 1) to ensure comparability. Be sure to provide a summary of findings as well as contextual or interpretive information.

The College has completed a review of all distance education courses against face-to-face delivery of courses to ensure that comparable learning is taking place. Memos were written by program faculty and sent to department head for final review and approval. All courses were found to be comparable in terms of learning outcomes, credit hours, student work/engagement, and level of faculty engagement. Additionally, program routinely monitors student progress in terms of grades, completion of required courses, required practicum/internships and timely completion program.

What steps have been taken, if any, to improve/strengthen the distance education program to ensure comparability? (i.e., provide the basic components of an Action Plan)

Students were surveyed on their perceptions of the program. The following results were noted:

- 100% of student respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the courses were easy to navigate.
- 100% of student respondents agreed or strongly agreed that instructors used course tools and technology effectively.
- 100% of student respondents agreed or strongly agreed that independent activities/assignments are useful.
- 83% of student respondents agreed or strongly agreed that partners/group activities/assignments were useful.
- 83% of student respondents agreed or strongly agreed that student to student collaboration was valuable.
- 92% of student respondents agreed or strongly agreed that concepts and skills connected and expanded as they moved through the program.
- 96% of student respondents agree or strongly agreed that they would recommend the program to others.

Additionally, student respondents noted that strengths of the program include professors’ knowledge and accessibility, prompt communication with students, applicable assignments, and open class discussions.
Mission / Purpose

The special education Masters degree is a distinct program within the Department of Educational Psychology. We prepare leaders, expert-level practitioners (advanced skills teachers, behavior coaches, behavior analysts, behavior therapists, response to intervention (RTI) coordinators), and a variety of other specialized positions in school and community settings. Our greater goal is to enhance equity by improving the quality of education and treatment services for children and youth with disabilities including their families. "We Transform Lives" through our teaching, national and international research, and service.

Goals

G 1: Improve the quality of life for individuals with disabilities.
Improve the quality of life for individuals with disabilities (and their families) through greater equity in the provision of educational and treatment services in schools and clinics.

G 2: Improve educational outcomes & decrease disparity
We desire to improve the educational outcomes for students with disabilities and decrease the disparity in academic, behavioral, and social achievement.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Demonstrate knowledge of Applied Behavior Analysis
We desire our graduates to have a deep understanding of the principals, foundations, and practices of Applied Behavior Analysis as measured by the national exam against a criterion of national norms.

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2 Demonstrate critical thinking
3 Practice personal and social responsibility
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
6 Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations
5 Build on the tradition of the professional education.
6 Diversify and globalize the A&M community.
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt in graduation semester

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of students passed comprehensive exam. Scores and ranges were commensurate with previous years.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Met. 100% of graduating students met or exceeded criteria for program using mean scores and standard deviations as the unit of measure.

39 Students took exam in year one of program, 31 end of year one; 32 final exam.

Min 12.00 12.00 12.00
Max 24.00 26.00 28.00
Range 12.00 14.00 16.00
Mean 18.69 19.35 22.13
Median 19.00 20.00 22.00
SD 3.22 3.32 3.10
1st -> 3rd 1st -> 2nd 2nd -> 3rd
Cohen’s d 1.11 Cohen’s d 0.20 Cohen’s d 0.85

Graduate students passed at a rate of 100%, given criterion benchmark.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**BCBA National Exam Scores**
Based on the 2015 review of the most recent data available (test year 2013) the TAMU pass rate for first time test takers was 50...

**edit to exam questions**
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Exam questions need to be edited to reflect dates of exam. SCR content taught after exam should be removed. Assessment content...

**M 2: National Exam**
The Board Certified Behavior Analyst®, (BCBA®) is a graduate-level certification in behavior analysis. Professionals who are certified at the BCBA level are independent practitioners who provide behavior-analytic services. A nationally normed, certification exam for the BCBA is held and results are reported back to the program each year.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
Pass rate of each graduating class will be above the national average for that corresponding year. 2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam, pass rate nationally was 48%

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met**
We had a 40% pass rate therefore the target was not met.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
We have improved to the 2nd highest pass rate in the state for distance programs, and are now at a pass rate of 70%.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Partially Met**
2014 data indicates 46% pass rate. We do not have more information than this yet.

2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam. National pass rate for 2013 was 48%. We were 4th highest distance program nationally.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Identify appropriate measure**
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Team will identify or create measure of graduates, the national exam does not track when individuals graduated.

**M 3: Single Case Study End of year 2**
A capstone research project is completed, presented and evaluated at the end of year two of the program

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target:**
75% of students earn a score of 90% or higher as evaluated by teacher graded rubric.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
More than 75% of students earned a score of 90% or better.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
all students earned above a 90 on this project in 2016

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
75% of students earned 90% or higher

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Competency in Applied Behavior Analysis**
Students will demonstrate competency in applying knowledge and skills of applied behavior analysis through a series of three practical applications in three courses across two years as measured by student grades and teacher nominations for adverse events or individual problems.

**Relevant Associations:**
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively
4. Practice personal and social responsibility
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
6. Prepare to engage in lifelong learning
7. Work collaboratively

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
Texas A&M University
2. Strengthen our graduate programs.
12. Meet our commitment to Texas.

**Related Measures**
**M 1: Comprehensive Exam**
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several
hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target:**
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
100% of students passed exam on first attempt.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Met, 100% of students passed comp exam time 1.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
First time test takers passed at a rate of 100%.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**BCBA National Exam Scores**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
Based on the 2015 review of the most recent data available (test year 2013) the TAMU pass rate for first time test takers was 50...

**M 2: National Exam**
The Board Certified Behavior Analyst® (BCBA®) is a graduate-level certification in behavior analysis. Professionals who are certified at the BCBA level are independent practitioners who provide behavior-analytic services. A nationally normed, certification exam for the BCBA is held and results are reported back to the program each year.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
Pass rate of each graduating class will be above the national average for that corresponding year. 2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met**
We had a 40% pass rate therefore the target was not met.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Pass rate is above the national average

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Partially Met**
2014 data indicates 46% pass rate. We do not have more information than this yet.

2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam. National pass rate for 2013 was 48%. We were 4th highest distance program nationally.

**M 3: Single Case Study End of year 2**
A capstone research project is completed, presented and evaluated at the end of year two of the program

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target:**
75% of students earn a score of 90% or higher as evaluated by teacher graded rubric.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
In excess of 75% of students earned greater than 90 on final project.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% students earned higher than 90%

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
75% of students score above 90

**SLO 3: Demonstrate retention and integration of knowledge across program**
Students will demonstrate retention and integration of knowledge across the program by achieving competency level completion rates in the final comprehensive exam as measured by growth across formative measures 1, 2, and 3 and by a score above competency criterion.

**Relevant Associations:**

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
6 Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

**Graduate Outcome Associations**
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
Texas A&M University
9 Build community and metropolitan connections.
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Comprehensive Exam**
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target:**
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**

100% of students passed comp exam on first attempt

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% students passed exam on first attempt

100% of students passed

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

BCBA National Exam Scores
Based on the 2015 review of the most recent data available (test year 2013) the TAMU pass rate for first time test takers was 50...

M 2: National Exam
The Board Certified Behavior Analyst® (BCBA®) is a graduate-level certification in behavior analysis. Professionals who are certified at the BCBA level are independent practitioners who provide behavior-analytic services. A nationally normed certification exam for the BCBA is held and results are reported back to the program each year.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
Pass rate of each graduating class will be above the national average for that corresponding year. 2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam, national pass rate was 48%

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
We had a 40% pass rate therefore the target was not met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
pass rate is above national average,

2014 data indicates 46% pass rate. We do not have more information than this yet.
2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam. National pass rate for 2013 was 48%. We were 4th highest distance program nationally.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Change National Exam Measure.
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Currently our assessment plan relies on the National Exam results to demonstrate performance in all learning outcomes. However, ...

M 3: Single Case Study End of year 2
A capstone research project is completed, presented and evaluated at the end of year two of the program
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target:
75% of students earn a score of 90% or higher as evaluated by teacher graded rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
More than 75% of students earned greater than 90% on evaluation of SCR project
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% students earned higher than 90%
75% of students scored above 90%

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Need new rubric to reflect full 2 year program competencies
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
SCR final project evaluation editing to align with full program retention, include all faculty in revision of rubric

SLO 4: Demonstrate bilingual special education competency
Students will demonstrate bilingual special education competency through successful completion of readings and assignments, assessments, and collaborative activities as measured by faculty ratings and course grades. Sub outcomes include demonstrate an understanding of being able to distinguish the difference between a learning disability and the process of learning a second language and (b) be able to identify effective instructional strategies for ELL with or at risk for disabilities (e.g., reading disabilities).

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively
4. Practice personal and social responsibility
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
7. Work collaboratively

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
2 Strengthen our graduate programs.
6 Diversify and globalize the A&M community.
9 Build community and metropolitan connections.
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% students passed comp exam on first attempt
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% students passed on first attempt
100% of students passed comp exam

M 4: Bilingual Special Education Assessment
Knowledge and skills in Bilingual special education will be determined by passing grade on SPED 620 research project.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
90% of Students will score above 80% on target assignment.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
93% of students met the target of 80% or higher on assignment.
Finding (2016-2016) - Target: Met
For the SPED 620 research project last summer, the average score/grade was 27.75 out of 30 possible points (N=62; range=19 to 30 points).
96% of students met this target. 1 student scored between 70-79

SLO 5: Demonstrate abilities in assessment and consultation across disabilities and cultures
Students will apply knowledge and skills to demonstrate cultural and diversity competencies within assessment and evaluation processes as measured by scores on collaboration assignments and end of course grades.

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2 Demonstrate critical thinking
3 Communicate effectively
4 Practice personal and social responsibility
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
7 Work collaboratively

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% students passed comp exam on first attempt
Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% students passed on first attempt
100% students passed on first attempt
100% students passed.

M 5: Assessment and Collaboration
Students will demonstrate knowledge and skill in assessment and collaboration that is legally compliant, culturally and person sensitive, valid and reliable in conclusions by presenting summative assessment materials for fictitious cases and clients as scored by the faculty using in-class rubrics. The rubric measures an assignment with multiple written and presentation based components.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
**Connected Document**  
**SPED M5 rubric for ABC analog case 2016-2017**

**Target:** 80% of students will score meet expectations which is 85% or higher on rubric.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**  
Greater than 80% of students met expectations (above 85% on rubric)

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**  
100% of students scored meet expectations based on rubric scoring. Therefore this target was met.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Above Expectations (96% of better)</th>
<th>Meets Expectations (85-95%)</th>
<th>Below Expectations (84% or lower)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application of Ethical Principles</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Service Communication</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Analysis with Literature Review</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 6: Demonstrate skills and abilities in successful transition planning**

Students will demonstrate abilities to assess, plan, and implement transition plans for individuals with disabilities as measured by exams.

**Relevant Associations:**

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively
4. Practice personal and social responsibility
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
6. Work collaboratively

**Graduate Outcome Associations**
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- Texas A&M University
  2 Strengthen our graduate programs.
  6 Diversify and globalize the A&M community.
  12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Comprehensive Exam**
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target:** 90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**  
100% of students passed comp exam on first attempt

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**  
100% students passed on 1st attempt

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**  
100% passed.

**M 6: Transition Planning**

Students will demonstrate knowledge and skill of best practices in transition planning via an end of course content exam.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**  
70% of students will earn 80% or higher.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**  
Faculty report greater than 70% of students earn 80% or higher on exam.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**  
34 students in the class. 25 -A's, 7 B's, and 2 F's met the goal.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Above Expectations (100-91%)</th>
<th>Meets Expectations (90-81%)</th>
<th>Below Expectations (80% or lower)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (16.67%)</td>
<td>16 (53.33%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EOC
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Continuing old action plans**

We will continue to work on old action plans for upcoming year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Hgh
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2015

**Assess 2015 course sequence change**

Based on a review of BCBA pass rates for first time test takers (50%), and scores on the comprehensive exam (49% correct), and capstone project scores (%< 70), the data indicate students in the distance program may not be accessing new knowledge and / or retaining content and / or applying knowledge to the degree we desire. Therefore beginning Fall 2015 we will implement a course re-alignmet and the change of course sequence will be evaluated post-hoc through faculty feedback, formative comprehensive exam for year one and student survey at the end of the year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Hgh
- **Implementation Description:** May 2016, Instructor of Advanced ABA will meet with instructor of ABA to review student comprehension and final student performance. Masters Committee will review student performance on comprehensive exam in (May 2015 or when released and May 2016). Student learning will be assessed through comprehensive exam to see if this improves scores and social validity will be assessed through student survey. Faculty from each course will review progress and differences in outcomes of the second advance class together.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty in two courses. Masters Committee, Masters Chair
- **Additional Resources:** none

**BCBA National Exam Scores**

Based on the 2015 review of the most recent data available (test year 2013) the TAMU pass rate for first time test takers was 50% in our first year of the program and for 6 people sitting for the exam. We set a goal last year to achieve or exceed the national pass rate of 58% but this data has not yet been released by the BCBA organization. In the interim, we additionally examined the pass rates for first time test takers in distance programs and found rates of 67% of Florida Institute of Technology for 566 students, 56% for 172 students at UNT and 56% for Southern Illinois’s 25 students. The top 20 programs are all on-campus programs and have pass rates between 71-100%, with a range of 6-44 candidates. Three of these programs are in Texas (UT, UNT, UofH).

To meet this goal we will implement three activities - First a course realignment of BCBA content in year one. Second, a formal evaluation review of outcome data by examining student knowledge on the comprehensive exam in the domains related to the BCBA exam. This data will be reviewed by the faculty. Third, we will implement a within-class high-stakes learning module program specifically aligned to the examination.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Hgh
- **Implementation Description:** To meet this goal we will implement three activities - First a course realignment of BCBA content in year one. Second, a formal evaluation review of outcome data by examining student knowledge on the comprehensive exam in the domains related to the BCBA exam. This data will be reviewed by the faculty. Third, we will implement a within-class high-stakes learning module program specifically aligned to the examination.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2016
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Masters Committee, Masters Chair, SPED faculty in BCBA course sequence.

**Increase Diversity**

Based on a review of demographic data for current students (<5% diverse), we will revise admissions process and plan for recruitment of a more diverse applicant pool.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Hgh
- **Implementation Description:** Identify communities with historically minority serving institutions. Revise recruitment materials to represent a more diverse student group. Target institutions with recruitment materials through mail and email. Provide more explicit detail about how to complete a competitive application. Announce priority to advisors Consider creating leveling coursework of interested applicants to increase opportunity for competitive applications/portfolio
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2016
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Masters Chair and GA

**Set new criteria for masters exam**

Masters exam has been edited to increase rigor, new cohort of students will establish new baseline for their graduation scores in 2018.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Hgh
- **Implementation Description:** Meet with faculty to review scores and determine benchmark criteria
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Masters chair, assessment team, masters committee

**Supervision of Programmatic GA's and Quality Matters Certification**

Based on high student scores, and high student evaluations, the next step to improving the program would be national recognition through Quality Matters certification.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

A review of outcomes reflects that the program met, and will continue to meet prior objectives through the institutionalization of several processes for quality matters, supervision and training of GAs, recruitment of a diverse student applicant pool.

Current findings indicate no way to individually identify or track students taking the national exam against which program, course sequence, or instructional changes. Team will identify new or different direct measure of outcomes from within the existing program to determine performance.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

Terminated action plans are the result of re-aligning focus and goals with priorities. The program has seen no dramatic changes in assessment results, students are typically high performing and demonstration of student learning outcomes for
the distance masters program involves high-achieving students maximizing points and scores. Thus going into the next year, very new and somewhat different approaches to assessments are expected to provide additional insights.

### Annual Report Section Responses

**How is the program ensuring the comparability of the distance education program with comparable campus-based (i.e., face to face) programs?**

Special Education MS/MED is an online only degree, and thus was compared to the Educational Psychology MS/MED (Learning Sciences) face-to-face degree, as both degrees are geared towards professional students.

SPSPED utilizes credentialed full-time faculty to teach courses. Courses adhere to TEA standards for teacher preparation and certification, regardless of course content delivery.

SESPED has the same application requirements regardless of degree delivery since they are standardized by the department.

- Academic and faculty advisors are fully accessible to distance students to assist them as they move through the program.

**What data/evidence are used to regularly assess the effectiveness of the distance education program (in comparison to comparable campus-based programs)?**

1. What data are routinely used to assess effectiveness and comparability?
2. What evidence does the program have to support the comparability of the distance education program with similar campus-based program(s)?

This year the college did a review of all distance education courses against face-to-face delivery of courses to ensure that comparable learning is taking place. Memos were written by program faculty and sent to department head for final review and approval. Additionally, program routinely monitors student progress in terms of grades, completion of required courses, required practicum/internships and timely completion program.

**What steps have been taken, if any, for improvement of the distance education program to ensure comparability? (i.e., provide the basic components of an Action Plan)**

To ensure academic rigor, faculty members who teach online courses often have completed additional professional development related to the quality of online teaching.
Mission / Purpose
The special education Masters degree is a distinct program within the Department of Educational Psychology. We prepare leaders, expert-level practitioners (advanced skills teachers, behavior coaches, behavior analysts, behavior therapists, response to intervention (RTI) coordinators), and a variety of other specialized positions in school and community settings. Our greater goal is to enhance equity by improving the quality of education and treatment services for children and youth with disabilities including their families. "We Transform Lives" through our teaching, national and international research, and service.

Goals
G 1: Improve the quality of life for individuals with disabilities.
Improve the quality of life for individuals with disabilities (and their families) through greater equity in the provision of educational and treatment services in schools and clinics.

G 2: Improve educational outcomes & decrease disparity
We desire to improve the educational outcomes for students with disabilities and decrease the disparity in academic, behavioral, and social achievement.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans
SLO 1: Demonstrate knowledge of Applied Behavior Analysis
We desire our graduates to have a deep understanding of the principals, foundations, and practices of Applied Behavior Analysis as measured by the national exam against a criterion of national norms.

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2 Demonstrate critical thinking
4 Practice personal and social responsibility
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
6 Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations
5 Build on the tradition of the professional education.
6 Diversify and globalize the A&M community.
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures
M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt in graduation semester

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
Met. 100% of graduating students met or exceeded criteria for program using mean scores and standard deviations as the unit of measure.

39 Students took exam in year one of program, 31 end of year one; 32 final exam.

Min 12.00 12.00 12.00
Max 24.00 26.00 28.00
Mean 18.69 19.35 22.13
Median 19.00 20.00 22.00
SD 3.22 3.32 3.10

1st -> 3rd
Cohen's d 1.11

Graduate students passed at a rate of 100%, given criterion benchmark.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
BCBA National Exam Scores  
Based on the 2015 review of the most recent data available (test year 2013) the TAMU pass rate for first time test takers was 50%.

M 2: National Exam  
The Board Certified Behavior Analyst® (BCBA®) is a graduate-level certification in behavior analysis. Professionals who are certified at the BCBA level are independent practitioners who provide behavior-analytic services. A nationally normed, certification exam for the BCBA is held and results are reported back to the program each year.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state  
Target:  
Pass rate of each graduating class will be above the national average for that corresponding year. 2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam, pass rate nationally was 48%  
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met  
We have improved to the 2nd highest pass rate in the state for distance programs, and are now at a pass rate of 70%.  
2014 data indicates 46% pass rate. We do not have more information than this yet.  
2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam. National pass rate for 2013 was 48%. We were 4th highest distance program nationally.

M 3: Single Case Study End of year 2  
A capstone research project is completed, presented and evaluated at the end of year two of the program  
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery  
Target:  
75% of students earn a score of 90% or higher as evaluated by teacher graded rubric.  
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met  
All students earned above a 90 on this project in 2016  
75% of students earned 90% or higher

SLO 2: Demonstrate Competency in Applied Behavior Analysis  
Students will demonstrate competency in applying knowledge and skills of applied behavior analysis through a series of three practical applications in three courses across two years as measured by student grades and teacher nominations for adverse events or individual problems.

Relevant Associations:  
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations  
1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree  
2 Demonstrate critical thinking  
3 Communicate effectively  
4 Practice personal and social responsibility  
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence  
6 Prepare to engage in lifelong learning  
7 Work collaboratively

Graduate Outcome Associations  
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.  
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.  
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.  
1.4 Communicate effectively.  
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.  
1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.  
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations  
Texas A&M University  
2 Strengthen our graduate programs.  
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures  
M 1: Comprehensive Exam  
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.  
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam  
Target:  
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.  
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met  
Met, 100% of students passed comp exam time 1.  
First time test takers passed at a rate of 100%.  
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):  
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
**M 2: National Exam**
The Board Certified Behavior Analyst® (BCBA®) is a graduate-level certification in behavior analysis. Professionals who are certified at the BCBA level are independent practitioners who provide behavior-analytic services. A nationally normed, certification exam for the BCBA is held and results are reported back to the program each year.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
Pass rate of each graduating class will be above the national average for that corresponding year. 2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Pass rate is above the national average.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Partially Met**
2014 data indicates 46% pass rate. We do not have more information than this yet.

2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam. National pass rate for 2013 was 48%. We were 4th highest distance program nationally.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Pass rate is above national average,

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Partially Met**

**M 3: Single Case Study End of year 2**
A capstone research project is completed, presented and evaluated at the end of year two of the program.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target:**
75% of students earn a score of 90% or higher as evaluated by teacher graded rubric.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% students earned higher than 90%

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
75% of students score above 90

**SLO 3: Demonstrate retention and integration of knowledge across program**
Students will demonstrate retention and integration of knowledge across the program by achieving competency level completion rates in the final comprehensive exam as measured by growth across formative measures 1, 2, and 3 and by a score above competency criterion.

**Relevant Associations:**
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
6. Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1. Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2. Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3. Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.7. Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
12. Meet our commitment to Texas.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Comprehensive Exam**
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target:**
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% students passed exam on first attempt

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% of students passed

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**BCBA National Exam Scores**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
Based on the 2015 review of the most recent data available (test year 2013) the TAMU pass rate for first time test takers was 50...

**M 2: National Exam**
The Board Certified Behavior Analyst® (BCBA®) is a graduate-level certification in behavior analysis. Professionals who are certified at the BCBA level are independent practitioners who provide behavior-analytic services. A nationally normed, certification exam for the BCBA is held and results are reported back to the program each year.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
Pass rate of each graduating class will be above the national average for that corresponding year. 2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam, national pass rate was 48%

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
Pass rate is above national average,

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Partially Met**
2014 data indicates 46% pass rate. We do not have more information than this yet.

2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam. National pass rate for 2013 was 48%. We were 4th highest distance program nationally.

**M 3: Single Case Study End of year 2**
A capstone research project is completed, presented and evaluated at the end of year two of the program

*Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery*

**Target:**

75% of students earn a score of 90% or higher as evaluated by teacher graded rubric.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% students earned higher than 90%

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
75% of students scored above 90%

**SLO 4: Demonstrate bilingual special education competency**

Students will demonstrate bilingual special education competency through successful completion of readings and assignments, assessments, and collaborative activities as measured by faculty ratings and course grades. Sub outcomes include demonstrate an understanding of being able to distinguish the difference between a learning disability and the process of learning a second language and (b) be able to identify effective instructional strategies for ELL with or at risk for disabilities (e.g., reading disabilities).

**Relevant Associations:**

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively
4. Practice personal and social responsibility
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
6. Work collaboratively

**Graduate Outcome Associations**
1. Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
2. Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
3. Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
4. Communicate effectively.
5. Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1. Texas A&M University
2. Strengthen our graduate programs.
3. Diversify and globalize the A&M community.
4. Build community and metropolitan connections.
5. Meet our commitment to Texas.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Comprehensive Exam**
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

*Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam*

**Target:**

90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% students passed on first attempt

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% of students passed comp exam

**M 4: Billingual Special Education Assessment**
Knowledge and skills in Billingual special education will be determined by passing grade on SPED 620 research project.

*Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group*

**Target:**

90% of Students will score above 80% on target assignment.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100 % students passed on first attempt

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% of students passed comp exam

**M 5: Billingual Special Education Assessment**
Knowledge and skills in Billingual special education will be determined by passing grade on SPED 620 research project.

*Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group*

**Target:**

90% of Students will score above 80% on target assignment.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
For the SPED 620 research project last summer, the average score/grade was 27.75 out of 30 possible points (N=62; range=19 to 30 points).

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
96% of students met this target. 1 student scored between 70-79

**SLO 5: Demonstrate abilities in assessment and consultation across disabilities and cultures**

Students will apply knowledge and skills to demonstrate cultural and diversity competencies within assessment and evaluation processes as measured by scores on collaboration assignments and end of course grades.

**Relevant Associations:**

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively
4. Practice personal and social responsibility
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
7 Work collaboratively

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target: 90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% students passed on first attempt

100% students passed.

M 5: Assessment and Collaboration
Students will demonstrate knowledge and skill in assessment and collaboration that is legally compliant, culturally and person sensitive, valid and reliable in conclusions by presenting summative assessment materials for fictitious cases and clients as scored by the faculty using in-class rubrics. The rubric measures an assignment with multiple written and presentation based components.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Connected Document
SPED M5 rubric for ABC analog case 2016-2017

Target: 80% of students will score meet expectations which is 85% or higher on rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students scored meet expectations based on rubric scoring, therefore this target was met.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Above Expectations (96% of better)</th>
<th>Meets Expectations (85-95%)</th>
<th>Below Expectations (84% or lower)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application of Ethical Principles</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Service Communication</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Analysis with Literature Review</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLO 6: Demonstrate skills and abilities in successful transition planning
Students will demonstrate abilities to assess, plan, and implement transition plans for individuals with disabilities as measured by exams.

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2 Demonstrate critical thinking
3 Communicate effectively
4 Practice personal and social responsibility
5 Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
7 Work collaboratively

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations

Texas A&M University
2 Strengthen our graduate programs.
6 Diversify and globalize the A&M community.
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target: 90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% students passed on 1st attempt

100% passed.

M 6: Transition Planning
Students will demonstrate knowledge and skill of best practices in transition planning via an end of course content exam.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
70% of students will earn 80% or higher.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
34 students in the class. 25 -A's, 7 B's, and 2 F's met the goal.


Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Continuing old action plans
We will continue to work on old action plans for upcoming year.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2015

Assess 2015 course sequence change
Based on a review of BCBA pass rates for first time test takers (50%), and scores on the comprehensive exam (49% correct), and capstone project scores (%<70), the data indicate students in the distance program may not be accessing new knowledge and / or retaining content and / or applying knowledge to the degree we desire. Therefore beginning Fall 2015 we will implement a course re-alignment and the change of course sequence will be evaluated post-hoc through faculty feedback, formative comprehensive exam for year one and student survey at the end of the year.

Masters committee members, and faculty vote responsible for move of Advanced ABA to spring to follow ABA in the fall. Student learning will be assessed through comprehensive exam to see if this improves scores and social validity will be assessed through student survey. Faculty from each course will review progress and differences in outcomes of the second advance class together.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: May 2016, Instructor of Advanced ABA will meet with instructor of ABA to review student comprehension and final student performance. Masters Commitee will review student performance on comprehensive exam in (May 2015 or when released and May 2016). Student learning will be assessed through comprehensive exam to see if this improves scores and social validity will be assessed through projected completion date: 05/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty in two courses. Masters Committee, Masters Chair
Additional Resources: none

BCBA National Exam Scores
Based on the 2015 review of the most recent data available (test year 2013) the TAMU pass rate for first time test takers was 50% in our first year of the program and for 6 people sitting for the exam. We set a goal last year to achieve or exceed the national pass rate of 56% but this data has not yet been released by the BCBA organization. In the interim, we additionally examined the pass rates for first time test takers in distance programs and found rates of 67% of Florida Institute of Technology for 566 students, 56% for 172 students at UNT and 56% for Southern Illinois’s 25 students. The top 20 programs are all on-campus programs and have pass rates between 71-100%, with a range of 6-44 candidates. Three of these programs are in Texas (UT, UNT, UofH).

To meet this goal we will implement three activities - First a course realignment of BCBA content in year one. Second, a formal evaluation review of outcome data by examining student knowledge on the comprehensive exam in the domains related to the BCBA exam. This data will be reviewed by the faculty. Third, we will implement a within-class high-stakes learning module program specifically aligned to the examination.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To meet this goal we will implement three activities - First a course realignment of BCBA content in year one. Second, a formal evaluation review of outcome data by examining student knowledge on the comprehensive exam in the domains related to the BCBA exam. This data will be reviewed by the faculty. Third, we will implement a within-class high-stakes learning module program specifically aligned to the examination.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2018
Responsible Person/Group: Masters Committee, Masters Chair, SPED faculty in BCBA course sequence.

Increase Diversity
Based on a review of demographic data for current students (<5% diverse), we will revise admissions process and plan for recruitment of a more diverse applicant pool.
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Identify communities with historically minority serving institutions. Revise recruitment materials to represent a more diverse student group. Target institutions with recruitment materials through mail and email. Provide more explicit detail about how to complete a competitive application. Announce priority to advisors Consider creating leveling coursework of interested applicants to increase opportunity for competitive applications/portfolio
Projected Completion Date: 04/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Masters Chair and GA

Recruitment Strategy
Increase diversity of applicants through recruitment targets and funding sources
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Hire GA to target and make presentation to schools, assess literature for common barriers and address in program meetings.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2017
Responsible Person/Group: Masters Chair, GA, Masters Committee
Additional Resources: GA

Set new criteria for masters exam
Masters exam has been edited to increase rigor, new cohort of students will establish new baseline for their graduation scores in 2018
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Meet with faculty to review scores and determine benchmark criteria
Projected Completion Date: 06/2018
Responsible Person/Group: Masters chair, assessment team, masters committee

Supervision of Programatic GA's and Quality Matters Certification
Based on high student scores, and high student evaluations, the next step to improving the program would be national recognition through Quality Matters certification.
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Organization meetings have taken place, and internal budgets reallocated to support this activity. GB will supervise students, training is in scheduling process.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2018

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Our program has always been very data-driven. We use routine student feedback, end of course exams and projects, end of year program exams, and end of program exams and final project data. We use dedicated-time people to review this data and the relevant information is presented at monthly program meetings. This year we voted to move into quality matters training to seek national recognition for the program. We also increased our pass rates in the national board exam to second in the state, and are looking for ways to achieve a first in state status. Faculty are seeking funding sources to increase quality and quantity of students. Our program overall has increased from low 20s to a new cohort of 53. Each course uses a GA to support the learning communities and our model now involves a specific training sequence and syllabus for doctoral students to learn additional competencies for supporting faculty. Diversity targets were exceeded but continue to be a challenge overall so we are working this year with someone to dedicate time toward local presentations for recruitment of students since feedback tells us that most applicants learn about us through word of mouth. The program is very systematically run and evaluated and these practices will continue.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.
Diversity in applications and accepted students was increased to above Vision 2020 targets. The program reached goals to have scores on national exams exceed national averages and we did through a realignment of courses and addition of study guide.
Mission / Purpose

The special education Masters degree is a distinct program within the Department of Educational Psychology. We prepare leaders, expert-level practitioners (advanced skills teachers, behavior coaches, behavior analysts, behavior therapists, response to intervention (RTI) coordinators), and a variety of other specialized positions in school and community settings. Our greater goal is to enhance equity by improving the quality of education and treatment services for children and youth with disabilities including their families. “We Transform Lives” through our teaching, national and international research, and service.

Goals

G 1: Improve the quality of life for individuals with disabilities.

Improve the quality of life for individuals with disabilities (and their families) through greater equity in the provision of educational and treatment services in schools and clinics.

G 2: Improve educational outcomes & decrease disparity

We desire to improve the educational outcomes for students with disabilities and decrease the disparity in academic, behavioral, and social achievement.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Demonstrate knowledge of Applied Behavior Analysis

We desire our graduates to have a deep understanding of the principals, foundations, and practices of Applied Behavior Analysis as measured by the national exam against a criterion of national norms.

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Practice personal and social responsibility
4. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
5. Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations

5 Build on the tradition of the professional education.
6 Diversify and globalize the A&M community.
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exam

The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target: 90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt in graduation semester

Graduate students passed at a rate of 100%, given criterion benchmark.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

BCBA National Exam Scores

Based on the 2015 review of the most recent data available (test year 2013) the TAMU pass rate for first time test takers was 50...

M 2: National Exam

A nationally normed, certification exam for the BCBA is held and results are reported back to the program each year.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target: Pass rate of each graduating class will be above the national average for that corresponding year. 2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam, pass rate nationally was 48%

2014 data indicates 46% pass rate. We do not have more information than this yet.

2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam. National pass rate for 2013 was 48%. We were 4th highest distance program nationally.

M 3: Single Case Study End of year 2
An aggregation of evidence based practices research project is completed, presented and evaluated at the end of year two of the program.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target:**
75% of students earn a score of 90% or higher as evaluated by teacher graded rubric.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
75% of students earned 90% or higher

---

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Competency in Applied Behavior Analysis**

Students will demonstrate competency in applying knowledge and skills of applied behavior analysis through a series of three practical applications in three courses across two years as measured by student grades and teacher nominations for adverse events or individual problems.

**Relevant Associations:**
**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively
4. Practice personal and social responsibility
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
6. Prepare to engage in lifelong learning
7. Work collaboratively

**Graduate Outcome Associations**
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, datasupported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
Texas A&M University
12 Strengthen our graduate programs.
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Comprehensive Exam**
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target:**
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
First time test takers passed at a rate of 100%.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**BCBA National Exam Scores**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
Based on the 2015 review of the most recent data available (test year 2013) the TAMU pass rate for first time test takers was 50...

**M 2: National Exam**
A nationally normed, certification exam for the BCBA is held and results are reported back to the program each year.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
Pass rate of each graduating class will be above the national average for that corresponding year. 2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Partially Met**
2014 data indicates 46% pass rate. We do not have more information than this yet.

2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam. National pass rate for 2013 was 48%. We were 4th highest distance program nationally.

**M 3: Single Case Study End of year 2**
An aggregation of evidence based practices research project is completed, presented and evaluated at the end of year two of the program.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target:**
75% of students earn a score of 90% or higher as evaluated by teacher graded rubric.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
75% of students score above 90

**SLO 3: Demonstrate retention and integration of knowledge across program**

Students will demonstrate retention and integration of knowledge across the program by achieving competency level
completion rates in the final comprehensive exam as measured by growth across formative measures 1, 2, and 3 and by a score above competency criterion.

**Relevant Associations:**

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
6. Prepare to engage in lifelong learning

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

Texas A&M University
12. Meet our commitment to Texas.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Comprehensive Exam**

The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target:**
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% of students passed

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**BCBA National Exam Scores**

Based on the 2015 review of the most recent data available (test year 2013) the TAMU pass rate for first time test takers was 50...

**M 2: National Exam**

A nationally normed, certification exam for the BCBA is held and results are reported back to the program each year.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
Pass rate of each graduating class will be above the national average for that corresponding year. 2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam, national pass rate was 48%

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Partially Met**
2014 data indicates 46% pass rate. We do not have more information than this yet.
2013 data was reported last year our baseline is 50% passing for 6 students who took the exam. National pass rate for 2013 was 48%. We were 4th highest distance program nationally.

**M 3: Single Case Study End of year 2**

An aggregation of evidence based practices research project is completed, presented and evaluated at the end of year two of the program

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target:**
75% of students earn a score of 90% or higher as evaluated by teacher graded rubric.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
75% of students scored above 90%

**SLO 4: Demonstrate bilingual special education competency**

Students will demonstrate bilingual special education competency through successful completion of readings and assignments, assessments, and collaborative activities as measured by faculty ratings and course grades. Sub outcomes include demonstrate an understanding of being able to distinguish the difference between a learning disability and the process of learning a second language and (b) be able to identify effective instructional strategies for ELL with or at risk for disabilities (e.g., reading disabilities).

**Relevant Associations:**

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
3. Communicate effectively
4. Practice personal and social responsibility
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
7. Work collaboratively

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

...
Texas A&M University
2 Strengthen our graduate programs.
6 Diversify and globalize the A&M community.
9 Build community and metropolitan connections.
12 Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target:
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.
100% of students passed comp exam

M 4: Bilingual Special Education Assessment
Knowledge and skills in Bilingual special education will be determined by grade on paper
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target:
90% of Students will score above 80% on target assignment.
96% of students met this target. 1 student scored between 70-79

SLO 5: Demonstrate abilities in assessment and consultation across disabilities and cultures
Students will apply knowledge and skills to demonstrate cultural and diversity competencies within assessment and evaluation processes as measured by scores on collaboration assignments and end of course grades.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target:
90% of students pass comp exam on first attempt.
100% of students passed.

M 5: Assessment and Collaboration
Students will demonstrate knowledge and skill in assessment and collaboration that is legally compliant, culturally and person sensitive, valid and reliable in conclusions by presenting summative assessment materials for fictitious cases and clients as scored by the faculty using in-class rubrics.
Source of Evidence: Faculty scoring rubrics
80% of students will score "meets expectations" which is 85% or higher on rubric

SLO 6: Demonstrate skills and abilities in successful transition planning
Students will demonstrate abilities to assess, plan, and implement transition plans for individuals with disabilities as measured by exams.
Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively
4. Practice personal and social responsibility
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
6. Work collaboratively

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations

Texas A&M University
- Strengthen our graduate programs.
- Diversify and globalize the A&M community.
- Meet our commitment to Texas.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exam

The comprehensive exam is a randomized exam of approximately 40 questions generated from a data bank of several hundred, the questions are stratified by courses so that equal numbers of questions are asked from each course. Instructors write the exam questions and item analysis is used to omit low-discrimination questions.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target: 100% passed.


M 6: Transition Planning

Students will demonstrate knowledge and skill of best practices in transition planning via an end of course content exam.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: 70% of students will earn 80% or higher.


Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Comprehensive Exam

We are currently in stage 4. "Revision of Questions". The comprehensive exam measures pre, mid point, and summative knowledge of all courses. The current item analysis indicates some questions should be removed for poor discrimination and 10 more from each class (12 classes = 120 new questions) are being added. Course realignment has also occurred as a result of this information, both in course sequence and in curriculum changes and book changes. We have also added new learning module components to two courses to cover new material, and removed one course that did not meet our strategic plan. Revised assessment will be given in May to exiting students, and in June to incoming students.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Masters committee

Continuing old action plans

We will continue to work on old action plans for upcoming year.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2015

Assess 2015 course sequence change

Based on a review of BCBA pass rates for first time test takers (50%), and scores on the comprehensive exam (49% correct), and capstone project scores (%< 70), the data indicate students in the distance program may not be accessing new knowledge and / or retaining content and / or applying knowledge to the degree we desire. Therefore beginning Fall 2015 we will implement a course re-alignment and the change of course sequence will be evaluated post-hoc through faculty feedback, formative comprehensive exam for year one and student survey at the end of the year.

Masters committee members, and faculty vote responsible for move of Advanced ABA to spring to follow ABA in the fall. Student learning will be assessed through comprehensive exam to see if this improves scores and social validity will be assessed through student survey. Faculty from each course will review progress and differences in outcomes of the second advance class together.


EOC

Above Expectations (100-91%) | Meets Expectations (90-81%) | Below Expectations (80% or lower)
---|---|---
5 (16.67%) | 16 (53.33%) | 9 (30%)
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

After creating and implementing a comprehensive exam of the program we discovered several things.

1. The pre-test scores of newly admitted students were much higher than expected (approximately 50%). This indicated to us that either a) the test was too easy (we expected scores near 20% which was the guessing floor), b) our students already had the content prior to starting the program which would indicate that we needed to do increase the rigor of our curriculum.

   We determined to work on both revising and improving the test, and evaluate the background of our incoming students. We found that our incoming cohorts were increasing in quality and our curriculum needed revision in its complexity and rigor. We also then surveyed faculty about the qualities they desired in our incoming cohort and the backgrounds to be successful in the class. In the spring 2015 admissions cycle, we will use this information in evaluating incoming students and prepare summaries of cohort background for faculty so that coursework can be adjusted up as needed.

2. The midpoint scores and exiting student scores were flat and consistently flat across cohorts. Students remained at near 50% levels. No statistically significant difference in content as measured on the test. We then surveyed all students and faculty for possible explanations and learned that because the exam was in the pilot phase students did not put forth tremendous efforts in subsequent test taking. We also identified the need for a comprehensive study guide and the elimination of any true/false or 50/50 questions. We have added question content and eliminated true false forth tremendous efforts in subsequent test taking. We also identified the need for a comprehensive study guide and the elimination of any true/false or 50/50 questions. We have added question content and eliminated true false

3. Additional Resources:

   1. Elimination of one course
   2. Addition of a new requirement, new course
   3. Move of learning objectives from eliminated course into two other courses.
   4. Increase in graduate assistance for courses to correspond with increasing enrollment
   5. Required training for all graduate assistants
   6. Begin of quality matter certification process for all courses
   7. Continuous ADA support for materials presentation
   8. Change in course sequence
   9. Change to a fixed cohort model
Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

Progress was made and is ongoing in the action plan to change course sequencing. Using scores on a variety of measures (as previously reported), Faculty voted and we approved the new course sequence. We eliminated one course and moved that content into two others and that program change was formalized and approved. The new sequence will go into effect Summer 2015 with a new cohort of students.

Progress was made and is ongoing in the BCBA national exam scores. 2015 data will be released in the near future and added here, meanwhile an evaluation of competitor programs allowed us to identify new targets for pass rates in the future.

We added a diversity action plan to facilitate what will be a new goal in the future which is to increase diversity of our applicant and admission pool.

We completed goals for creating the exam, piloting, and reviewing scores. We terminated the action plan for increasing criterion levels in our comprehensive exam because we are not yet at a point for establishing a baseline, instead, we revised the exam, eliminating poor questions and adding new question sets. Passing criteria will be determined in spring 2016 after a pre, and formative measure comparison using slope to predict outcome performance for the cohort.
Mission / Purpose

Mission: The mission of the special education program is to improve the quality of services for children and youth with disabilities and their families through teaching, research, and service.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Knowledge & Behavioral Theory & Practice
Graduates of the M.Ed. in Special Education will have knowledge of behavioral theory and practice.

Related Measures

M 1: Complete 5 ABA Courses
Students will successfully complete the 5 courses they need as a component of qualifying for the ABA Graduate Transcripted Certificate.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of graduates sampled will have successfully completed (A or B) SEFB 618, SPED 609, SPED 642, SPED 699, and EPSY 630

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data reported in this cycle.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of graduates successfully completed with (A or B) grades in SEFB 618, SPED 609, SPED 642, SPED 699, and EPSY 630. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Partially Met
2011-2012 performance:
73.7% of 11-12 graduates successfully completed the courses within the ABA graduate certificate.

Explanation:
The SPED Master's program had 19 graduates. Five of these students did not complete the course work to complete the BCBA courses- in these cases 3 students were completing the degree who had enrolled in the previous MEd program prior to the new degree plan implemented in 10-11. Two of the graduates are PhD students now who got their MEd last semester – but have not completed the BCBA certificate work as of yet.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This is a new Master's program that began in Fall 2010; data on program participants will be available beginning in Spring 2012.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Adjust Target
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
If the program has achieved a higher percentage than the target, the target will be adjusted to be higher.

SLO 2: Knowledge & Skills in SPED
Graduates will complete the M.Ed. in special education with knowledge and skills in special education.

Related Measures

M 2: Successful Completion of 36 MEd Credits
Graduates will have completed 36 hours of graduate coursework successfully

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of graduates will complete the program with 3.0 GPAs or greater

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data reported in this cycle.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100 % of graduates successfully completed the program with 3.0 GPAs or greater. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
100% of graduates completed the program with 3.0 GPAs or greater.

Finding (2010-2011) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This is a new Master's program that began in Fall 2010; data on program participants will be available beginning in Spring 2012.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Adjust Target
If the program has achieved a higher percentage than the target, the target will be adjusted to be higher.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Complete 5 ABA Courses | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge & Behavioral Theory & Practice

Implementation Description: Evaluate achievement in comparison to the target.
Responsible Person/Group: SPED Master's Committee Chair
Additional Resources: 2 faculty lines
Budget Amount Requested: $150,000.00 (recurring)

Comprehensive Exam
We are in the process of developing a comprehensive exam for the program which will measure pre-mid-post and follow up knowledge and skills of our students. We will use this data to inform instructional quality and performance of graduates.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Projected Completion Date: 09/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Masters Committee

Continuing old action plans
We will continue to work on old action plans for upcoming year.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Projected Completion Date: 05/2015

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

We are increasing our enrollment numbers based on levels of attrition. We are realigning our curriculum based on pass rates on exams and discussing the move of courses from one semester to another to promote retention of content.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.
The comprehensive masters exam has been piloted at time 1 and will be implemented one time more in Spring 2014 before finalizing its use.
# Summary of Outcome Data Reported for Graduate Certificate Programs

Administered by the Department of Educational Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Certificate</th>
<th>Academic Years Outcome Data are Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Behavioral Analysis</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Science</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission / Purpose

This program, delivered both face-to-face and via online delivery, prepares practitioners who are working with individuals with disabilities. The purpose is to increase knowledge and application of applied behavior analysis approaches, which are considered to be evidence-based practices for working with children with autism and other disabilities, in these practitioners.

Goals

G 1: Certificate signifies advanced knowledge and skill in Applied Behavior Analysis
Students receiving certificate in behavior analysis will demonstrate advanced knowledge and skills in Applied Behavior Analysis aligning with national standards

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Coherent understanding through synthesis
Students progressing and completing the program demonstrate increasing mastery of knowledge and skills related to applied behavior analysis and demonstrate an integrated understanding.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures

M 1: Intervention Assignment
This assignment is to demonstrate understanding of multi-tier programming (prevention and intervention) and to deepen knowledge of the professional literature on a topic of your choosing.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% of students will score 80/100 or above based on first on-time submission of the intervention assignment, based on a grading rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Status: 93% of students scored 80% or above on first-time submission. Target is met.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This data has not yet been collected. No students are in the certificate only option.

No data collected this year
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
There are no certificate-only students to assess during this cycle, therefore no data was collected.

M 2: SCR high-impact capstone rubric
A rubric for the capstone assignment and presentation will reflect cumulative knowledge as scored by two independent raters. The rubric incorporates competencies across the ABA certification program and evaluates a demonstration of knowledge and skills through the design and implementation of an experimental research design.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Connected Document
Single Case Research Study Rubric

Target:
100% of students will score 70% or better on the single case research high-impact capstone rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
not reported this cycle.

M 3: Law and Ethical Applications
Students will prepare and lead an oral presentation on law and ethics, which will be evaluated using a rubric that scores content knowledge and application in law and ethics, along with research activities.
Criteria for these scores follows:

2 = provided thorough summary of ethical codes, relating the codes to case examples
1 = provided thorough summary of ethical codes, but case examples are not clearly and closely connected to this content
0 = summary of ethical code and case are inaccurate or incomplete

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**

90% of the students will be evaluated on their understanding of ethical concepts by receiving only scores of "1" or "2" on related rubric items, which indicate satisfactory performance.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**

43/43 students scored 1 or 2 (100%) on the ethics case. Therefore, the target was met. Note that scores include both students in the special education MS program and certificate only students, as the vast majority of certificate applicants are already pursuing a degree.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No data collected this cycle. No certificate only students enrolled in the certificate at this time.

**SLO 2: Apply knowledge to solve problems**

Students completing 18 credit hours for certification will demonstrate cumulative knowledge and the ability to apply skills by engaging in a high-impact learning project in EPSY 630 Single Case Research.

**Relevant Associations:**

Save Graduate Outcome Associations

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.

1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Intervention Assignment**

This assignment is to demonstrate understanding of multi-tier programming (prevention and intervention) and to deepen knowledge of the professional literature on a topic of your choosing.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**

At least 90% of the students will score "2" or "1", demonstrating satisfactory performance, and no scores of "0", which demonstrates poor performance.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Status: 93% of students scored 80% or above on first-time submission. Target is met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

*BCBA Exam*

**Established in Cycle: 2017-2018**

To support our students in their ability to demonstrate knowledge of Applied Behavior Analysis, and given that approximately 90%...

**M 2: SCR high-impact capstone rubric**

A rubric for the capstone assignment and presentation will reflect cumulative knowledge as scored by two independent raters. The rubric incorporates competencies across the ABA certification program and evaluates a demonstration of knowledge and skills through the design and implementation of an experimental research design.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Connected Document**

Single Case Research Study Rubric

**Target:**

Criteria of scoring 70% or better for 100% of students is expected to be the target

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Not reported this cycle.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No students are currently enrolled in the certificate only program

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**No data collected this year**

**Established in Cycle: 2016-2017**

There are no certificate-only students to assess during this cycle, therefore no data was collected.

**SLO 3: Analyze and integrate information for critical, reasoned arguments**

Students will demonstrate an increasing ability to analyze and integrate evidence based practices and legal principles in the practice of applied behavior analysis.
Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 1: Intervention Assignment
This assignment is to demonstrate understanding of multi-tier programming (prevention and intervention) and to deepen knowledge of the professional literature on a topic of your choosing.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% of students will score 80/100 or above based on first on-time submission of the EBD intervention project, based on a grading rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
not reported cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

*BCBA Exam
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
To support our students in their ability to demonstrate knowledge of Applied Behavior Analysis, and given that approximately 90%...

M 2: SCR high-impact capstone rubric
A rubric for the capstone assignment and presentation will reflect cumulative knowledge as scored by two independent raters. The rubric incorporates competencies across the ABA certification program and evaluates a demonstration of knowledge and skills through the design and implementation of an experimental research design.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Connected Document
Single Case Research Study Rubric

Target:
80% of students will score 80% or better on high-impact capstone rubric TBD

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
not reported this cycle.

M 4: Law Codes Discussion and Cases
Students will present case examples and lead a discussion with the class, sharing their experiences and relating them to law codes. Students must demonstrate analysis and integration of information by making connections between ethical codes, case examples, and their own experiences via questions on a grading rubric.

Ethical code scoring:
2 = Connected cases to the selected code/sub-code.
1 = Connected cases to the code/sub-code but did not clearly relate to the assigned code.
0 = Did not connect cases to the code/sub-code.

Discussion:
2 = Well-led discussion with audience, drawing out numerous examples of cases that apply to the code.
1 = Led a discussion with audience drawing out minimal examples of cases that apply to the code.
0 = Did not initiate a discussion with the audience.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
At least 90% of the students will score "2" or "1", demonstrating satisfactory performance, and no scores of "0", which demonstrates poor performance.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No longer using measure.

M 5: Law Codes Discussion and Cases
Glitch duplicate. Please remove.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

No data collected this year
There are no certificate-only students to assess during this cycle, therefore no data was collected.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Finished
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

Alignment of the program courses with the BCBA Task List #5 is essential in order to maintain status as a Verified Course Sequence and also for our students to be able to sit for and pass their BCBA examination.

**CRITICAL** Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

As this is a relatively new certificate program, no action plan was established last cycle. For this cycle, we have established an action plan that will help to improve the program and student learning. Next cycle, we will be able to address successes, challenges, and/or obstacles in implementing the new action plan developed.

Annual Report Section Responses

How is the program ensuring the comparability of the distance education program with traditional, campus-based (i.e., face to face) programs? Specifically, what data are routinely gathered and reviewed to ensure the quality of the distance education program. Metrics could include, but are not limited to:

- comparisons related to assessment of similar student learning outcomes across modes of delivery or campuses;
- comparisons of student achievement metrics such as retention or student satisfaction;
- comparisons of course evaluation data across modes of delivery or campuses.

The Applied Behavior Analysis Certificate Program utilizes BACB credentialed BCBA or approved faculty to teach the six course sequence. Courses adhere to current BCBA standards for a verified course sequence. Academic and faculty advisors are fully accessible to distance students to assist them as they move through the program.

Provide a summary of findings based on the strategies used by the programs (identified in question 1) to ensure comparability. Be sure to provide a summary of findings as well as contextual or interpretive information.

This year the College completed a review of all distance education courses against face-to-face delivery of courses to ensure that comparable learning is taking place. Memos were written by program faculty and sent to department head for final review and approval. Additionally, program routinely monitors student progress in terms of grades, completion of required courses, required practicum/internships and timely completion program.

What steps have been taken, if any, to improve/strengthen the distance education program to ensure comparability? (i.e., provide the basic components of an Action Plan)

To ensure academic rigor, faculty members who teach online courses often have completed additional professional development related to the quality of online teaching.
Mission / Purpose

Coursework and field work necessary to sit for the Board Certified Behavior Analyst examination.

Goals

G 1: Certification signifies advanced knowledge and skill in Applied Behavior Analysis

Students receiving certificate in behavior analysis will demonstrate advanced knowledge and skills in Applied Behavior Analysis aligning with national standards.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Coherent understanding through synthesis

Students progressing and completing the program demonstrate increasing mastery of knowledge and skills related to applied behavior analysis and demonstrate an integrated understanding.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

Related Measures

M 1: EBD Project Rubric

Rubric scoring will reflect competencies from each class required in certification prior to the EBD course (assessment, behavior management, advanced applied behavior analysis) and include the application of knowledge and skills as applied to a population of interest.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:

Criteria scores will be identified after design and review by faculty and first use by instructor

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

This data has not yet been collected. No students are in the certificate only option.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 2: SCR high-impact capstone rubric

A rubric for the capstone assignment and presentation will reflect cumulative knowledge as scored by two independent raters. The rubric incorporates competencies across the ABA certification program and evaluates a demonstration of knowledge and skills through the design and implementation of an experimental research design.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

M 3: Law and Ethical Applications

Evaluation of a written paper through a rubric includes scoring content knowledge in law and ethics along with research activities.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:

Success on the rubric measure for the the outcome/objective of coherent understanding through synthesis is determined by a score of 80% or better on the rubric for all (100%) students completing the course.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No data collected this cycle. No certificate-only students to assess during this cycle, therefore no data was collected.

SLO 2: Apply knowledge to solve problems

Students completing 18 credit hours for certification will demonstrate cumulative knowledge and the ability to apply skills by engaging in a high-impact learning project in EPSY 630 Single Case Research.

Relevant Associations:

Save

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.

1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

1.6 Develop clear research plans and conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: EBD Project Rubric**
Rubric scoring will reflect competencies from each class required in certification prior to the EBD course (assessment, behavior management, advanced applied behavior analysis) and include the application of knowledge and skills as applied to a population of interest.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**M 2: SCR high-impact capstone rubric**
A rubric for the capstone assignment and presentation will reflect cumulative knowledge as scored by two independent raters. The rubric incorporates competencies across the ABA certification program and evaluates a demonstration of knowledge and skills through the design and implementation of an experimental research design.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target:**
Criteria of scoring 70% or better for 100% of students is expected to be the target

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No students are currently enrolled in the certification only program

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

No data collected this year

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
There are no certificate-only students to assess during this cycle, therefore no data was collected.

**SLO 3: Analyze and integrate information for critical, reasoned arguments**
Students will demonstrate an increasing ability to analyze and integrate evidence based practices and legal principals in the practice of applied behavior analysis

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

1.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice, and develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
1.4 Communicate effectively.
1.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
1.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: EBD Project Rubric**
Rubric scoring will reflect competencies from each class required in certification prior to the EBD course (assessment, behavior management, advanced applied behavior analysis) and include the application of knowledge and skills as applied to a population of interest.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**M 2: SCR high-impact capstone rubric**
A rubric for the capstone assignment and presentation will reflect cumulative knowledge as scored by two independent raters. The rubric incorporates competencies across the ABA certification program and evaluates a demonstration of knowledge and skills through the design and implementation of an experimental research design.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target:**
80% of students will score 80% or better on high-impact capstone rubric TBD

**M 3: Law and Ethical Applications**
Evaluation of a written paper through a rubric includes scoring content knowledge in law and ethics along with research activities.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
Determining success on the outcome/objective of analyzing and integrating information for critical, reasoned arguments will be set at a bar of 80% or higher scoring on the rubric by 100% of the students in the course.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data collected this cycle. No certificate only students enrolled in the certificate at this time.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

No data collected this year

There are no certificate-only students to assess during this cycle, therefore no data was collected.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

Measure: EBD Project Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Coherent understanding through synthesis
Measure: SCR high-impact capstone rubric | Outcome/Objective: Apply knowledge to solve problems
Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

There are no certificate-only students to assess during this cycle, therefore no data was collected.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

There are no previously established action plans from which to provide updates.
Mission / Purpose

The TAMU certificate in CPS is a graduate level certificate that prepares students to address the prevention of adolescent cognitive, social, emotional and physical problems through a transdisciplinary approach.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Intervention
Students will demonstrate knowledge about prevention methods for physical and/or mental health problems from various fields.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures
M 1: SPSY 638 Article Review Assignment
SPSY 638 prevention science article review assignment, which includes identifying a published study (e.g. journal article) evaluating the effects of a prevention intervention in one of the areas discussed in class (e.g., promoting academic achievement, preventing depression, reducing unwanted teenage pregnancies). Review and write a critique of the prevention intervention.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
SPSY 638 Article Review Rubric 2017

Target:
75% of students will be able to apply concepts related to basic training, collaborative activities and collaborative processes within prevention science. Target set as a benchmark since this is the first-year of program assessment.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
As only two students in SPSY 638 were certificate-only students, data cannot be reported this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

SLO 2: Theory
Students will demonstrate the ability to apply theories from within and outside their own discipline to address physical and mental health problems.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures
M 2: SPSY 638 Systematic literature review:
Students will prepare a research synthesis on a prevention or health promotion topic. The paper should describe a particular approach to a problem (e.g. aggression, risk sexual behavior, school failure) or goal (e.g. school completion) or risk (e.g. children of divorce, children exposed to violence).

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
SPSY 638 Systematic Literature Review Rubric

Target:
75% of CPS students will receive satisfactory score (as defined as 160/200) on SPSY 638 systematic literature review, thus indicating that students were able to identify prevention methods for two disciplines to prevent physical or mental health problems.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
As only two students completed the certificate-only tract, no data will be reported this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Update Systematic Lit review to include more interdisciplinarity
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
While we will not be reporting on findings due to the small sample size of certificate completion, We are making changes to the ...
**SLO 3: Research and Evaluation**

Students will be able to evaluate prevention science research and evaluate the evidenced-bases to support prevention and intervention programs.

**Relevant Associations:**

Graduate Outcome Associations

1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

**Related Measures**

**M 3: SPSY 638 Grant Proposal**

Students prepare a grant submission to implement a dropout prevention program, which will involve plans to measure and evaluate the implementation of the program.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**  
SPSY 638 Grant Proposal Rubric

**Target:**

75% of CPS students will receive satisfactory score (defined as 80/100). Satisfactory indicates that students were able to identify the research to support implementing prevention programs, develop plans to measure implementation, evaluate program progress, and measure program success based on expected outcomes.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Only two students on the certificate only track completed the certificate, therefore the data will not be reported this cycle.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Research and Theory**

Based on the results of the post-assessment, we determined there is a gap in students’ reported ability to apply theoretical concepts and models to prevention science research and programming, and the ability to apply research and evaluation methodologies to prevention science research and programming. Will provide students with examples that are transdisciplinary and have students utilize transdisciplinary conceptual frameworks in their final paper in an effort to have students demonstrate ability to apply theory and integrate ideas from other disciplines into research methods (RPTS 689 final paper).

**Established in Cycle:** 2016-2017
**Implementation Status:** Terminated
**Priority:** Medium
**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2017
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty Drs. Outley and Blake

**Update Systematic Lit review to include more interdisciplinarity**

While we will not be reporting on findings due to the small sample size of certificate completion, We are making changes to the SPSY 638 systematic literature review, as we identified a need for a greater interdisciplinary focus to meet the goals of the certificate. Within the course, students will be required to identify multiple disciplines in defining the problem area or disorder that is the prevention focus on their systematic literature review. Additionally, students will be required to identify how at least two disciplines can work in tandem to prevent the target problem area. Multiple discipline intervention topics will be covered throughout the course to provide students opportunity to identify disciplines for the assignment’s focus. Providing more content overview and revising the assignment will improve students’ conceptualization of prevention science and how they work to integrate different disciplinary theories and methods to analyze and prevent a problem area.

**Established in Cycle:** 2017-2018
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** SPSY 638 Systematic literature review | **Outcome/Objective:** Theory

**Implementation Description:** Changes are made to course curriculum for implementation in Fall 2018

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2018
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jamilia Blake

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

*Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?*

All students are required to take SPSY 638 near the conclusion of the certificate program, therefore, many of the assignments serve as a culminating learning experience. As such, this course is designed for students to explore different prevention science theory, intervention, prevention, research, and evaluation. The action plan was created to increase intentionalism in the interdisciplinary goal of the prevention science certificate, which is in alignment with the Society of Prevention Science, a national organization of which the certificate is based. Providing more content overview and revising the assignment will improve students’ conceptualization of prevention science and how they work to integrate different disciplinary theories and methods to analyze and prevent a problem area.

*CRITICAL* Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.
The certificate course plan and learning objectives were revised during the 2017-2018 year. As a result, RPTS 689 final paper (and the actual course) are removed from the course listings available to complete the certificate. Previously, students were able to choose from a variety of approved courses throughout the university to suffice certificate requirements (one of which was RPTS 689). As of 2018-2019, students will have to take the same 5 approved courses to meet certificate requirements. Therefore, the 16-17 action plan regarding gaps in students’ reported ability to apply theoretical concepts and models to prevention science research and programming no longer applies. Despite this change in program, the learning outcomes, and assignments in approved concepts do align to address research and evaluation processes in prevention sciences.
Mission / Purpose

The TAMU certificate in CPS is a graduate level certificate that prepares students to address the prevention of adolescent cognitive, social, emotional and physical problems through a transdisciplinary approach.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Intervention
Students will demonstrate the ability to approach a problem from a transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary lens.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures

M 1: SPSY 638 End of Semester Paper
All students participating in the certificate need to take SPSY 638. The end of semester paper will be reviewing for students' ability to meet learning outcome.

[Description of paper TBD]
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
75% of students will be able to apply concepts related to basic training, collaborative activities and collaborative processes within prevention science. Target set as a benchmark since this is the first-year of program assessment.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

M 2: CPS Evaluative Post-Assessment
This evaluative post-assessment measures training, conceptual frameworks, and collaboration activities related to interdisciplinary research and collaboration within prevention sciences. It includes two open-ended post-certificate questions which ask the student to articulate key components of prevention science foci area related to intervention, theory, and research. Additional sections of the survey are self-assessment which measure collaboration processes, collaboration activities, and training related to prevention science.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
75% of students will report good or better training and collaboration experiences in prevention science. 75% of students will be able to describe key concepts related to transdisciplinary research in the areas of intervention. (Q23 survey).

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of student (n =8) reported a good or better experience when collaborating in the following areas:
- Communicating among collaborators from different disciplines.
- Ability to capitalize on the strengths of different researchers from different disciplines.
- Overall productivity of collaboration

Data based on a 6 point likert scale.
Additionally 100% of students reported that the certificate course training was somewhat or very effective.

Additionally, 7% of students (6/8) were able to use accurately describe key concepts related to transdisciplinary research.

SLO 2: Theory
Students will demonstrate the ability to view research problems and questions holistically from distinct vantage points and transverse multiple levels of analysis.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
1.2 Apply subject matter knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 2: CPS Evaluative Post-Assessment
This evaluative post-assessment measures training, conceptual frameworks, and collaboration activities related to interdisciplinary research and collaboration within prevention sciences. It includes two open-ended post-certificate questions which ask the student to articulate key components of prevention science foci area related to intervention, theory, and research. Additional sections of the survey are self-assessment which measure collaboration processes, collaboration activities, and training related to prevention science.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Connected Document
Prevention Science Evaluative Survey

Target:
75% of students will articulate key concepts and experiences related to transdisciplinary theory, within the context of Prevention Science. Target set as a benchmark since this is the first-year of program assessment.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Measure will no longer be used based on assessment changes.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
62% (n=5 of 8) students articulated key concepts and experiences related to transdisciplinary theory in their post-assessment.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Research and Theory
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Based on the results of the post-assessment, we determined there is a gap in students' reported ability to apply theoretical con...

M 3: RPTS 689 Participatory Research Paper
It is important that you have an opportunity to synthesize the information gathered throughout this course. The research orientation paper will guide this synthesis, and it may even be applicable for the methodology section of your thesis or dissertation. The 10-15 page paper (double spaced) will address the following questions:

What is the orientation of a participatory action researcher?
What is the history upon which PAR researchers stand?
What are the principles and practices of PAR?
How has PAR been used in your area of interest?
Why would you choose to use or how would you justify a PAR approach?
How does PAR fit with your own personal orientation to research and community involvement?

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
75% of students will be able to apply theoretical concepts and models to prevention science research and programming. Target set as a benchmark since this is the first-year of program assessment.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No longer being used due to assessment program changes.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

SLO 3: Research
Students will demonstrate the ability to engage within and outside of disciplines and integrate ideas with the intent of collaborating on research.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
1.3 Use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures

M 2: CPS Evaluative Post-Assessment
This evaluative post-assessment measures training, conceptual frameworks, and collaboration activities related to interdisciplinary research and collaboration within prevention sciences. It includes two open-ended post-certificate questions which ask the student to articulate key components of prevention science foci area related to intervention, theory, and research. Additional sections of the survey are self-assessment which measure collaboration processes, collaboration activities, and training related to prevention science.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Connected Document
Prevention Science Evaluative Survey

Target:
75% of students will report that interdisciplinary research and training is important in prevention science. 75% of students will be able to describe key concepts related to transdisciplinary research in the areas of research. Target set as a benchmark since this is the first-year of program assessment.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
75% of students were able to accurately describe key concepts related to transdisciplinary research.

100% (n=8) of students positively on the importance and value of transdisciplinary research and training,
including cost effectiveness, influence on future career prospects, its contribution to higher quality scholarship, and the likelihood to conduct trans disciplinary research in the future.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Research and Theory**

*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*

Based on the results of the post-assessment, we determined there is a gap in students' reported ability to apply theoretical concepts and models to prevention science research and programming, and the ability to apply research and evaluation methodologies to prevention science research and programming. Will provide students with examples that are transdisciplinary and have students utilize transdisciplinary conceptual frameworks in their final paper in an effort to have students demonstrate ability to apply theory and integrate ideas from other disciplines into research methods (RPTS 689 final paper).

**M 3: RPTS 689 Participatory Research Paper**

It is important that you have an opportunity to synthesize the information gathered throughout this course. The research orientation paper will guide this synthesis, and it may even be applicable for the methodology section of your thesis or dissertation. The 10-15 page paper (double spaced) will address the following questions:

What is the orientation of a participatory action researcher?
What is the history upon which PAR researchers stand?
What are the principles and practices of PAR?
How has PAR been used in your area of interest?
Why would you choose to use or how would you justify a PAR approach?
How does PAR fit with your own personal orientation to research and community involvement?

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**

75% of students will be able to apply research and evaluation methodologies to prevention science research and programming. Target set as a benchmark since this is the first-year of program assessment.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No longer being used due to assessment program changes.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Not reported this cycle.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Research and Theory**

Based on the results of the post-assessment, we determined there is a gap in students' reported ability to apply theoretical concepts and models to prevention science research and programming, and the ability to apply research and evaluation methodologies to prevention science research and programming. Will provide students with examples that are transdisciplinary and have students utilize transdisciplinary conceptual frameworks in their final paper in an effort to have students demonstrate ability to apply theory and integrate ideas from other disciplines into research methods (RPTS 689 final paper).

**Established in Cycle: 2016-2017**

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** CPS Evaluative Post-Assessment | **Outcome/Objective:** Research | Theory

**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2017

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty Drs. Outley and Blake

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

Based on the results of the CPS Post-Assessment we are implementing trans-disciplinary concepts into RPTS 689 research course. These intentional learning engagement activities will improve knowledge, understanding, and application related to intervention and research.

Additionally, this is the first year we are using the post-assessment to measure learning, as it is difficult to capture learning experiences since students have multiple course options across Schools/colleges from which to meet the certificate requirements. We will be revisiting the effectiveness of the post-assessment, and making needed changes in the coming cycles.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

No previous action plans exist as this is the first year the certificate is being assessed.
## Summary of Outcome Data Reported for PhD Programs Administered by the Department of Educational Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Programs</th>
<th>Academic Years Outcome Data are Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD EPSY- Bilingual Education Specialization</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD EPSY - Learning Sciences Specialization</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD EPSY - Special Education Specialization</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD School Psychology</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission / Purpose

The Counseling Psychology program at Texas A&M University (TAMU) offers doctoral education and training in psychology, with the expressed intention of preparing students for the practice of professional psychology. It endorses and subscribes to the scientist-practitioner model for the training of professional psychologists. The primary mission of the program is the development of psychologists who recognize the importance of and are equipped to engage in scholarly inquiry and the application of various methods to the resolution of problems encountered at the individual level, in institutions/clinics, and at the societal/community level. The program endeavors to train psychologists capable of contributing to the health care of diverse populations, from perspectives of prevention and intervention. The training program attempts to equip students to work in a variety of private and institutional settings, including public/private schools and universities, the military, hospitals, and various government agencies. The program emphasizes and promotes diversity issues related to the practice of psychology, as well as addressing achievement and mental health disparities among minority populations. Rigorous academic standards are maintained, and teaching, supervision, and research experiences are made available so students may successfully compete for academic positions at colleges and universities throughout the country as well as university counseling centers, VA hospitals, mental health facilities, and the military.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Mastery of Content Knowledge
Students will be able to exhibit a coherent understanding of discipline-specific knowledge

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in exhibiting a coherent understanding of counseling psychology knowledge, theories and competences.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met
60% (6/10) of students received a score of 4 or higher in exhibiting a coherent understanding of counseling psychology knowledge, theories and competences. This target was not met.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Rubric results for N of 8 indicate that 100% of students scored a 4 or above in mastery of content knowledge, including counseling psychology theories, models, and competences. Based on the results, this target was met. The mean score for this domain was 0.93 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for N of 5 indicate that 60% of students scored a 4 or above in mastery of content knowledge, including counseling psychology theories, models, and competences. Based on the results, this target was not met.

SLO 2: Knowledge Application
Students will be able to apply discipline specific knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems, make and justify decisions?

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Target: 90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in applying the scientist-practitioner model to solve problems, make and justify clinical and empirical decisions.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met
60% of students (6/10) scored a 4 of higher (exceeded expectations) in applying the scientist-practitioner model to solve problems, make and justify clinical and empirical decisions. This target was not met.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Rubric results for N of 8 indicate that 100% of students scored a 4 or above in their ability to apply the scientist-practitioner model to solve problems, make and justify clinical and empirical decisions. Therefore this target was met. The mean score for this domain was 1.33 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for N of 5 indicate that 40% of students scored a 4 or above in their ability to apply the scientist-practitioner model to solve problems, make and justify clinical and empirical decisions. Therefore this target was not met.

SLO 3: Apply Tools and Strategies
Students will be able to use a variety of sources and evaluates multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures
M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target: 90% of students will score a 4 or higher in their ability to use a variety of sources to evaluate, analyze, and integrate multiple points of view.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met
50% (5/10) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to use a variety of sources to evaluate, analyze, and integrate multiple points of view. This target was not met.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Results for n of 8 indicate that 100% students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to use a variety of sources to evaluate, analyze, and integrate multiple points of view. Therefore this target was met. The mean score for this domain was 0.93 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Results for n of 5 indicate that 40% students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to use a variety of sources to evaluate, analyze, and integrate multiple points of view. Therefore this target was not met.

SLO 4: Effective Communication
Students will be able to communicate effectively.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures
M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target: 90% of students score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in communicating effectively.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met
60% (6/10) of students scored a 4 or higher on the rubric labeled communicating effectively.
Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Rubric results for n of 8 indicate that 100% scored a 4 or higher their ability to communicate effectively. Based on the results, this target was met. The mean score for this domain was 1.10 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 40% scored a 4 or higher their ability to communicate effectively. Based on the results, this target was not met.

SLO 5: Teaching Subject Matter
Students will be able to teach or explain the subject matter in their discipline to a broad range of audiences

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

Related Measures
M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in their ability to teach or explain subject matter specific to Counseling psychology to various audiences.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met
60% (6/10) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to teach or explain subject matter specific to Counseling psychology to various audiences. The target was not met.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Rubric results for n of 8 indicate that 100% scored a 4 or higher in their ability to teach or explain subject matter specific to Counseling psychology to various audiences. Therefore this target was met. The mean score for this domain was 1.53 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 20% scored a 4 or higher in their ability to teach or explain subject matter specific to Counseling psychology to various audiences. Therefore this target was not met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Enhancement of Teaching Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Regarding 2017-2018 lowest scored domains, the lowest three includes teaching subject matter (3.70), developing research plans...

SLO 6: Technology
Students will be able to exhibit proficiency in technology appropriate to solve problems in their discipline.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures
M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in exhibiting proficiency in technology appropriate to solve problems or provide clinical treatment solutions within Counseling psychology.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met
66.6% (6/9) of students scored a 4 or higher in exhibiting proficiency in technology appropriate to solve problems or provide clinical treatment solutions within Counseling psychology. Of the three students who did not meet the targets, they scored a 2/5. This target was not met. One student was excluded from the sample due to not receiving a score.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 8 indicate that 86% of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to exhibit proficiency in technology appropriate to solve problems or provide clinical treatment solutions within Counseling Psychology. Based on the results, this target was not met. The mean score for this domain was 1.37 higher...
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 20% (1/5) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to exhibit proficiency in technology appropriate to solve problems or provide clinical treatment solutions within Counseling Psychology. Based on the results, this target was not met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Technology Increases
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
We plan to set a goal to increase the number of students who complete at telehealth practicum, in an effort to improve learning ...

Enhancement of Teaching Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Regarding 2017-2018 lowest scored domains, the lowest three includes teaching subject matter (3.70), developing research plans...

SLO 7: Ethical Action
Students will be able to choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures
M 1: CITI Training
Students will complete CITI training, which is a web-based ethics training course for those conducting research with human subjects. All principal investigators, co-investigators, and study personnel must complete CITI training with a minimum score of 90 percent.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target:
100% of students will complete CITI training.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not an active measure. System glitch.

M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in their ability to choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met
80% (8/10) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to choose ethical courses of action in research and practice. Of the two who did not meet requirements, they scored a 2 out of 5.

This target was not met.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Rubric results for n of 8 indicate that 100% of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to choose ethical courses of action in research and practice. Based on the results, this target was met. The mean score for this domain was 0.73 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 60% (3/5) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to choose ethical courses of action in research and practice. Based on the results, this target was not met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Enhancement of Teaching Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Regarding 2017-2018 lowest scored domains, the lowest three includes teaching subject matter (3.70), developing research plans...

SLO 8: Develop Research Plans
Students will be able to develop clear, hypothesis driven research plans.

RelevantAssociations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.
**Related Measures**

**M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric**
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time of or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students will score a 4 or higher in developing clear, hypothesis driven research plans.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met**
70% (7/10) of students scored a 4 or higher in developing clear, hypothesis driven research plans. Of the students who did not meet the target, two scored a 2 or below. The target was not met.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met**
Rubric results for n of 8 indicate that 75% scored a 4 or higher in their ability to develop clear, hypothesis driven research plans as evidenced through their dissertation. Based on the results, this target was not met. The mean score for this domain was 1.00 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 20% (1/5) scored a 4 or higher in their ability to develop clear, hypothesis driven research plans as evidenced through their dissertation. Based on the results, this target was not met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Research Development**
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Target areas for additional development include: developing research plans, conducting research, and disseminating research. Sys...

**Enhancement of Teaching Opportunities**
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Regarding 2017-2018 lowest scored domains, the lowest three includes teaching subject matter (3.70), developing research plans...

**SLO 9: Conduct research**
Students will be able to conduct valid, data supported and theoretically consistent research.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**
2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric**
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time of or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in conducting valid, data supported and theoretically consistent research.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met**
70% (7/10) of students scored a 4 or higher in conducting valid, data supported and theoretically consistent research. 2/3 of students who did not meet the target scored a 3. The target was not met.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met**
Rubric results for n of 8 indicate that 75% of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to conduct valid, data supported and theoretically consistent research. Based on the results, this target was not met. The mean score for this domain was 1.00 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 20% (1/5) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to conduct valid, data supported and theoretically consistent research. Based on the results, this target was not met. [Preview Formatting]

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Research Development**
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Target areas for additional development include: developing research plans, conducting research, and disseminating research. Sys...
Enhancement of Teaching Opportunities  
*Established in Cycle: 2017-2018*

Regarding 2017-2018 lowest scored domains, the lowest three includes teaching subject matter (3.70), developing research plans...

**SLO 10: Disseminate research**

Students will be able to effectively disseminate research results in appropriate contexts.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric**

Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document:

[2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric](#)

**Target:**

90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in disseminating research results, as evidenced through submitting manuscripts to journals and peer reviewed conferences.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met**

60% (6/10) of students scored a 4 or higher in disseminating research results, as evidenced through submitting manuscripts to journals and peer reviewed conferences. 3/4 students who did not meet the target scored at a 2 or below. The target was not met.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met**

Rubric results for n of 8 indicate that 75% of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to disseminate research results, as evidenced by submitting manuscripts to journals and peer reviewed conferences. Based on the results, this target was not met. The mean score for this domain was 1.00 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**

Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 40% (2/5) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to disseminate research results, as evidenced by submitting manuscripts to journals and peer reviewed conferences. Every student is required to submit at least one manuscript for publication, though many are encouraged to submit more. All students met expectations of submitting at least once manuscript throughout their educational experience.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Research Development**

*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*

Target areas for additional development include: developing research plans, conducting research, and disseminating research. Sys...

**Enhancement of Teaching Opportunities**

*Established in Cycle: 2017-2018*

Regarding 2017-2018 lowest scored domains, the lowest three includes teaching subject matter (3.70), developing research plans...

---

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Action Plan**

Goals have been met.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Action Plan to meet Publishing goals**

We are going to ensure student provide necessary data. Faculty will monitor and assist students in their publication activity.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2017  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

**Technology Increases**

We plan to set a goal to increase the number of students who complete at telehealth practicum, in an effort to improve learning within technology. Telehealth services emerged out of evolving standards whereby practitioners provide distance health services to patients by using virtual and telecommunications. Completing a telehealth practicum provides students with opportunities to increase awareness of practices and legal issues of delivering mental health services at a distance in comparison to in person services.

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016  
**Implementation Status:** Terminated
Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
We will restructure the times by which students are evaluated using the Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric, from fully at the time of dissertation to 1) rubrics post 1-6 to be measured at the completion of coursework as students are applying for internships and 2) points 7-10 to be evaluated at the time of dissertation defense. This timing was changed to capture student competencies within a more accurate timeframe that aligns with the expected developmental progress. By adjusting the period of assessment implementation to a more formative approach, it will provide program faculty with a snapshot of student performance so that ongoing improvements and adjustments can be made to current student performance.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 06/2018

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Technology

Research Development
Target areas for additional development include: developing research plans, conducting research, and disseminating research. Systemically, we need more equitable advisor to advisee ratio to ensure adequate exposure and one-on-one training as it relates to research skill development. Balancing the distribution of advisees between more faculty will ensure that each student receive adequate time, attention, and feedback from which to develop critical skills related to research and dissemination. This is particularly important as advisors are the key contributors to students’ successful development of research skills.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Conduct research
Develop Research Plans | Disseminate research

Implementation Description: We will work with faculty who teach research course CPSY 690 to provide more explicit training
Projected Completion Date: 06/2019

Enhancement of Teaching Opportunities
Regarding 2017-2018 lowest scored domains, the lowest three includes teaching subject matter (3.70), developing research plans (3.60), and disseminating research (3.60). In this regard, 2/3 domains are the same as 2016-2017 average scores. 2/3 of the lowest scores overlap with the lowest 2016-2017 scored domains and tells that students may need additional assistance. As we have another action plan in place regarding these research domains, we will continue to work towards meeting the goals of that action plan. Additionally, regarding teaching experiences, we will outline clearer expectations and highlight more resources available to students (e.g. Center for Teaching Excellence Future Faculty training academy) to enhance teaching performance.

Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Conduct research
Develop Research Plans | Disseminate research | Ethical Action | Teaching Subject Matter | Technology

Projected Completion Date: 05/2020
Responsible Person/Group: Tim Elliott Program Chair

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?
Unfortunately, none of the targets were met this assessment cycle. This is largely do to such a mathematically small sample size, requiring all eight students to score a 4 or higher to meet the target. Among all rubric domains, students did not meet achievement targets of 90% receive exceeds expectations. We believe that there are several reasons to explain student performance. 1) Statistically, we have a small number of students in CPSY Ph.D. program, and thus often one student's failure to score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) on rubric domains will cause the target not to be met. 2) It has been discovered that some faculty were incorrectly scoring students on the rubric. Of the students assessed this year, 7/8 were recommended for post doc positions, as evidenced on the rubric. This means, that despite lower than expected scores, faculty are confident that students would succeed beyond the academic program.

However, it should be noted that students' scores are lower on average than reported last year, but the areas in which students are lower is not in congruence with last year's student performance. For instance, in 2016-2017, students scored the highest on teaching subject matter 4.43/5, knowledge application 4.43/5, and ethical actions 4.43/5. Lowest average scores were dissemination of research 4.00/5, developing research plans 4.14/5, conducting research 4.14/5, and technology 4.14/5. It should be noted that while the students scored lower in 4 domains, the mean score was still at are above 4.00, which is exceeds expectations (the target). In comparison, 2017-2018 students' highest average scores were for mastery of content knowledge (4.10), ethical action (4.00), and conducting research (4.00). As you can see, only ethical actions (1/3 domains) overlaps in highest performance in comparison to this year. As well, students mean score is 4.00 or higher, thus showing exceeds expectations. In some regard it is difficult to ascertain if students' rubric scores are due to individual students are due to program outcomes.

That being said, we do not believe that failing to meet achievement targets as outlined in the assessment plan accurately portrays student performance and thus will be changing the target to account for mean student performance instead of a percentage of individual student scores. Targets will be adjusted for next year to reflect mean performance.
among students, instead of an individual performance represented in percentage form.

Beyond the above mentioned issues, we selected enhanced teaching opportunities to address the recent dip in teaching performance, as scored on the rubric. We believe this should assist students in supplementing their higher education teaching skills.

*CRITICAL* Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

Research Development (2016-2017): This action plan is still in progress, though challenging to track progress as it relies on chair one-on-one development with students. Data from this year shows that students continue to perform lower in research development categories, and thus more work may be needed to enhance learning in this regard.

Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric: This action plan was not completed as planned. We will revisit rubric data collection processes at the next program faculty retreat.
Mission / Purpose

The Counseling Psychology program at Texas A&M University (TAMU) offers doctoral education and training in psychology, with the expressed intention of preparing students for the practice of professional psychology. It endorses and subscribes to the scientist-practitioner model for the training of professional psychologists. The primary mission of the program is the development of psychologists who recognize the importance of and are equipped to engage in scholarly inquiry and the application of various methods to the resolution of problems encountered at the individual level, in institutions/clinics, and at the societal/community level. The program endeavors to train psychologists capable of contributing to the health care of diverse populations, from perspectives of prevention and intervention. The training program attempts to equip students to work in a variety of private and institutional settings, including public/private schools and universities, the military, hospitals, and various government agencies. The program emphasizes and promotes diversity issues related to the practice of psychology, as well as addressing achievement and mental health disparities among minority populations. Rigorous academic standards are maintained, and teaching, supervision, and research experiences are made available so students may successfully compete for academic positions at colleges and universities throughout the country as well as university counseling centers, VA hospitals, mental health facilities, and the military.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Mastery of Content Knowledge
Students will be able to exhibit a coherent understanding of discipline-specific knowledge

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures
M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in exhibiting a coherent understanding of counseling psychology knowledge, theories and competences.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Rubric results for N of 8 indicate that 100% of students scored a 4 or above in mastery of content knowledge, including counseling psychology theories, models, and competences. Based on the results, this target was met. The mean score for this domain was 0.93 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for N of 5 indicate that 60% of students scored a 4 or above in mastery of content knowledge, including counseling psychology theories, models, and competences. Based on the results, this target was not met.

SLO 2: Knowledge Application
Students will be able to apply discipline specific knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems, make and justify decisions?

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures
M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Target:
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in applying the scientist-practitioner model to solve problems, make and justify clinical and empirical decisions.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Rubric results for N of 8 indicate that 100% of students scored a 4 or above in their ability to apply the scientist-practitioner model to solve problems, make and justify clinical and empirical decisions. Therefore this target was met. The mean score for this domain was 1.33 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for N of 5 indicate that 40% of students scored a 4 or above in their ability to apply the scientist-practitioner model to solve problems, make and justify clinical and empirical decisions. Therefore this target was not met.

SLO 3: Apply Tools and Strategies
Students will be able to use a variety of sources and evaluates multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures
M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
Results for n of 8 indicate that 100% students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to use a variety of sources to evaluate, analyze, and integrate multiple points of view. Therefore this target was met.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Results for n of 8 indicate that 100% students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to use a variety of sources to evaluate, analyze, and integrate multiple points of view. Therefore this target was met. The mean score for this domain was 0.93 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Results for n of 5 indicate that 40% students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to use a variety of sources to evaluate, analyze, and integrate multiple points of view. Therefore this target was not met.

SLO 4: Effective Communication
Students will be able to communicate effectively.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures
M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in communicating effectively.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Rubric results for n of 8 indicate that 100% scored a 4 or higher their ability to communicate effectively. Based on the results, this target was met. The mean score for this domain was 1.10 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 40% scored a 4 or higher their ability to communicate effectively. Based on the results, this target was not met.

SLO 5: Teaching Subject Matter
Students will be able to teach or explain the subject matter in their discipline to a broad range of audiences
Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

Related Measures

M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document

2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in their ability to teach or explain subject matter specific to Counseling psychology to various audiences.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Rubric results for n of 8 indicate that 100% scored a 4 or higher in their ability to teach or explain subject matter specific to Counseling psychology to various audiences. Therefore this target was met. The mean score for this domain was 1.53 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 20% scored a 4 or higher in their ability to teach or explain subject matter specific to Counseling psychology to various audiences. Therefore this target was not met.

SLO 6: Technology
Students will be able to exhibit proficiency in technology appropriate to solve problems in their discipline.

Related Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures

M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document

2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in exhibiting proficiency in technology appropriate to solve problems or provide clinical treatment solutions within Counseling psychology.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 8 indicate that 88% of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to exhibit proficiency in technology appropriate to solve problems or provide clinical treatment solutions within Counseling Psychology. Based on the results, this target was not met. The mean score for this domain was 1.37 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 20% (1/5) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to exhibit proficiency in technology appropriate to solve problems or provide clinical treatment solutions within Counseling Psychology. Based on the results, this target was not met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Technology Increases
Established In Cycle: 2015-2016
We plan to set a goal to increase the number of students who complete at telehealth practicum, in an effort to improve learning ...

SLO 7: Ethical Action
Students will be able to choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 1: CITI Training
Students will complete CITI training, which is a web-based ethics training course for those conducting research with human subjects. All principal investigators, co-investigators, and study personnel must complete CITI training with a minimum score of 90 percent.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Connected Document  
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
100% of students will complete CITI training.

SLO 8: Develop Research Plans
Students will be able to develop clear, hypothesis driven research plans.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Findings:
Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Rubric results for n of 8 indicate that 100% of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to choose ethical courses of action in research and practice. Based on the results, this target was met. The mean score for this domain was 0.73 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 60% (3/5) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to choose ethical courses of action in research and practice. Based on the results, this target was not met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Target areas for additional development include: developing research plans, conducting research, and disseminating research.

SLO 9: Conduct research
Students will be able to conduct valid, data supported and theoretically consistent research.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Registered Document  
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in conducting valid, data supported and theoretically consistent research.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 8 indicate that 75% of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to conduct valid, data supported and theoretically consistent research. Based on the results, this target was not met. The mean score for this domain was 1.00 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 20% (1/5) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to conduct valid, data supported and theoretically consistent research. Based on the results, this target was not met. [Preview Formatting]

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Research Development
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Target areas for additional development include: developing research plans, conducting research, and disseminating research. Sys...

SLO 10: Disseminate research
Students will be able to effectively disseminate research results in appropriate contexts.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations

2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

Related Measures
M 2: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time of or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in disseminating research results, as evidenced through submitting manuscripts to journals and peer reviewed conferences.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 8 indicate that 75% of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to disseminate research results, as evidenced by submitting manuscripts to journals and peer reviewed conferences. Based on the results, this target was not met. The mean score for this domain was 1.00 higher this year than in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Thus, this cohort of students seem to be demonstrating learning at a great depth.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 40% (2/5) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to disseminate research results, as evidenced by submitting manuscripts to journals and peer reviewed conferences. Every student is required to submit at least one manuscript for publication, though many are encouraged to submit more. All students met expectations of submitting at least one manuscript throughout their educational experience.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Research Development
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Target areas for additional development include: developing research plans, conducting research, and disseminating research. Sys...

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Action Plan
Goals have been met.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Action Plan to meet Publishing goals
We are going to ensure student provide necessary data. Faculty will monitor and assist students in their publication activity.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 06/2017
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty
Technology Increases
We plan to set a goal to increase the number of students who complete at telehealth practicum, in an effort to improve learning within technology. Telehealth services emerged out of evolving standards whereby practitioners provide distance health services to patients by using virtual and telecommunications. Completing a telehealth practicum provides students with opportunities to increase awareness of practices and legal issues of delivering mental health services at a distance in comparison to in person services.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Technology

Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric
We will restructure the times by which students are evaluated using the Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric, from fully at the time of dissertation to 1) rubrics post 1-6 to be measured at the completion of coursework as students are applying for internships and 2) points 7-10 to be evaluated at the time of dissertation defense. This timing was changed to capture student competencies within a more accurate timeframe that aligns with the expected developmental progress. By adjusting the period of assessment implementation to a more formative approach, it will provide program faculty with a snap shot of student performance so that ongoing improvements and adjustments can be made to current student performance.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 06/2018

Research Development
Target areas for additional development include: developing research plans, conducting research, and disseminating research. Systemically, we need more equitable advisor to advisee ratio to ensure adequate exposure and one-on-one training as it relates to research skill development. Balancing the distribution of advisees between more faculty will ensure that each student receive adequate time, attention, and feedback from which to develop critical skills related to research and dissemination. This is particularly important as advisors are the key contributors to students’ successful development of research skills.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Conduct research | Develop Research Plans | Disseminate research

Implementation Description: We will work with faculty who teach research course CPSY 690 to provide more explicit training
Projected Completion Date: 06/2019

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

We observed notable improvements in student performance within each rubric domain in comparison to 2015-2016 cohort. Now that we have two years of data we have identified three key areas related to research to improve student learning. We chose to address equitable distribution of advisees to program advisors based on the knowledge that advisors have an integral role in the development of a successful research plan, sound research, and the dissemination of research results (as evidenced by the dissertation defense). Balancing the distribution of advisees between more faculty will ensure that each student receive adequate time, attention, and feedback from which to develop critical skills related to research and dissemination. We will also review curriculum in CPSY 690 class on research to ensure that students are provided with in depth training and knowledge related to research practices within Counseling Psychology.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

2015-2016 action plan involved increasing the number of students who complete the telehealth practicum. Telehealth practicum is not a requirement for all students, it self-selected. After leadership changes within the program, it was decided to refocus learning improvement in areas where all students would benefit. Therefore, we did not set to increase the goal of student participants in telehealth practicums.
Mission / Purpose

The Counseling Psychology program at Texas A&M University (TAMU) offers doctoral education and training in psychology, with the expressed intention of preparing students for the practice of professional psychology. It endorses and subscribes to the scientist-practitioner model for the training of professional psychologists. The primary mission of the program is the development of psychologists who recognize the importance of and are equipped to engage in scholarly inquiry and the application of various methods to the resolution of problems encountered at the individual level, in institutions/clinics, and at the societal/community level. The program endeavors to train psychologists capable of contributing to the health care of diverse populations, from perspectives of prevention and intervention. The training program attempts to equip students to work in a variety of private and institutional settings, including public/private schools and universities, the military, hospitals, and various government agencies. The program emphasizes and promotes diversity issues related to the practice of psychology, as well as addressing achievement and mental health disparities among minority populations. Rigorous academic standards are maintained, and teaching, supervision, and research experiences are made available so students may successfully compete for academic positions at colleges and universities throughout the country as well as university counseling centers, VA hospitals, mental health facilities, and the military.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Effective Communication
Demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures

M 1: Conference Presentation Evidence
Evidence of presenting at a conference
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target:
90% of students will have presented by the time they graduate.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The program redesigned learning outcomes and will discontinue measuring this outcome in the future.

100% of students presented at a conference. Therefore, the target is met.

M 6: Comprehensive Exams
Students are evaluated during their comp. exams. (methodology description - communication, research skills, content knowledge, analysis & Critical thinking)

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

SLO 2: Ethical and Legal Action
Demonstrate understanding and application of ethical and legal courses of action

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 5: CITI Training
Students will complete CITI training, which is a web-based ethics training course for those conducting research with human subjects. All principal investigators, co-investigators, and study personnel must complete CITI training with a minimum score of 90 percent.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target:
100% of students should graduate with CITI training at time of graduation.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The program redesigned learning outcomes and will discontinue measuring this outcome in the future.

All students completed required CITI training before graduation. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 3: Professional Field Experience
Engage in professional field experiences in various settings to demonstrate competencies in assessment, intervention, and consultation

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations

2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 3: Professional Experience
Evidence of participating in a professional activity
Source of Evidence: Professional standards
Target: 90% of graduating students will have a professional experience
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
100% of students had professional experience. Therefore, the target is met

SLO 5: Mastering Degree Requirements
Master the degree requirements and complete graduation within allowable time period

Related Measures:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

M 4: Time to Graduation
Most of CPSY doctoral students will graduate within a specified time period.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target: 90% of students will complete all program requirements and graduate within 6 years time-frame including 1 year of internship.
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
All students graduated within the targeted time frame. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 6: Clear Research Plan
Students should be able to develop and execute research plan using publications as evidence

Related Measures:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

M 2: Manuscript Submission Evidence
Evidence of submitting a manuscript to a journal
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target: 90% of Students will publish or submit to a peer reviewed journal
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
83% of students submitted manuscript or published in peer reviewed journal. Therefore, the target is not met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan to meet Publishing goals
We are going to ensure student provide necessary data. Faculty will monitor and assist students in their publication activity.

SLO 7: Strategies and Tools
Students should be able to use various strategies and tools to produce research

Related Measures:

M 1: Conference Presentation Evidence
Evidence of presenting at a conference
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
90% of students will have presented by the time they graduate.

- **Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The program redesigned learning outcomes and will discontinue measuring this outcome in the future.

- **Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
100% of students presented at a conference. Therefore, the target is met.

**M 2: Manuscript Submission Evidence**
Evidence of submitting a manuscript to a journal

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
90% of Students will publish or submit to a peer reviewed journal

- **Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The program redesigned its learning outcomes and this outcome will not be measured.

- **Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Met**
83% of students submitted manuscript or published in peer reviewed journal. Therefore, the target is not met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Action Plan to meet Publishing goals**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
We are going to ensure student provide necessary data. Faculty will monitor and assist students in their publication activity.

**SLO 8: Mastery of Content Knowledge**
Students will be able to exhibit a coherent understanding of discipline-specific knowledge

**Relevant Associations:**
**Graduate Outcome Associations**
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Dissertation**
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in exhibiting a coherent understanding of counseling psychology knowledge, theories and competences.

- **Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**
Rubric results for N of 5 indicate that 60% of students scored a 4 or above in mastery of content knowledge, including counseling psychology theories, models, and competences. Based on the results, this target was not met.

**SLO 9: Knowledge Application**
Students will be able to apply discipline specific knowledge in a range of contexts to solve problems, make and justify decisions?

**Relevant Associations:**
**Graduate Outcome Associations**
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Dissertation**
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in applying the scientist-practitioner model to solve problems, make and justify clinical and empirical decisions.

- **Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**
Rubric results for N of 5 indicate that 40% of students scored a 4 or above in their ability to apply the scientist-practitioner model to solve problems, make and justify clinical and empirical decisions. Therefore this target was not met.
SLO 10: Apply Tools and Strategies
Students will be able to use a variety of sources and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information.

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Dissertation**
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in their ability to use a variety of sources and evaluates multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**
Results for n of 5 indicate that 40% students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to use a variety of sources to evaluate, analyze, and integrate multiple points of view. Therefore this target was not met.

SLO 11: Effective Communication
Students will be able to communicate effectively.

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.3 Communicate effectively.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Dissertation**
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in communicating effectively.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 40% scored a 4 or higher their ability to communicate effectively. Based on the results, this target was not met.

SLO 12: Teaching Subject Matter
Students will be able to teach or explain the subject matter in their discipline to a broad range of audiences

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Dissertation**
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in their ability to teach or explain subject matter specific to Counseling psychology to various audiences.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 20% scored a 4 or higher in their ability to teach or explain subject matter specific to Counseling psychology to various audiences. Therefore this target was not met.

SLO 13: Technology
Students will be able to exhibit proficiency in technology appropriate to solve problems in their discipline.

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Dissertation**
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

**Source of Evidence:** Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**

[2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric](#)

**Target:**

90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in exhibiting proficiency in technology appropriate to solve problems or provide clinical treatment solutions within Counseling psychology.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**

Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 20% (1/5) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to exhibit proficiency in technology appropriate to solve problems or provide clinical treatment solutions within Counseling Psychology. Based on the results, this target was not met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the [Details of Action Plans](#) section of this report.

**Technology Increases**

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016

We plan to set a goal to increase the number of students who complete at telehealth practicum, in an effort to improve learning ...

**SLO 14: Ethical Action**

Students will be able to choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Relevant Associations:**

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: CITI Training**

Students will complete CITI training, which is a web-based ethics training course for those conducting research with human subjects. All principal investigators, co-investigators, and study personnel must complete CITI training with a minimum score of 90 percent.

**Source of Evidence:** Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**M 7: Dissertation**

Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

**Source of Evidence:** Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**

[2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric](#)

**Target:**

90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in developing clear, hypothesis driven research plans.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**

Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 20% (1/5) scored a 4 or higher in their ability to develop clear, hypothesis driven research plans as evidenced through their dissertation. Based on the results, this target was not met.

**SLO 15: Develop Reserach Plans**

Students will be able to develop clear, hypothesis driven research plans.

**Relevant Associations:**

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Dissertation**

Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

**Source of Evidence:** Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**

[2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric](#)

**Target:**

90% of students will score a 4 or higher in developing clear, hypothesis driven research plans.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**

Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 20% (1/5) scored a 4 or higher in their ability to develop clear, hypothesis driven research plans as evidenced through their dissertation. Based on the results, this target was not met.

**SLO 16: Conduct research**

Students will be able to conduct valid, data supported and theoretically consistent research.

**Relevant Associations:**

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally
appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Dissertation**
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**

2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in conducting valid, data supported and theoretically consistent research.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 20% (1/5) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to conduct valid, data supported and theoretically consistent research. Based on the results, this target was not met.

**SLO 17: Disseminate research**
Students will be able to effectively disseminate research results in appropriate contexts.

**Relevant Associations:**

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Dissertation**
Advisors utilize a rubric at the time or prior to the dissertation defense. In addition to the dissertation, the advisor may also consider prior performance in areas such as field placement activities, courses, and writing in providing a score.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**

2015-16 CPSY Graduate Student Evaluation Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students will score a 4 or higher (exceed expectations) in disseminating research results, as evidenced through submitting manuscripts to journals and peer reviewed conferences.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**
Rubric results for n of 5 indicate that 40% (2/5) of students scored a 4 or higher in their ability to disseminate research results, as evidenced by submitting manuscripts to journals and peer reviewed conferences. Every student is required to submit at least one manuscript for publication, though many are encouraged to submit more. All students met expectations of submitting at least once manuscript throughout their educational experience.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Action Plan**
Goals have been met.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
**Implementation Status:** Finished

**Priority:** High

**Action Plan to meet Publishing goals**
We are going to ensure student provide necessary data. Faculty will monitor and assist students in their publication activity.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015
**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Manuscript Submission Evidence | **Outcome/Objective:** Clear Research Plan | Strategies and Tools

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2017

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

**Technology Increases**
We plan to set a goal to increase the number of students who complete at telehealth practicum, in an effort to improve learning within technology. Telehealth services emerged out of evolving standards whereby practitioners provide distance health services to patients by using virtual and telecommunications. Completing a telehealth practicum provides students with opportunities to increase awareness of practices and legal issues of delivering mental health services at a distance in comparison to in person services.

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016
**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Dissertation | **Outcome/Objective:** Technology
Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

We set high targets of achievement based on a desire to see our students demonstrating a higher than average level of competences, knowledge and skills in order to be competitive upon entering the field. Although all students are meeting minimum program expectations, the assessment results indicate a smaller than desired number are achieving at a high level. Specifically, students’ ability to teach subject matter and to use appropriate technologies are the lowest among all outcomes. Regarding students’ ability to teach subject matter, not all students plans to enter professorship, so being able to demonstrate strong teaching skills is difficult to incorporate into all student’s plans. Comparatively, students demonstrate the highest levels of achievement in learning within the mastery of content knowledge and in choosing ethical action. We plan to adjust the targets to a more reasonable goal.

These new learning outcomes are illuminating the need to work more proactively with students in the areas to improve the amount that are not simply meeting expectations, but exceeding expectations. Despite not achieving targets, it should be noted that each evaluator supported a recommendation for 100% of students to pursue a post-doctoral experience, thus speaking to confidence in the students’ ability to be successful in new opportunities upon graduation.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

The action plan to increase manuscript submissions is still ongoing. Historically, we reviewed students’ CVs in order to evaluate how many students are submitting manuscripts. However, we experienced difficulty with receiving accurate data from the CVs as many weren't updated regularly by students. We have shifted the priority to measuring achievement in the new student learning outcomes. However, students will still be required to submit manuscripts for publication.
Mission / Purpose

The Counseling Psychology program at Texas A&M University (TAMU) offers doctoral education and training in psychology, with the expressed intention of preparing students for the practice of professional psychology. It endorses and subscribes to the scientist-practitioner model for the training of professional psychologists. The primary mission of the program is the development of psychologists who recognize the importance of and are equipped to engage in scholarly inquiry and the application of various methods to the resolution of problems encountered at the individual level, in institutions/clinics, and at the societal/community level. The program endeavors to train psychologists capable of contributing to the health care of diverse populations, from perspectives of prevention and intervention. The training program attempts to equip students to work in a variety of private and institutional settings, including public/private schools and universities, the military, hospitals, and various government agencies. The program emphasizes and promotes diversity issues related to the practice of psychology, as well as addressing achievement and mental health disparities among minority populations. Rigorous academic standards are maintained, and teaching, supervision, and research experiences are made available so students may successfully compete for academic positions at colleges and universities throughout the country as well as university counseling centers, VA hospitals, mental health facilities, and the military.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Effective Communication
Demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form

Related Measures

M 1: Conference Presentation Evidence
Evidence of presenting at a conference
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target:
90% of students will have presented by the time they graduate.
100% of students presented at a conference. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 2: Ethical and Legal Action
Demonstrate understanding and application of ethical and legal courses of action

Related Measures

M 5: CITI Training
All doctoral students are required to complete CITI training by the end of graduation.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge
Target:
100% of students should graduate with CITI training at time of graduation.
All students completed required CITI training before graduation. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 3: Professional Field Experience
Engage in professional field experiences in various settings to demonstrate competencies in assessment, intervention, and consultation

Related Measures

M 3: Professional Experience
Evidence of participating in a professional activity
Source of Evidence: Professional standards
Target:
90% of graduating students will have a professional experience.
100% of students had professional experience. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 5: Mastering Degree Requirements
Master the degree requirements and complete graduation within allowable time period

Related Measures

M 4: Time to Graduation
Most of CPSY doctoral students will graduate within a specified time period.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target:
90% of students will complete all program requirements and graduate within 6 years time-frame including 1 year of
All students graduated within the targeted time frame. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 6: Clear Research Plan
Students should be able to develop and execute research plan using publications as evidence

Related Measures

M 2: Manuscript Submission Evidence
Evidence of submitting a manuscript to a journal
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
90% of Students will publish or submit to a peer reviewed journal
83% of students submitted manuscript or published in peer reviewed journal. Therefore, the target is not met.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan to meet Publishing goals
We are going to ensure student provide necessary data. Faculty will monitor and assist students in their publication activity.

SLO 7: Strategies and Tools
Students should be able to use various strategies and tools to produce research

Related Measures

M 1: Conference Presentation Evidence
Evidence of presenting at a conference
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target:
90% of students will have presented by the time they graduate.
100% of students presented at a conference. Therefore, the target is met.

M 2: Manuscript Submission Evidence
Evidence of submitting a manuscript to a journal
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
90% of Students will publish or submit to a peer reviewed journal
83% of students submitted manuscript or published in peer reviewed journal. Therefore, the target is not met.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan to meet Publishing goals
We are going to ensure student provide necessary data. Faculty will monitor and assist students in their publication activity.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Action Plan
Goals have been met.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Action Plan to meet Publishing goals
We are going to ensure student provide necessary data. Faculty will monitor and assist students in their publication activity.
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Manuscript Submission Evidence | Outcome/Objective: Clear Research Plan | Strategies and Tools
Project Completion Date: 05/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.
The program’s level of paper submissions does not meet the expected level of manuscript submissions for doctoral students. The program will review current procedures related to research projects to improve this area.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements. Program Faculty is reviewing student progress towards meeting this goal. Program procedures will be modified as needed to ensure this goal is met.
Mission / Purpose

The program promotes the scientist-practitioner model through its emphasis on three interrelated themes: multiculturalism, community engagement, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Collectively, these themes address present needs and opportunities in society, and they poise the program for relevance, opportunities, and leadership in the field. While each theme is prominent and holds a unique place in the program, their interrelatedness is critical as a defining feature of the program. Counseling psychology can play an important role in enhancing the provision of health and mental health care to diverse populations with particular attention to the socio-cultural underpinnings of behavior, inequities and disparities in the systems of care, and multicultural competence of providers. Moreover, the program recognizes that the specialty can best achieve these aims through active engagement in the community and through collaboration with other disciplines as opposed to its historical isolation as a discipline.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Conference Presentation
Students will present research at a conference

Related Measures

M 1: Conference Presentation Evidence
Evidence of presenting at a conference
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
90% of graduating students will present research at a conference

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% of graduating students presented research at a conference. Therefore, the target is met

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of graduating students presented research at a conference. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Maintain current rate
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Continue to encourage students.

SLO 2: Manuscript Submission
Students will submit a manuscript for publication

Related Measures

M 2: Manuscript Submission Evidence
Evidence of submitting a manuscript to a journal
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
90% of graduating students will submit a manuscript to a journal

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met
75% of graduating PhD students submitted manuscript to a journal. Therefore, the target is not met.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
93% of graduating PhD students submitted manuscript to a journal. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 3: Professional Experience
Students will gain professional experience in the field

Related Measures

M 3: Professional Experience
Evidence of participating in a professional activity
Source of Evidence: Professional standards

Target:
90% of graduating students will have a professional experience

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
82% of graduating PhD students have a professional experience. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
93% of graduating PhD students have a professional experience. Therefore, the target is met.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
**Action Plan**

Goals have been met.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Maintain current rate**

Continue to encourage students.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Conference Presentation Evidence  
**Outcome/Objective:** Conference Presentation

**Implementation Description:** By faculty advisor.

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2015  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty advisor  
**Additional Resources:** NA

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.**

One of the program's tasks indicated that the program did not achieve its goal of having 90% of its graduates submit a manuscript to a journal before graduating. Based on a review of student vitae, students and advisor’s will be instructed to include a section on their vita for submitted papers, posters, symposia, etc. Students will be reminded to include this when they update their vita for their annual review. Faculty will review student vitae to ensure compliance.

**Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.**

Program will monitor all target data to make sure the action plan is successful in ensuring that all targets are met annually.
Mission / Purpose

Doctoral program in Bilingual Education prepares graduates for university and leadership positions in the field of education, including consultation and evaluation, teacher training and supervision or coordination of programs. A combination of coursework, practica, program competencies and the final dissertation ensure both the breadth and depth of training. Faculty trained and experienced in bilingual curriculum development, distance teaching formats and instructional design leads the program.

Goals

G 1: Prepare Students for the Professoriat
The Bilingual Education Doctoral program is focused on preparing students for the professoriat.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Effective Communication
Demonstrate effective communication skills in written and oral format.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures

M 1: Individual or Group Presentation
The direct measure being used is proof, provided by students on their vita and conference schedule, that they have presented at one or more international, national, or regional peer-reviewed conferences.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
90% of doctoral students (as an individual or in a group) will present at an international, national, or regional peer-reviewed conference by the time they graduate.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
This measure is fully met as all 3 students (including 1 student who has successfully defended her dissertation in May and is graduating in August) at the time of graduation have presented at a peer-reviewed conference by the time they graduated.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

*M 2: Conference Proposal Review and Submission
Students in 2nd year and beyond submit a peer-reviewed conference proposal, which will be evaluated using the attached rubric, by the student’s academic advisor/committee chair. Additional feedback will be provided to the student to improve the quality of the proposal. (Rubric TBD)

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Conference Proposal Rubric

Target:
90% of the students will receive a score of 15 or above on the rubric as rated by their academic advisor/committee chair. 75% of students in their 2nd year or beyond will submit at least one conference proposal.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met
Two students in their 2nd year and beyond didn’t submit a peer-reviewed conference proposal. Therefore, we could not use the conference proposal rubric to evaluate students proposal. This target was not met. However, results are difficult to generalize to the broader student population based on the small sample size (n=2).

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This measure is just added and data will be collected in the next cycle of 2017-2018 for reporting.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Assessment Revision
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
As we are working on the revision and realignment of the learning outcome and the corresponding measures, we will be able to col...
*Students Missing Targets Mentoring Plan
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
While students are meeting targets in some areas (e.g. successful proposal and dissertation defense), students are missing targe...

Cohort Structure and Sequencing
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Our second finding is that the 2nd measure under Outcome 1 to request those students who are in their 2nd year (and beyond) to ...

SLO 2: Conduct Research
Identify a research issue related to bilingual education, design a methodologically-sound study, collect and analyze data, and interpret the finding within the theoretical and empirical context

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

Related Measures
M 3: Manuscript Advisor Review
Before manuscripts are submitted to prospective peer-reviewed journals, students will obtain feedback from program chair/advisor as to strength of the manuscript, identifying gaps and areas of improvement.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document  
Rubric for manuscript evaluation

Target:
90% of doctoral students' manuscript receive positive feedback from program chair/faculty regarding manuscript submissions.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% (4/4) of the students have submitted at least one manuscript for publication to a peer-reviewed journal and provided proof to his or her chairperson, at the time of graduation (including 1 student who has successfully defended her dissertation in May and is graduating in August). For those students, they received favorable (marked appropriate on the rubric) feedback from their professors as to the completion and strength of the manuscript before submission.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This measure is just added and data will be collected in the next cycle of 2017-2018 for reporting.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 4: Submission of a Manuscript for Publication
Students in 3rd year and beyond develops a manuscript targeted for peer-review journal submission.

Rubric for manuscript submission is in development, and will be available for 17-18 cycle.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
90% of senior doctoral students will submit at least one manuscript for publication to a peer-reviewed journal.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Partially Met
TBD

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% (3/3) of the students have submitted at least one manuscript for publication to a peer-reviewed journal and provided proof to his or her chairperson, by the time of graduation.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

*SLO 3: Demonstrate Competency
Master and demonstrate competency in bilingual pedagogy and research methodology.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.
**Related Measures**

**M 5: Dissertation Defense**
The direct measure being used to ascertain a successful completion of a dissertation defense, as evaluated by the students committee.

We anticipate to submit a finalized version of the rubrics for dissertation proposal and dissertation defense in the next reporting cycle.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
90% of the doctoral students pass dissertation defense at first attempt. Target set based on expected performance at end of program.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
100% (3/3) of the students scored and above, and have successfully defended their dissertation.

**M 6: Preliminary Exam**
Students will have a successful preliminary exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Connected Document**

**Prelim Exam Rubric**

**Target:**
90% of the doctoral students pass prelim exam at first attempt.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
100% (3/3) of the students successfully passed their preliminary exam.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This measure is just added and data will be collected in the next cycle of 2017-2018 for reporting.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Duplicate due to system glitch. Disregard.

**M 7: Dissertation Proposal**
Students will successfully complete their dissertation proposal.

We anticipate to submit a finalized version of the rubrics for dissertation proposal and dissertation defense in the next reporting cycle.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
90% of the doctoral students pass proposal defense at first attempt.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
100% (4/4) of the students successfully passed his/her proposal exam. Performance is expected, when comparing to previous findings.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This measure is just added and data will be collected in the next cycle of 2017-2018 for reporting.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Assessment Revision**

*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*
As we are working on the revision and realignment of the learning outcome and the corresponding measures, we will be able to col...

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Submission of Manuscript Tracking & Support**

1. Based on our findings that we only had 85% of students meet the target of submitting a manuscript for publication to a peer-refereed journal, as a faculty we will compile a database for tracking what students are or are not submitting manuscripts. Those students who have not submitted a manuscript for publication prior to their year, will provided additional coaching to complete and submit a manuscript for publication, for their committee chair and committee.

2. Based on our findings that 100% of students meet the target of passing the Dissertation Defense, at first attempt, we will create a rubric to have a uniform and consistent way to evaluate students in the program. And we will be able to capture more specific data as to specifics of student performance, instead of holistic score.

**Established in Cycle: 2014-2015**

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** For the fall of 2016, manuscript writing will be brought up as an agenda item for the first BIED faculty meeting. A rubric will be developed and will be incorporated into coursework and program advisement, in order to identify students who are struggling with manuscripts. Guidelines for coaching students will be created. We will identify opportunities for student to submit manuscripts.

**Responsible Person/Group:** BIED faculty & advisors for their respective students.

**Defense Rubric**

We plan to create a dissertation defense rubric so that students will be evaluated using consistent metrics. We test out the created rubric over two years in order to have an adequate sample from which to evaluate the rubric's
Assessment Revision

As we are working on the revision and realignment of the learning outcome and the corresponding measures, we will be able to collect and report more meaningful and complete data during the next cycle. Meanwhile, each committee chair/co-chair will continue working with their advisees to identify a research topic that is of the advisee's interest, and develop into a conference proposal, using the rubrics attached. Each committee chair/co-chair will also work with their advisees to craft and submit manuscript for peer-reviewed journal publications. The advisor may pair up students based on their professional interest, and create a peer-support/peer-assistance structure. Further, advisor/committee chair will identify gaps a student may have and propose plans for improvement such as taking additional courses, conducting research synthesis, etc.

*Cohort Structure and Sequencing*

Our second finding is that the 2nd measure under Outcome 1 to request those students who are in their 2nd year (and beyond) to submit a proposal was not fully met. Some students didn't have an opportunity to develop and submit a peer-reviewed conference proposal or attempt to submit a scholarly writing piece to peer-reviewed journal. When the program faculty met during the academic year of 2017-2018, we agreed that a lack of cohort structure and course sequence in the program was attributable to our findings. Such structure with a 2-year program study in place is much needed, so that students take the same courses and form a peer structure; further, the course sequence also better prepares students and lays foundation on the content and research method skills that necessary to navigate through the doctoral program.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

The targets established by past assessment cycle has all been either met or partially met, with the exception of the conference proposal review measure. We will continue encouraging each faculty to work with their advisees on conference proposal submission, which is an indicator of the quality of their research, as well as a great opportunity for them to communicate with the scholarly community about their research. Some students didn't have an opportunity to develop and submit a peer-reviewed conference proposal or attempt to submit a scholarly writing piece to peer-reviewed journal.
Program faculty agreed that a lack of cohort structure and course sequence in the program was attributable to our findings. Such structure with a 2-year program study in place is much needed, so that students take the same courses and form a peer structure; further, the course sequence also better prepares students and lays foundation on the content and research method skills that necessary to navigate through the doctoral program.

Additionally, another action plan was developed to address missing targets related to program completion within 6 years, adequate academic performance, and student research productivity.

*CRITICAL* Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

The action plan was completed in the cycle of 2017-2018, as chairs/co-chairs worked with their advisees to identify a research topic, develop into a conference proposal, craft and submit manuscript for peer-reviewed journal publications. The advisors also paired up students based on their professional interest, and created a peer-support/peer-assistance structure. Further, advisor/committee chair identified gaps a student had and proposed plans for improvement such as taking additional statistical courses, providing guidance on conducting research synthesis (such as systematic review of literature and meta-analysis), etc. The improvement is that we have more students who are able to advance in their degree program through conference presentation, conducting field-based research project, co-authoring with faculty on peer-reviewed journal submission. We will continue using the database (which was an action plan in 2015-2016) to monitor the progress of these students, and updating the list to indicate those who graduated and were newly admitted.
Mission / Purpose

Doctoral program in Bilingual Education prepares graduates for university and leadership positions in the field of education, including consultation and evaluation, teacher training and supervision or coordination of programs. A combination of coursework, practica, program competencies and the final dissertation ensure both the breadth and depth of training. Faculty trained and experienced in bilingual curriculum development, distance teaching formats and instructional design leads the program.

Goals

G 1: Prepare Students for the Professoriate

The Bilingual Education Doctoral program is focused on preparing students for the professoriat.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Effective Communication

Demonstrate effective communication skills in written and oral format.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures

M 2: Conference Proposal Review and Submission

Students in 2nd year and beyond submits a peer-reviewed conference proposal, which will be evaluated using the attached rubric, by the student’s academic advisor/committee chair. Additional feedback will be provided to the student to improve the quality of the proposal. (Rubric TBD)

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document

Conference Proposal Rubric

Target:

90% of the students will receive a score of 15 or above on the rubric as rated by their academic advisor/committee chair

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

This measure is just added and data will be collected in the next cycle of 2017-2018 for reporting.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Assessment Revision

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017

As we are working on the revision and realignment of the learning outcome and the corresponding measures, we will be able to col...

SLO 2: Conduct Research

Identify a research issue related to bilingual education, design a methodologically-sound study, collect and analyze data, and interpret the finding within the theoretical and empirical context.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

Related Measures

M 3: Manuscript Advisor Review

Before manuscripts are submitted to prospective peer-reviewed journals, it will be rated using the rubric attached for quality monitoring and faculty will provide feedback on the manuscript to identify gaps and areas of improvement. Rubric TBD.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:

90% of doctoral students' manuscript receives a rating of 15 or higher on the rubrics rated by the advisor and another faculty.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This measure is just added and data will be collected in the next cycle of 2017-2018 for reporting.

**M 4: Submission of a Manuscript for Publication**
Students in 3rd year and beyond develops a manuscript targeted for peer-review journal submission.

Rubric for manuscript submission is in development, and will be available for 17-18 cycle.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
90% of senior doctoral students will submit at least one manuscript for publication to a peer-reviewed journal.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
100% (3/3) of the students have submitted at least one manuscript for publication to a peer-reviewed journal and provided proof to his or her chairperson, by the time of graduation.

**SLO 3: Demonstrate Competency**
Master and demonstrate competency in bilingual pedagogy and research methodology.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

**Related Measures**

**M 6: Preliminary Exam**
Students will have a successful preliminary exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Connected Document**

**Prelim Exam Rubric**

**Target:**
90% of the doctoral students pass prelim exam at first attempt.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Duplicate due to system glitch. Disregard.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This measure is just added and data will be collected in the next cycle of 2017-2018 for reporting.

**M 7: Dissertation Proposal**
Students will successfully complete their dissertation proposal.

We anticipate to submit a finalized version of the rubrics for dissertation proposal and dissertation defense in the next reporting cycle.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
90% of the doctoral students pass proposal defense at first attempt.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This measure is just added and data will be collected in the next cycle of 2017-2018 for reporting.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Assessment Revision**

*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*

As we are working on the revision and realignment of the learning outcome and the corresponding measures, we will be able to col...

**SLO 4: Submit a Manuscript for Publication**
Students will present a paper or poster at a peer-reviewed inter-national, national, or regional conference.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 4: Submission of a Manuscript for Publication**
Students in 3rd year and beyond develops a manuscript targeted for peer-review journal submission.

Rubric for manuscript submission is in development, and will be available for 17-18 cycle.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
90% of doctoral students will submit at least one manuscript for publication to a peer-reviewed journal and provide proof to his or her chairperson, prior to graduation.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Outcome has been replaced and will be phased out after this cycle.
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
91% of students submitted at least one manuscript for publication to a peer-reviewed journal and provide proof to his or her chairperson, prior to graduation. Measure: Submission of a Manuscript for Publication
Outcome/Objective: Submit a Manuscript for Publication

80% of the students submitted a manuscript for publication.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Submission of Manuscript Tracking & Support
1. Based on our findings that we only had 85% of students meet the target of submitting a manuscript for publication to a peer...

SLO 5: Successful Dissertation Defense
Students will have a successful dissertation defense.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures
M 5: Dissertation Defense
The direct measure being used to ascertain a successful completion of a dissertation defense, as evaluated by the students committee.

We anticipate to submit a finalized version of the rubrics for dissertation proposal and dissertation defense in the next reporting cycle.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% of doctoral students will have a successful Dissertation Defense, at first attempt.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% (2/2) of the students have successfully defended their dissertation. We have one more student who is defending in June and will update the data in the summer.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students passed on their first attempt.

100% of students have successfully defended.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Assessment Revision
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
As we are working on the revision and realignment of the learning outcome and the corresponding measures, we will be able to col...

SLO 6: Present at a Research Conference
Students will present a paper or poster at a peer-reviewed inter-national, national, or regional conference.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures
M 1: Individual or Group Presentation
The direct measure being used is proof, provided by students on their vita and conference schedule, that they have presented at one or more international, national, or regional peer-reviewed conferences.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
90% of doctoral students (as an individual or in a group) will present at an international, national, or regional peer-reviewed conference by the time they graduate.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% (2/2) of the students have successfully defended their dissertation. We have one more student who is defending in June and will update the data in the summer.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students passed on their first attempt.

100% of students have successfully defended.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Submission of Manuscript Tracking & Support
1. Based on our findings that we only had 85% of students meet the target of submitting a manuscript for publication to a peer-referred journal, as a faculty we will compile a database for tracking what students are or are not
submitting manuscripts. Those students who have not submitted a manuscript for publication prior to their year, will provided additional coaching to complete and submit a manuscript for publication, for their committee chair and committee.

2. Based on our findings that 100% of students meet the target of passing the Dissertation Defense, at first attempt, we will create a rubric to have a uniform and consistent way to evaluate students in the program. And we will be able to capture more specific data as to specifics of student performance, instead of holistic score.

**Established in Cycle**: 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status**: Planned  
**Priority**: High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Submission of a Manuscript for Publication | Outcome/Objective: Submit a Manuscript for Publication

**Implementation Description**: For the fall of 2016, manuscript writing will be brought up as an agenda item for the first BIED faculty meeting. A rubric will be developed and will be incorporated into coursework and program advisement, in order to identify students who are struggling with manuscripts. Guidelines for coaching students will be created. We will identify opportunities for student to submit manuscripts.

**Responsible Person/Group**: BIED faculty & advisors for their respective students.

**Defense Rubric**

We plan to create a dissertation defense rubric so that students will be evaluated using consistent metrics. We test out the created rubric over two years in order to have an adequate sample from which to evaluate the rubric's effectiveness. This necessary due to the small cohort size of the Ph.D. Program.

**Established in Cycle**: 2015-2016  
**Implementation Status**: Planned  
**Priority**: High  
**Projected Completion Date**: 05/2018

**Assessment Revision**

As we are working on the revision and realignment of the learning outcome and the corresponding measures, we will be able to collect and report more meaningful and complete data during the next cycle. Meanwhile, each committee chair/co-chair will continue working with their advisees to identify a research topic that is of the advisee's interest, and develop into a conference proposal, using the rubrics attached. Each committee chair/co-chair will also work with their advisees to craft and submit manuscript for peer-reviewed journal publications. The advisor may pair up students based on their professional interest, and create a peer-support/peer-assistance structure. Further, advisor/committee chair will identify gaps a student may have and propose plans for improvement such as taking additional courses, conducting research synthesis, etc.

**Established in Cycle**: 2016-2017  
**Implementation Status**: Planned  
**Priority**: High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Conference Proposal Review and Submission | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication
Measure: Dissertation Defense | Outcome/Objective: Successful Dissertation Defense
Measure: Dissertation Proposal | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Competency

**Projected Completion Date**: 01/2018

**Responsible Person/Group**: BIED Program Faculty

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?**

The target established by past assessment cycle has all been met. However, as we are conducting a major revisioin to the assessment plan, we are adding more learning outcomes and associated measures/targets to more comprehensively and precisely represent the competency and skills that students in BIED doctoral program will demonstrate, which can further help better monitor and improve the quality of doctoral program in BIED. Below is a list of revisions to the assessment plan. First, all students who graduate in this reporting cycle have presented at peer-reviewed conferences. We will continue encouraging each faculty to work with their advisees on conference proposal submission. However, we, as a program, believe that submitting a conference proposal itself is a good practice for doctoral students. Therefore, we will add a second measure under Outcome 1 to request those students who are in their 2nd year (and beyond) to submit a proposal, which will be reviewed and rated by their advisor/chair using an internal rubric. The reason not to request 1st year doctoral student is that it is not always feasible for these students to present at a professional conference, as the cycle of submitting a proposal to a proposal being accepted, and to a final presentation normally takes at least a semester, or even longer (such as AERA, for which the proposal is due end of July, and presentation in April of the following year). Further, during year 1 they are normally focusing on taking core courses and getting familiar with the theoretical bases of the subject and do need more time before being able to craft a research topic to develop into a proposal. The description of Outcome 2 was also revised to match the heading (instead of present a paper or poster, it should be submitting a manuscript). Along the same line, for Outcome 2, although the 3 students who graduate in the reporting cycle have submitted manuscripts for publication, we as a program would like to encourage doctoral students at other stages to make such attempt as well, and have come up with a rubric for evaluation of the manuscript. We revised Outcome 3 to include measures on prelim, proposal, and dissertation defense, all of which are milestones for a doctoral degree seeking process.

**Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in**
The action plan from 2015-2016 was completed in the cycle of 2016-2017, as a tracking database was established, with a list of all active doctoral students, the year they were enrolled, their assigned chair person, and progress in each year. We will continue using this database to monitor the progress of these students, and updating the list to indicate those who graduated and were newly admitted. The other action plan of creating a dissertation defense rubric is also completed and used during two defenses, with the rubric attached. In this manner the evaluation became uniform and consistent in the program. We will continue using this rubric and collect more data in the next cycle.
Mission / Purpose

Doctoral program in Bilingual Education prepares graduates for university and leadership positions in the field of education, including consultation and evaluation, teacher training and supervision or coordination of programs. A combination of coursework, practica, program competencies and the final dissertation ensure both the breadth and depth of training. Faculty trained and experienced in bilingual curriculum development, distance teaching formats and instructional design leads the program.

Goals

G 1: Prepare Students for the Profesoriate
The Bilingual Education Doctoral program is focused on preparing students for the professoriat.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Present at a Research Conference
Students will present a paper or poster at a peer-reviewed inter-national, national, or regional conference.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures

M 1: Individual or Group Presentation
The direct measure being used is proof, provided by students on their vita and conference schedule, that they have presented at one or more international, national, or regional peer-reviewed conferences.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target: 90% of doctoral students (as an individual or in a group) will present at an international, national, or regional peer-reviewed conference by the time they graduate.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
94% of the students successfully presented at an international, national, or regional peer-reviewed conference.

90% of students presented at conference.

SLO 2: Submit a Manuscript for Publication
Students will present a paper or poster at a peer-reviewed inter-national, national, or regional conference.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

Related Measures

M 2: Submission of a Manuscript for Publication
The direct measure being used is tracking (via submitted proof to chair) that the student has submitted at least one paper for publication consideration to a peer-reviewed journal, prior to graduation.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target: 90% of doctoral students will submit at least one manuscript for publication to a peer-reviewed journal and provide proof to his or her chairperson, prior to graduation.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
91% of students submitted at least one manuscript for publication to a peer-reviewed journal and provide proof to his or her chairperson, prior to graduation. Measure:Submission of a Manuscript for PublicationOutcome/Objective:Submit a Manuscript for Publication

80% of the students submitted a manuscript for publication.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Submission of Manuscript Tracking & Support
1. Based on our findings that we only had 85% of students meet the target of submitting a manuscript for
SLO 3: Successful Dissertation Defense
Students will have a successful dissertation defense.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures
M 3: Dissertation Defense
The direct measure being used to ascertain a successful completion of a dissertation defense, as evaluated by the students committee.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 90% of doctoral students will have a successful Dissertation Defense, at first attempt.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of students passed on their first attempt.
100% of students have successfully defended.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Submission of Manuscript Tracking & Support
1. Based on our findings that we only had 85% of students meet the target of submitting a manuscript for publication to a peer-referred journal, as a faculty we will compile a database for tracking what students are or are not submitting manuscripts. Those students who have not submitted a manuscript for publication prior to their year, will provided additional coaching to complete and submit a manuscript for publication, for their committee chair and committee.
2. Based on our findings that 100% of students meet the target of passing the Dissertation Defense, at first attempt, we will create a rubric to have a uniform and consistent way to evaluate students in the program. And we will be able to capture more specific data as to specifics of student performance, instead of holistic score.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Submission of a Manuscript for Publication | Outcome/Objective: Submit a Manuscript for Publication
Implementation Description: For the fall of 2016, manuscript writing will be brought up as an agenda item for the first BIED faculty meeting. A rubric will be developed and will be incorporated into coursework and program advisement, in order to identify students who are struggling with manuscripts. Guidelines for coaching students will be created. We will identify opportunities for student to submit manuscripts.
Responsible Person/Group: BIED faculty & advisors for their respective students.

Defense Rubric
We plan to create a dissertation defense rubric so that students will be evaluated using consistent metrics. We test out the created rubric over two years in order to have an adequate sample from which to evaluate the rubric’s effectiveness. This necessary due to the small cohort size of the Ph.D. Program.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2018

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Findings for this cycle show that all measured targets were met. Regarding learning improvements, we will continue to collect dissertation defense data from a larger sample of students to support the development of rubric from which to consistently evaluate students within the program.

inform future needs and have not identified any specific changes from which to improve learning and plan to implement strategic improvements to manuscript submissions.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.
Action updates from the 2014-2015 cannot be reported on this cycle. The initial plan was to create a coaching initiative for students submitting manuscripts. However, plans to implement this action plan were not completed due to restructured priorities, and the rubric is still in the process of being developed to identify students in need of support. Despite not having implemented the action plan, it should be noted that there is a 11% increase in the number of students who submitted a manuscript, thereby meeting this year’s target. The action plan to support the increase in manuscript submissions will continue as a priority for the 2016-2017 cycle year.
Mission / Purpose

Doctoral program in Bilingual Education prepares graduates for university and leadership positions in the field of education, including consultation and evaluation, teacher training and supervision or coordination of programs. A combination of coursework, practica, program competencies and the final dissertation ensure both the breadth and depth of training. Faculty trained and experienced in bilingual curriculum development, distance teaching formats and instructional design leads the program.

Goals

G 1: Prepare Students for the Profesoriate
The Bilingual Education Doctoral program is focused on preparing students for the professoriat.

G 2: Erase - Submit a Manuscript for Publication
Students will submit a manuscript for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, as first or second author.

G 3: Erase - Successful Dissertation Defense
Students will have a successful dissertation defense.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Present at a Research Conference
Students will present a paper or poster at a peer-reviewed inter-national, national, or regional conference.

Related Measures

M 1: Individual or Group Presentation
The direct measure being used is proof, provided by students on their vita and conference schedule, that they have presented at one or more international, national, or regional peer-reviewed conferences.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
90% of doctoral students (as an individual or in a group) will present at an international, national, or regional peer-reviewed conference by the time they graduate.

90% of students presented at conference.

SLO 2: Submit a Manuscript for Publication
Students will present a paper or poster at a peer-reviewed inter-national, national, or regional conference.

Related Measures

M 2: Submission of a Manuscript for Publication
The direct measure being used is tracking (via submitted proof to chair) that the student has submitted at least one paper for publication consideration to a peer-reviewed journal, prior to graduation.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
90% of doctoral students will submit at least one manuscript for publication to a peer-reviewed journal and provide proof to his or her chairperson, prior to graduation.

80% of the students submitted a manuscript for publication.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Submission of Manuscript Tracking & Support
1. Based on our findings that we only had 85% of students meet the target of submitting a manuscript for publication to a peer...

SLO 3: Successful Dissertation Defense
Students will have a successful dissertation defense.

Related Measures

M 3: Dissertation Defense
The direct measure being used to ascertain a successful completion of a dissertation defense.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% of doctoral students will have a successful Dissertation Defense, at first attempt, as evaluated by the students committee using the "BIED Dissertation Defense" rubric.
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Submission of Manuscript Tracking & Support**

1. Based on our findings that we only had 85% of students meet the target of submitting a manuscript for publication to a peer-referred journal, as a faculty we will compile a database for tracking what students are or are not submitting manuscripts. Those students who have not submitted a manuscript for publication prior to their year, will provided additional coaching to complete and submit a manuscript for publication, for their committee chair and committee.
2. Based on our findings that 100% of students meet the target of passing the Dissertation Defense, at first attempt, we will create a rubric to have a uniform and consistent way to evaluate students in the program. And we will be able to capture more specific data as to specifics of student performance, instead of holistic score.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Submission of a Manuscript for Publication | Outcome/Objective: Submit a Manuscript for Publication

**Implementation Description:** For the fall of 2015, will be brought up as an agenda item for the first BIED faculty meeting.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** BIED faculty & advisors for their respective students.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.**

As a program, we are going to collect data about manuscript submissions, to determine patterns for submission and offer more coaching to enable each students to submit at least one manuscript upon graduation.

**Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.**

In the previous year, bilingual was grouped under the EPSY Weave process. As of this semester, we have our own WEAVE profile and thus, we have our own new objectives and measures.
Mission / Purpose

The Learning Sciences program is based on the belief that psychological theory and empirical research can inform and improve education by increasing our understanding of how people learn, develop, think, and solve problems; and how instruction and technology influence these processes. Development and application of measurement and statistical methods to facilitate empirical research on these issues are thus crucial. Central to our mission is promoting human learning and development. To do so, we develop theory, study new approaches made possible by emerging technologies, and use quantitative and qualitative methods to conduct research, all with the goal of developing innovative real-world applications.

Doctoral study in Learning Sciences is based on the Apprentice Scholar model, in which students become immersed in developing a rich understanding of what we know and in exploring and discovering what has yet to be learned. Learning Sciences students participate on research teams designed to advance our understanding of these issues, and in the development of applications based on theory and research in the learning sciences.

Through our program, Learning Science students can acquire the knowledge, skills, and experiences they need to become university faculty, researchers, or leading professionals in schools, business, and industry. The Learning Sciences program enables students, through the guidance of faculty mentors, to build an individualized program of study that meets their individual needs and professional objectives.

The Learning Sciences Program offers the Ph.D. in Educational Psychology with specializations in Cognition, Creativity, Instruction, and Development; Educational Technology; or Research, Measurement and Statistics.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Mastery of Degree Requirements
Articulates the foundational concepts, principles, and theories in the discipline; able to synthesize subject matter across courses and experiences.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document

PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Mastery of Degree Requirements" component of the rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
For this year's students, 1/18 did scored below expectations, 11/18 met expectations, and 6/18 exceeded expectations. Overall, 95% (17/18) of students met or exceeded expectations for mastery of degree requirements. This year’s performance is on bar with previous years.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceed expectations in "Mastery of Degree Requirements". Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Mastery of Degree Requirements". Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
Mastery of Degree Requirements - Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
The Division of Learning Sciences will add a new component to the existing action plan by focusing SLO 1 (Mastery of Degree Re...)

SLO 2: Teaching or Field Experience
Through appropriate teaching or field experience; students will be able to explain the subject matter in the discipline.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

Related Measures
M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the “Teaching / Field Experience” component of the rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
For this year’s students, 9/18 met expectations, 7/18 exceeded expectations, and 2/18 were noted observed for teaching/field experience. Overall, 100% (16/16, excluding 2 n/a) of students met or exceeded expectations for teaching/field experience. This year’s performance is on bar with previous years.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
95% of students met or exceeded expectations in “Teaching/Field experience” component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in “Teaching/Field experience” component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 3: Reasoned Arguments
Uses a variety of sources to evaluate multiple points of view; analyzes and integrates information to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures
M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the “Reasoned Arguments” component of the rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
For this year’s students, 9/18 met expectations and 9/18 exceeded expectations. Overall, 100% (18/18) of students met or exceeded expectations for reasoned arguments. This year's performance is on bar with previous years.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
95% of students met or exceeded expectations in “Reasoned Arguments” component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in “Reasoned Arguments” component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...
SLO 4: Communication
Communicates well in both written and verbal forms.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures
M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Communication" component of the rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
For this year's students, 11/18 met expectations and 7/18 exceeded expectations. Overall, 100% (18/18) of students met or exceeded expectations for communication. This year's performance is on par with previous years.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
95% of students met or exceeded expectations in "Communication" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Communication" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 5: Technology
Demonstrates the ability to use appropriate technologies to achieve a variety of tasks, including communicating, collaborating with others, conducting research, and solving problems.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures
M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Technology" component of the rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
For this year's students, 9/18 met expectations and 9/18 exceeded expectations. Overall, 100% (18/18) of students met or exceeded expectations for use of technology. This year's performance is on par with previous years.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded expectations in "Technology" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Technology" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...
SLO 6: Research

Students will be able to develop a research plan and conduct institutionally appropriate research.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense

Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document

PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:

90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Research" component of the rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met

For this year's students, 1/18 scored below expectations, 11/18 met expectations, 5/18 exceeded expectations, and 1 student was not observed. Overall, 95% (16/17, excluding 1 not observed) of students met or exceeded expectations for research. This year's performance is on par with previous years.

Research: 1 out of 18 below expectations; 11 out of 18 meets expectations; 5 out of 18 above expectations; 1 not observable

Ethics: 10 out of 18 meets expectations; 8 out of 18 above expectations

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met

100% of students met or exceeded expectations in "Research" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Research" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 7: Ethics

Students can recognize ethical issues when issues are present in complex, multi-layered context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense

Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document

PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:

90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Ethics" component of the rubric.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met

For this year's students, 1/18 scored below expectations and 11/18 exceeded expectations. Overall, 100% (18/18) of students met or exceeded expectations for demonstration of ethics. This year's performance is on par with previous years.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met

100% of students met or exceeded expectations in "Ethics" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Ethics" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Student Colloquium
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will offer students the opportunity to present their research (either critical review of existing research or original research) in a research colloquium. The colloquium will include (but is not limited to) at least one research-based presentation given before defense date of the Ph.D. dissertation. The Learning Sciences program will hold a program-wide colloquium at least twice-a-year (at least once in Fall and once in Spring) for student presentations.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Dissertation Defense | Outcome/Objective: Communication
| Reasoned Arguments | Research | Technology

Implementation Description: The research colloquium will be in both face-to-face and online (video-recorded) formats to accommodate on-campus and online students. All students are encouraged to participate in the research colloquium as a presenter at least once before they graduate.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2017

Mastery of Degree Requirements - Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams

The Division of Learning Sciences will add a new component to the existing action plan by focusing SLO 1 (Mastery of Degree Requirements) for 2017-2018 and initiating conversations amongst Learning Sciences faculty on the format of doctoral students’ preliminary/comprehensive examinations. There are 3 distinct but related areas/cognates in Learning Sciences (i.e., CCID, RMS, and Educational Technology). At present, there are multiple formats by which students in Learning Sciences can complete the preliminary/comprehensive examination as part of their degree requirement. For 2017-2018, the faculty in Learning Sciences will initiate discussion and begin evaluation of the procedures for students’ preliminary/comprehensive examination to ensure that the examination will involve procedures and formats that allow for faculty to adequately assess students’ mastery of degree requirements up to the point of the examination.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Dissertation Defense | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of Degree Requirements

Implementation Description: It is expected by that 2018, the faculty in Learning Sciences will be able to provide a summary or brief report on their discussions, evaluation, and recommendations for Division-wide procedures and formats for doctoral students’ preliminary/comprehensive examination. Doing so will ultimately result in a formalized and systematic procedure to assess students’ mastery of degree requirements (up to the point of the preliminary/comprehensive examination) for all doctoral students (regardless of area of study).

Responsible Person/Group: Learning Science Program Faculty

Self-assessments

The Division of Learning Sciences will continue to work on being attentive and responsive to students’ learning needs by initiating student self-assessments of their academic progress including their perceptions of their progress in the academic program toward graduation and the degree to which they are meeting their learning objectives in their coursework. The student self-assessments will include both quantitative and qualitative response fields to allow students to rate or quantify their progress and also provide their perspectives, feedback, and comments. This will allow faculty to better understand and respond to and meet students’ learning needs, especially because there are diverse career paths for doctoral students that range from going into industry, practice, or application and into research or academia. Furthermore, some doctoral students want to pursue a post-doctoral position while others want to go directly in to the job market. Having student self-assessments will allow faculty to better understand how to work with their students and also give students a greater sense of student efficacy and awareness of their own professional development.

Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

Based on feedback received from students from the Division of Learning Sciences Brown Bag Seminar Series, students expressed want more specialized coursework relevant for Developmental Sciences, particularly at the doctoral or upper-division level. In response to students’ feedback and their educational and professional development needs, the faculty in the Division of Learning Sciences responded by reorganizing the program to reflect the strengths of the faculty and meet the needs of their students. The reorganization resulted in a change from the program of Cognition, Creativity, Instruction, and Development (CCID) to the program of Developmental Sciences. As part of this change, several new courses have been developed and offered to students, including a graduate seminar on Interpersonal Relationships in Schools and a graduate seminar on Social Emotional Learning (both developed and offered by a new faculty member, Dr. Ilean Ettekhal). New research training opportunities are also planned for doctoral students in 2018-2019 in the area of Developmental Sciences.

*CRIICAL* Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

The Division of Learning Sciences added a new component to the existing action plan by focusing SLO 1 (Mastery of
Degree Requirements) for 2017-2018 and held multiple faculty meetings to discuss the format of master’s students’ final examinations (or exemptions whenever applicable or appropriate). The faculty also held open forum meetings with graduate students in the Division of Learning Sciences to have an open forum called Division of Learning Sciences Brown Bag Seminar Series (similar to a “town hall” meeting) that gave students an opportunity to understand the format of master’s final examinations and ask faculty questions regarding the process. Lastly, the faculty in the Division of Learning Sciences reviewed and updated section on preliminary or comprehensive examination guidelines and procedures in the Student Handbook to ensure that a formalized and systematic procedure to assess students’ mastery of degree requirements for all Ph.D. students (regardless of area/cognate) in Learning Sciences is in place.

In 2017-2018, the Division of Learning Sciences offered a series of once-a-month open-forum meetings for students called the Division of Learning Sciences Seminar Series. In each two-hour meeting, faculty shared their work with students through a research presentation followed by a one-hour interactive discussion between students and faculty regarding a student-generated professional development topic. Student-generated topics that were discussed included curriculum vitae development, I.R.B. applications, dissertation proposal development, journal article publication, dissertation defense, and the job search and job interview processes. Students’ feedback from these once-a-month open-forum meetings were generally positive, and students appreciated getting information regarding important milestones such as the master’s final examination because many of them were confused or unsure about these procedures. Despite the success of the Seminar Series, some doctoral students’ conflicted with the meeting dates/times. In the future, the faculty could find ways to facilitate distance broader participation amongst doctoral students by video-recording the meetings or including a way for online or conference call participation for students who may not live near campus. This will increase access and participation in the Seminar Series.
Mission / Purpose

The Learning Sciences program is based on the belief that psychological theory and empirical research can inform and improve education by increasing our understanding of how people learn, develop, think, and solve problems; and how instruction and technology influence these processes. Development and application of measurement and statistical methods to facilitate empirical research on these issues are thus crucial. Central to our mission is promoting human learning and development. To do so, we develop theory, study new approaches made possible by emerging technologies, and use quantitative and qualitative methods to conduct research, all with the goal of developing innovative real-world applications.

Doctoral study in Learning Sciences is based on the Apprentice Scholar model, in which students become immersed in developing a rich understanding of what we know and in exploring and discovering what has yet to be learned. Learning Sciences students participate on research teams designed to advance our understanding of these issues, and in the development of applications based on theory and research in the learning sciences.

Through our program, Learning Science students can acquire the knowledge, skills, and experiences they need to become university faculty, researchers, or leading professionals in schools, business, and industry. The Learning Sciences program enables students, through the guidance of faculty mentors, to build an individualized program of study that meets their individual needs and professional objectives.

The Learning Sciences Program offers the Ph.D. in Educational Psychology with specializations in Cognition, Creativity, Instruction, and Development; Educational Technology; or Research, Measurement and Statistics.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Mastery of Degree Requirements
Articulates the foundational concepts, principles, and theories in the discipline; able to synthesize subject matter across courses and experiences.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Mastery of Degree Requirements" component of the rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded expectations in "Mastery of Degree Requirements". Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Mastery of Degree Requirements". Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Mastery of Degree Requirements - Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
The Division of Learning Sciences will add a new component to the existing action plan by focusing SLO 1 (Mastery of Degree Re...
Graduate Outcome Associations

2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Teaching / Field Experience" component of the rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
95% of students met or exceeded expectations in "Teaching/Field experience" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Teaching/Field experience" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 3: Reasoned Arguments
Uses a variety of sources to evaluate multiple points of view; analyzes and integrates information to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations

2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Reasoned Arguments" component of the rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
95% of students met or exceeded expectations in "Reasoned Arguments" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Reasoned Arguments" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 4: Communication
Communicates well in both written and verbal forms.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations

2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Communication" component of the rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
95% of students met or exceeded expectations in "Communication" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Communication" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Student Colloquium**  
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*  
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

**SLO 5: Technology**  
Demonstrates the ability to use appropriate technologies to achieve a variety of tasks, including communicating, collaborating with others, conducting research, and solving problems.

**Relevant Associations:**
- Graduate Outcome Associations
  - 2.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

**Related Measures**
- **M 1: Dissertation Defense**
  Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
  Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**  
*PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences*

**Target:**
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Technology" component of the rubric.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded expectations in "Technology" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Technology" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Student Colloquium**  
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*  
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

**SLO 6: Research**  
Students will be able to develop a research plan and conduct institutionally appropriate research.

**Relevant Associations:**
- Graduate Outcome Associations
  - 2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

**Related Measures**
- **M 1: Dissertation Defense**
  Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
  Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**  
*PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences*

**Target:**
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Research" component of the rubric.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded expectations in "Research" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Research" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Student Colloquium**  
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*  
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

**SLO 7: Ethics**  
Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are present in complex, multi-layered context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.
Relevant Associations:

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

**M 1: Dissertation Defense**
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document

PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the “Ethics” component of the rubric.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded expectations in “Ethics” component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in “Ethics” component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Student Colloquium**
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will offer students the opportunity to present their research (either critical review of existing research or original research) in a research colloquium. The colloquium will include (but is not limited to) at least one research-based presentation given before defense date of the Ph.D. dissertation. The Learning Sciences program will hold a program-wide colloquium at least twice-a-year (at least once in Fall and once in Spring) for student presentations.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Dissertation Defense | Outcome/Objective: Communication
Reasoned Arguments | Research | Technology

Implementation Description: The research colloquium will be in both face-to-face and online (video-recorded) formats to accommodate on-campus and online students. All students are encouraged to participate in the research colloquium as a presenter at least once before they graduate.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2017

**Mastery of Degree Requirements - Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams**
The Division of Learning Sciences will add a new component to the existing action plan by focusing SLO 1 (Mastery of Degree Requirements) for 2017-2018 and initiating conversations amongst Learning Sciences faculty on the format of doctoral students' preliminary/comprehensive examinations. There are 3 distinct but related areas/cognates in Learning Sciences (i.e., CCID, RMS, and Educational Technology). At present, there are multiple formats by which students in Learning Sciences can complete the preliminary/comprehensive examination as part of their degree requirement. For 2017-2018, the faculty in Learning Sciences will initiate discussion and begin evaluation of the procedures for students' preliminary/comprehensive examination to ensure that the examination will involve procedures and formats that allow for faculty to adequately assess students' mastery of degree requirements up to the point of the examination.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Dissertation Defense | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of Degree Requirements

Implementation Description: It is expected by that 2018, the faculty in Learning Sciences will be able to provide a summary or brief report on their discussions, evaluation, and recommendations for Division-wide procedures and formats for doctoral students’ preliminary/comprehensive examination. Doing so will ultimately result in a formalized and systematic procedure to assess students’ mastery of degree requirements (up to the point of the preliminary/comprehensive examination) for all doctoral students (regardless of ar

Responsible Person/Group: Learning Science Program Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

At present, there are multiple formats by which students in Learning Sciences can complete the preliminary/comprehensive examination as part of their degree requirement. For 2017-2018, the faculty in Learning Sciences will initiate discussion and begin evaluation of the procedures for students' preliminary/comprehensive examination to ensure that the examination will involve procedures and formats that allow for faculty to adequately assess students' mastery of degree requirements up to the point of the examination. It is expected by that 2018, the faculty in Learning Sciences will be able to provide a summary or brief report on their discussions, evaluation, and recommendations for Division-wide procedures and formats for doctoral students’ preliminary/comprehensive examination. Doing so will ultimately result in a formalized and systematic procedure to assess students' mastery of degree
In addition, the Division of Learning Sciences implemented formal and informal opportunities for students to present their research so students can demonstrate their academic competencies to the broader Learning Sciences faculty members and to their academic peers (i.e., other graduate students).

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

In 2016, the Division of Learning Sciences implemented several formal and informal opportunities for students to present their research. These forums include research and educational/professional colloquia, as well as online “presentation galleries” (often hosted on ECampus) implemented for students who are enrolled in online coursework or in fully online graduate programs to ensure online students have the similar educational experiences as face-to-face students. In particular, the online “presentation galleries” are particularly used to assess students’ competencies on SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) and those assessment data is supplemented by data collected from face-to-face research and educational/professional colloquia. Doctoral students complete multiple courses that include the online “presentation galleries” to allow for adequate assessment of students’ competencies. Students have generally responded very positively to these formal and informal opportunities to communicate and present their research with faculty and with peers. Preliminary data suggests that doctoral level students have little problem demonstrating competencies through course-based online “presentation galleries”, and a good number of doctoral-level students also participate in face-to-face research and educational/professional colloquia. One challenge that has been observed so far is that majority of students who participate in the face-to-face research and educational/professional colloquia are doctoral students from the CCID and RMS doctoral programs. In particular, there appears to be significantly fewer doctoral students from the Ed Tech program who participate in the face-to-face colloquia. It is speculated that many Ed Tech doctoral students spend significantly less time physically in the Educational Psychology department, particularly because their program emphasizes online interactions more than face-to-face interactions with faculty and peers. Nonetheless, having multiple formal and informal opportunities for students to present their work allow for a good way for students to demonstrate learning objectives and skills with faculty and with peers. It may be somewhat too early to fully see the impact or improvements in assessment results for these targeted outcomes, but preliminary evidence suggests that students are engaged and benefiting from these forums.
Mission / Purpose

The Learning Sciences program is based on the belief that psychological theory and empirical research can inform and improve education by increasing our understanding of how people learn, develop, think, and solve problems; and how instruction and technology influence these processes. Development and application of measurement and statistical methods to facilitate empirical research on these issues are thus crucial. Central to our mission is promoting human learning and development. To do so, we develop theory, study new approaches made possible by emerging technologies, and use quantitative and qualitative methods to conduct research, all with the goal of developing innovative real-world applications.

Doctoral study in Learning Sciences is based on the Apprentice Scholar model, in which students become immersed in developing a rich understanding of what we know and in exploring and discovering what has yet to be learned. Learning Sciences students participate on research teams designed to advance our understanding of these issues, and in the development of applications based on theory and research in the learning sciences.

Through our program, Learning Science students can acquire the knowledge, skills, and experiences they need to become university faculty, researchers, or leading professionals in schools, business, and industry. The Learning Sciences program enables students, through the guidance of faculty mentors, to build an individualized program of study that meets their individual needs and professional objectives.

The Learning Sciences Program offers the Ph.D. in Educational Psychology with specializations in Cognition, Creativity, Instruction, and Development; Educational Technology; or Research, Measurement and Statistics.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

**SLO 1: Mastery of Degree Requirements**
Articulates the foundational concepts, principles, and theories in the discipline; able to synthesize subject matter across courses and experiences.

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations

2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

**Related Measures**

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Mastery of Degree Requirements" component of the rubric.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Mastery of Degree Requirements". Therefore, the target is met.

**SLO 2: Teaching or Field Experience**
Through appropriate teaching or field experience; students will be able to explain the subject matter in the discipline.

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations

2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

**Related Measures**

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences
Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Teaching / Field Experience" component of the rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Teaching/Field experience" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 3: Reasoned Arguments
Uses a variety of sources to evaluate multiple points of view; analyzes and integrates information to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Reasoned Arguments" component of the rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Reasoned Arguments" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 4: Communication
Communicates well in both written and verbal forms.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Communication" component of the rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Communication" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 5: Technology
Demonstrates the ability to use appropriate technologies to achieve a variety of tasks, including communicating, collaborating with others, conducting research, and solving problems.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences
Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Technology" component of the rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Technology" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 6: Research
Students will be able to develop a research plan and conduct institutionally appropriate research.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Research" component of the rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Research" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Colloquium
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will off...

SLO 7: Ethics
Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are present in complex, multi-layered context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Ethics" component of the rubric.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
90% or more of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in "Ethics" component of rubric. Therefore, the target is met.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Student Colloquium
To improve assessment of SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) we will offer students the opportunity to present their research (either critical review of existing research or original research) in a research colloquium. The colloquium will include (but is not limited to) at least one research-based presentation given before defense date of the Ph.D. dissertation. The Learning Sciences program will hold a program-wide colloquium at least twice-a-year (at least once in Fall and once in Spring) for student presentations.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Dissertation Defense | Outcome/Objective: Communication
Implementation Description: The research colloquium will be in both face-to-face and online (video-recorded) formats to accommodate on-campus and online students. All students are encouraged to participate in the research colloquium as a presenter at least once before they graduate.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2017

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

Based on the analysis of program findings, we are implementing a research colloquium for students to demonstrate SLO 3 (Reasoned Arguments), SLO 4 (Communication), SLO 5 (Technology), and SLO 6 (Research) to the overall faculty and other students in the Learning Sciences program. This additional form of assessment would allow demonstration of learning objectives and skills in a real-world context.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.
This is the first year we are implementing an Action Plan. We will wait for the data and analyses in the subsequent year to assess the outcomes of this plan.
Mission / Purpose

The Learning Sciences program is based on the belief that psychological theory and empirical research can inform and improve education by increasing our understanding of how people learn, develop, think, and solve problems; and how instruction and technology influence these processes. Development and application of measurement and statistical methods to facilitate empirical research on these issues are thus crucial. Central to our mission is promoting human learning and development. To do so, we develop theory, study new approaches made possible by emerging technologies, and use quantitative and qualitative methods to conduct research, all with the goal of developing innovative real-world applications.

Doctoral study in Learning Sciences is based on the Apprentice Scholar model, in which students become immersed in developing a rich understanding of what we know and in exploring and discovering what has yet to be learned. Learning Sciences students participate on research teams designed to advance our understanding of these issues, and in the development of applications based on theory and research in the learning sciences.

Through our program, Learning Science students can acquire the knowledge, skills, and experiences they need to become university faculty, researchers, or leading professionals in schools, business, and industry. The Learning Sciences program enables students, through the guidance of faculty mentors, to build an individualized program of study that meets their individual needs and professional objectives.

The Learning Sciences Program offers the Ph.D. in Educational Psychology with specializations in Cognition, Creativity, Instruction, and Development; Educational Technology; or Research, Measurement and Statistics.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Mastery of Degree Requirements
Articulates the foundational concepts, principles, and theories in the discipline; able to synthesize subject matter across courses and experiences.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Mastery of Degree Requirements" component of the rubric.

SLO 2: Teaching or Field Experience
Through appropriate teaching or field experience; students will be able to explain the subject matter in the discipline.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation Defense
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences

Target:
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Teaching / Field Experience" component of the rubric.
SLO 3: Reasoned Arguments
Uses a variety of sources to evaluate multiple points of view; analyzes and integrates information to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

**Relevant Associations:**
- Graduate Outcome Associations
  2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Dissertation Defense**
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
[PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences](#)

**Target:** 90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the “Reasoned Arguments” component of the rubric.

SLO 4: Communication
Communicates well in both written and verbal forms.

**Relevant Associations:**
- Graduate Outcome Associations
  2.3 Communicate effectively.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Dissertation Defense**
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
[PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences](#)

**Target:** 90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the “Communication” component of the rubric.

SLO 5: Technology
Demonstrates the ability to use appropriate technologies to achieve a variety of tasks, including communicating, collaborating with others, conducting research, and solving problems.

**Relevant Associations:**
- Graduate Outcome Associations
  2.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Dissertation Defense**
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
[PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences](#)

**Target:** 90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the “Technology” component of the rubric.

SLO 6: Research
Students will be able to develop a research plan and conduct institutionally appropriate research.

**Relevant Associations:**
- Graduate Outcome Associations
  2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Dissertation Defense**
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
[PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences](#)

**Target:** 90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the “Research” component of the rubric.

SLO 7: Ethics
Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are present in complex, multi-layered context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.

**Relevant Associations:**
## Graduate Outcome Associations

2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

### Related Measures

**M 1: Dissertation Defense**
Graduate committee evaluation at dissertation defense (see rubric).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

### Connected Document

[PHD Rubric-Learning Sciences](#)

**Target:**
90% of graduates will meet or exceed expectations in the "Ethics" component of the rubric.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Special Education Doctoral Program at Texas A&M University is to prepare future scholars to assume faculty positions in higher education through which they can promote the development, measurement, and application of evidence-based practices to improve the quality of life of individuals with diverse learning needs and their families.

Goals

G 1: CEHD Strategic Goal 7
The Special Education Doctoral Program will prepare research scholars for the professoriate. This will be measured by tracking the number of our graduates who are at Tier 1 AAU institutions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education
Graduates will effectively articulate theories, concepts, and principles germane to Special Education and their area of concentration.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
2 Strengthen our graduate programs.

Related Measures

M 1: Articulate theories and concepts orally and in writing
Students will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" on both their written and oral competency in the area of "Mastery of Degree Requirements" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will pass the Foundations of Special Education portion of the written and oral competency exams. This is measured by a score of a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the Mastery of Degree requirements item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of students taking written and oral competency exams met expectations, and is on par with previous program trends.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of the SPED doctoral program graduates met or exceeded expectations for Mastery of Degree Requirements.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates met or exceeded expectations for Mastery of Degree Requirements.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, they are not reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...
Increase Grant Writing Development  
*Established in Cycle: 2017-2018*
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education Emphasis Area doctoral pro...

**M 6: Research rigor and quality**
Student research rigor and quality will be assessed by the student's dissertation committee based on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation as well as the Ongoing Collaborative Research and Pre-Dissertation Research items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
[Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric](#)

**Target:**
90% of students will earn a "Meets expectations" or "above expectations" on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded expectations on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertations. Student performance in alignment with previous findings.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation as indicated by their rating on the "Research" section on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of the 2016 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation as indicated by their rating on the "Research" section on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Action Plan for future**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

**Special Education Doctoral Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

**SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development**
*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*
Based on the analysis of our findings and action plans from this cycle, the following change (representing a more targeted emp...

**Increase Grant Writing Development**
*Established in Cycle: 2017-2018*
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education Emphasis Area doctoral pro...

**SLO 2: Graduates will demonstrate advanced pedagogical skills necessary to teach at the college level**
Graduates will have varied teaching and field experiences both face to face and online, to develop advanced pedagogical skills necessary to effectively explain the subject matter in the discipline.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Teaching competency performance**
Following the completion of each semester of college teaching, student performance quality for their college teaching competency will be evaluated by their mentor/supervising faculty member in the area of "Teaching/Field Experience" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**
[Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric](#)

**Target:**
90% of students will complete their college teaching competency with a rating from their supervising faculty member of "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the Doctoral Competency Evaluation rubric.

**Connected Document**
[Doctoral Competency Evaluations](#)
Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of our students working on their college teaching competency met or exceeded expectations. Student performance is consistent with previous years.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of our students who completed their college teaching competency met this expectation.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% (5/5) of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates met or exceeded this program competency.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

Increase Grant Writing Development
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education Emphasis Area doctoral pro...

SLO 3: Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education
Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures
M 3: Synthesis of Research
Student synthesis of research to develop a reasoned argument will be assessed through their dissertation proposal and defense. (See dissertation committee’s Doctoral Student Evaluation form.)
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric
Target:
90% of graduates will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Research" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form) based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of our graduates met or exceeded expectations on their written and oral dissertation defenses. Performance is consistent with previous years findings.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of our students who completed a dissertation and oral dissertation defense met this expectation.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Research" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form) based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Based on the analysis of our findings and action plans from this cycle, the following change (representing a more targeted emp...

Increase Grant Writing Development
M 6: Research rigor and quality

Student research rigor and quality will be assessed by the student's dissertation committee based on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation as well as the Ongoing Collaborative Research and Pre-Dissertation Research items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will earn a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Reasoned Arguments" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of our students were able to present reasoned arguments in both their written and oral dissertation research defenses. Performance is consistent with previous assessment reports.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Reasoned Arguments" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Reasoned Arguments" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Based on the analysis of our findings and action plans from this cycle, the following change (representing a more targeted emp...

Increase Grant Writing Development
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education Emphasis Area doctoral pro...

SLO 4: Graduates will communicate effectively
Graduates will demonstrate high level of competency in both verbal and written communications.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures

M 4: Student communication
Student competency in verbal and written communication will be assessed by their committee during their dissertation defense (as recorded on the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric).

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of graduates will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" for the communication item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric based on their written and oral competency exams.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of our graduates met or exceeded expectations on this communication item on their written and oral competency exams. Performance is consistent with previous years of findings.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
100% of doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Communication" on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their written and oral competency exams.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Communication" on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their written and oral competency exams.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Action Plan for future**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

**Special Education Doctoral Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

**SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development**
*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*
Based on the analysis of our findings and action plans from this cycle, the following change (representing a more targeted emp...

**Increase Grant Writing Development**
*Established in Cycle: 2017-2018*
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education Emphasis Area doctoral pro...

**SLO 5: Graduates will use technology proficiently.**
Graduates will be proficient in using technologies to communicate with others, to collaborate, to conduct research, and to solve problems.

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations

2.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Technology for research and teaching**
Students will present an oral presentation at a conference or during college teaching competency. Their use of technology will be assessed by their chair using the Doctoral Student Evaluation Technology item and the College Teaching competency on the Student Competencies Evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Connected Document**
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students will earn a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the technology item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their use of technology for an oral presentation for a conference or course.

**Connected Document**
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
100% of students met or performed above expectations on this item as they presented at professional conferences, and as part of course assignment requirements (e.g., conference presentation in SPED 624). Feedback is provided to students by faculty members, and sometimes fellow students, as students practiced in preparation for conference session and/or poster presentations using technology.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
100% of SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the technology item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their use of technology for an oral presentation for a conference or course.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the technology item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their use of technology for an oral presentation for a conference or course.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

Increase Grant Writing Development
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education Emphasis Area doctoral pro...

SLO 6: Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
Graduates will develop clear research plans through which they conduct valid, data-supported, and theoretically consistent research linked to the mission of the Special Education program.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

Related Measures
M 3: Synthesis of Research
Student synthesis of research to develop a reasoned argument will be assessed through their dissertation proposal and defense. (See dissertation committee’s Doctoral Student Evaluation form.)

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of graduates will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" for the research item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" for the research item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

Increase Grant Writing Development
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education Emphasis Area doctoral pro...

M 6: Research rigor and quality
Student research rigor and quality will be assessed by the student's dissertation committee based on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation as well as the Ongoing Collaborative Research and Pre-Dissertation Research items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will earn a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Research" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations
Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of our graduates met or exceeded expectations in conducting/carrying out quality and rigorous research in their written dissertations and oral dissertation defenses.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of our students who completed a dissertation and oral dissertation defense met this expectation.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Research" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Based on the analysis of our findings and action plans from this cycle, the following change (representing a more targeted emp...

Increase Grant Writing Development
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education Emphasis Area doctoral pro...

SLO 7: Graduates will behave ethically in research and practice.
Students will recognize ethical issues related to research and practice and will adhere to professional guidelines such as those specified by CEC and/or the BACB.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations
Executive Vice President for Academics and Provost
1.2 Climate: Promote a positive and supportive climate by identifying aspects in the climate of individual units and the University which foster and/or impede a working and learning environment that fully recognizes, values, and integrates diversity in the pursuit of academic excellence.

Related Measures
M 7: Ethical and professional behavior at annual review
Students will be reviewed annually by their chair and any other faculty who have worked with the student that year using the Ethics item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form as well as on all items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers
Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of student annual evaluations will indicate they have met ethical and professional expectations (via the "Ethics" section of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
100% of our students met ethical and professional expectations as outlined on rubric. This is consistent with previous years of performance.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of SPED doctoral program graduates met ethical and professional expectations (via the "Ethics" section of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates met ethical and professional expectations (via the "Ethics" section of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation tasks are performed and conveyed for analysis and subsequent entry into WEAVEonline website. During the month of October 2015, the Special Education Program faculty will convene to (a) review identified student learning outcomes with corresponding measures, (b) review evaluation instruments, (c) confirm the specific faculty members who will be involved in completing evaluations for each measure and each student, (d) agree upon a timeline of when assessments will be performed and submitted to SPED Doctoral Chair, and (e) identify a date during spring semester for meeting to review findings.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Articulate theories and concepts orally and in writing  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education
- **Measure:** Ethical and professional behavior at annual review  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will behave ethically in research and practice.
- **Measure:** Research rigor and quality  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
  | Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education  
  | Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education
- **Measure:** Student communication  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will communicate effectively
- **Measure:** Synthesis of Research  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
  | Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education
- **Measure:** Teaching competency performance  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will demonstrate advanced pedagogical skills necessary to teach at the college level
- **Measure:** Technology for research and teaching  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will use technology proficiently.

**Implementation Description:** During the month of October 2015, the Special Education Program faculty will convene to discuss all the implementation details.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2016  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Special Program Faculty

**Special Education Doctoral Program**

This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or exceeded doctoral-level expectations for (a) mastery of degree requirements, (b) college teaching competence, (c) research competence including reasoned arguments within dissertation, (d) communication, (e) use of technology, and (f) ethical and professional behaviors.

Accordingly, the program will continue to emphasize assignments within required core doctoral courses (e.g., SPED 619 Critical Research and Practice Issues in Special Education, SPED 624 Professional Development in Research, SPED 683 Field Practicum/College Teaching Experience) that increase students’ participation and advanced skill development in teaching and research with Special Education program faculty.

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Articulate theories and concepts orally and in writing  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education
- **Measure:** Ethical and professional behavior at annual review  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will behave ethically in research and practice.
- **Measure:** Research rigor and quality  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
  | Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education  
  | Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education
- **Measure:** Student communication  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will communicate effectively
- **Measure:** Synthesis of Research  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
  | Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education
- **Measure:** Teaching competency performance  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will demonstrate advanced pedagogical skills necessary to teach at the college level
- **Measure:** Technology for research and teaching  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will use technology proficiently.

This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or exceeded doctoral-level expectations for (a) mastery of degree requirements, (b) college teaching competence, (c) research competence including reasoned arguments within dissertation, (d) communication, (e) use of technology, and (f) ethical and professional behaviors.
SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development

Based on the analysis of our findings and action plans from this cycle, the following change (representing a more targeted emphasis) is currently being made to improve our program. While our doctoral students have met or exceeded expectations across our learning outcomes, there is one area that we acknowledge needs strengthening. Some students have had opportunities to work with faculty members through SPED 683 (Field Practicum/Directed Studies) courses on aspects of grant proposal development (e.g., helping to update the literature), but few have participated in grant writing activities. While an overview is covered and examples are provided in SPED 624 (the Professional Development in Research doctoral seminar), more emphasis will be placed on this important skill by way of an assignment with associated evaluation outcomes. The goal of this action plan emphasis area is that students will have a good starting point from which to work when they begin their academic careers and respond to a request for proposals with their own submission. Additionally, we decided on a greater grant writing focus to support our efforts of becoming a higher-ranked special education program nationally.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Research rigor and quality | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
- Measure: Student communication | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will communicate effectively
- Measure: Synthesis of Research | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education

Implementation Description: Specifically, students will develop a mock grant proposal on a topic related to their unique research interests using the scoring rubric (e.g., significance of the project) from the U.S. Department of Education (our common funding agency). They will have to submit a finished product (proposal) at end of the semester. In SPED 619, students focused on foundations, concepts, principles, and theories of Special Education, articulating theories and concepts orally and in writing, synthesis of research, and ethical and professional behavior at annual review; in SPED 624, students will focus on research rigor and quality, use of technology, and ethical and professional behaviors. Accordingly, the program will continue to emphasize assignments within required core doctoral courses (e.g., SPED 619 Critical Research and Practice Issues in Special Education, SPED 624 Professional Development in Research, SPED 683 Field Practicum/College Teaching Experience) that increase students’ participation and advanced skill development in teaching and research with Special Education program faculty.

Projected Completion Date: 07/2018
Responsible Person/Group: SPED 683 and SPED 624 Faculty

Increase Grant Writing Development

This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education Emphasis Area doctoral program graduates met or exceeded doctoral-level expectations for: (a) mastery of degree requirements, (b) college teaching competence, (c) research competence including reasoned arguments within dissertation, (d) communication, and (e) use of technology, and (f) ethical and professional behaviors. Accordingly, the program will continue to emphasize assignments within required core doctoral courses (e.g., SPED 619 Critical Research and Practice Issues in Special Education, SPED 624 Professional Development in Research, SPED 683 Field Practicum/College Teaching Experience) that increase students’ participation and advanced skill development in teaching and research with Special Education program faculty.

Grant writing is an important and necessary skill for future scholars, and currently the students do not have a required course in their degree plan to gain these skills. Outside of partnering with a faculty member who is in the process of writing a grant, students may not get the writing experience until they graduate from the program. Thus, we are creating a series of writing activities that prepare our doctoral students for academic careers.

Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Articulate theories and concepts orally and in writing | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles, and theories of Special Education
- Measure: Ethical and professional behavior at annual review | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will behave ethically in research and practice.
- Measure: Research rigor and quality | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.

Implementation Description: SPED instructors for SPED 619, 624, and 683 will select targeted assignments and corresponding evaluation criteria for faculty discussion and input during the November 2016 program meeting. Any suggested changes and additions will be incorporated by April 2017 and presented during the April SPED program meeting.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2017
Responsible Person/Group: Special Education Doctoral Program Faculty including corresponding instructors for SPED 619, SPED 624, and SPED 683.

SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development

This action plan is based on the analysis of our findings and action plans from this cycle, the following change (representing a more targeted emphasis) is currently being made to improve our program. While our doctoral students have met or exceeded expectations across our learning outcomes, there is one area that we acknowledge needs strengthening. Some students have had opportunities to work with faculty members through SPED 683 (Field Practicum/Directed Studies) courses on aspects of grant proposal development (e.g., helping to update the literature), but few have participated in grant writing activities. While an overview is covered and examples are provided in SPED 624 (the Professional Development in Research doctoral seminar), more emphasis will be placed on this important skill by way of an assignment with associated evaluation outcomes. The goal of this action plan emphasis area is that students will have a good starting point from which to work when they begin their academic careers and respond to a request for proposals with their own submission. Additionally, we decided on a greater grant writing focus to support our efforts of becoming a higher-ranked special education program nationally.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Research rigor and quality | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
- Measure: Teaching competency performance | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will demonstrate advanced pedagogical skills necessary to teach at the college level
- Measure: Technology for research and teaching | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will use technology proficiently.

Implementation Description: SPED instructors for SPED 619, 624, and 683 will select targeted assignments and corresponding evaluation criteria for faculty discussion and input during the November 2016 program meeting. Any suggested changes and additions will be incorporated by April 2017 and presented during the April SPED program meeting.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2017
Responsible Person/Group: Special Education Doctoral Program Faculty including corresponding instructors for SPED 619, SPED 624, and SPED 683.
**Measure**: Synthesis of Research | **Outcome/Objective**: Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.

**Measure**: Teaching competency performance | **Outcome/Objective**: Graduates will demonstrate advanced pedagogical skills necessary to teach at the college level

**Measure**: Technology for research and teaching | **Outcome/Objective**: Graduates will use technology proficiently.

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

Students and graduates of the Special Education Emphasis Area program are performing well on all previously stated learning objectives. These action plan items remain to help ensure that students continue to achieve these learning outcomes. Additionally, we continue to evaluate how to enhance students' grant writing experiences. Currently, two options are outlined in the doctoral handbook for meeting the grant writing competency. One additional consideration is the development of a grant writing course.

"**CRITICAL**" Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

Because of ongoing collaboration with faculty members on research projects, writing for publication, and professional conference presentations, students and graduates of our program continue to excel in these area. We have noted that learning outcome goals continue to be met and exceeded given the level of one-on-one mentoring, as well as small and larger research group supports that are in place.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Special Education Doctoral Program at Texas A&M University is to prepare future scholars to assume faculty positions in higher education through which they can promote the development, measurement, and application of evidence-based practices to improve the quality of life of individuals with diverse learning needs and their families.

Goals

G 1: CEHD Strategic Goal 7
The Special Education Doctoral Program will prepare research scholars for the professoriate. This will be measured by tracking the number of our graduates who are at Tier 1 AAU institutions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education
Graduates will effectively articulate theories, concepts, and principles germane to Special Education and their area of concentration.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Strategic Plan Associations
Texas A&M University
2 Strengthen our graduate programs.

Related Measures

M 1: Articulate theories and concepts orally and in writing
Students will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" on both their written and oral competency in the area of "Mastery of Degree Requirements" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will pass the Foundations of Special Education portion of the written and oral competency exams. This is measured by a score of a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the Mastery of Degree requirements item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of the SPED doctoral program graduates met or exceeded expectations for Mastery of Degree Requirements.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates met or exceeded expectations for Mastery of Degree Requirements.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, they are not reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

M 6: Research rigor and quality
Student research rigor and quality will be assessed by the student's dissertation committee based on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation as
well as the Ongoing Collaborative Research and Pre-Dissertation Research items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
   Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will earn a "Meets expectations" or "above expectations" on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation.

Connected Document
   Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation as indicated by their rating on the "Research" section on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation as indicated by their rating on the "Research" section on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
   This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
   Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
   This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development
   Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
   Based on the analysis of our findings and action plans from this cycle, the following change (representing a more targeted emp...

SLO 2: Graduates will demonstrate advanced pedagogical skills necessary to teach at the college level
Graduates will have varied teaching and field experiences both face to face and online, to develop advanced pedagogical skills necessary to effectively explain the subject matter in the discipline.

Relevant Associations:
   Graduate Outcome Associations

2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

Related Measures
   M 2: Teaching competency performance

Following the completion of each semester of college teaching, student performance quality for their college teaching competency will be evaluated by their mentor/supervising faculty member in the area of "Teaching/Field Experience" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
   Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will complete their college teaching competency with a rating from their supervising faculty member of "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the Doctoral Competency Evaluation rubric.

Connected Document
   Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of our students who completed their college teaching competency met this expectation.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% (5/5) of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates met or exceeded this program competency.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
   This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SLO 3: Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education

Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures
M 3: Synthesis of Research
Student synthesis of research to develop a reasoned argument will be assessed through their dissertation proposal and defense. (See dissertation committee’s Doctoral Student Evaluation form.)
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of our students who completed a dissertation and oral dissertation defense met this expectation

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Research" (via dissertation committee’s Doctoral Student Evaluation form) based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Based on the analysis of our findings and action plans from this cycle, the following change (representing a more targeted emp...

M 6: Research rigor and quality
Student research rigor and quality will be assessed by the student’s dissertation committee based on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation as well as the Ongoing Collaborative Research and Pre-Dissertation Research items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form. .

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will earn a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Reasoned Arguments" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Reasoned Arguments" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a “meets expectations” or “above expectations” for “Reasoned Arguments” for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student
Evaluation form).

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Action Plan for future**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

**Special Education Doctoral Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

**SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development**
*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*
Based on the analysis of our findings and action plans from this cycle, the following change (representing a more targeted emp...

**SLO 4: Graduates will communicate effectively**
Graduates will demonstrate high level of competency in both verbal and written communications.

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations

2.3 Communicate effectively.

**Related Measures**

**M 4: Student communication**
Student competency in verbal and written communication will be assessed by their committee during their dissertation defense (as recorded on the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric).

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/ end-of-program subject matter exam

**Connected Document**
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

**Target:**
90% of graduates will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" for the communication item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric based on their written and oral competency exams.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
100% of doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Communication" on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their written and oral competency exams.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Communication" on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their written and oral competency exams.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Action Plan for future**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

**Special Education Doctoral Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

**SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development**
*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*
Based on the analysis of our findings and action plans from this cycle, the following change (representing a more targeted emp...

**SLO 5: Graduates will use technology proficiently.**
Graduates will be proficient in using technologies to communicate with others, to collaborate, to conduct research, and to solve problems.

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations

2.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Technology for research and teaching**
Students will present an oral presentation at a conference or during college teaching competency. Their use of technology will be assessed by their chair using the Doctoral Student Evaluation Technology item and the College Teaching competency on the Student Competencies Evaluation form.
SLO 6: Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.

Graduates will develop clear research plans through which they conduct valid, data-supported, and theoretically consistent research linked to the mission of the Special Education program.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

Related Measures

M 3: Synthesis of Research

Student synthesis of research to develop a reasoned argument will be assessed through their dissertation proposal and defense. (See dissertation committee’s Doctoral Student Evaluation form.)

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document

Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will earn a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the technology item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their use of technology for an oral presentation for a conference or course.

Connected Document

Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the technology item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their use of technology for an oral presentation for a conference or course.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the technology item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their use of technology for an oral presentation for a conference or course.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future

This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...
M 6: Research rigor and quality
Student research rigor and quality will be assessed by the student's dissertation committee based on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation as well as the Ongoing Collaborative Research and Pre-Dissertation Research items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will earn a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Research" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of our students who completed a dissertation and oral dissertation defense met this expectation.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Research" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Based on the analysis of our findings and action plans from this cycle, the following change (representing a more targeted emp...

SLO 7: Graduates will behave ethically in research and practice.
Students will recognize ethical issues related to research and practice and will adhere to professional guidelines such as those specified by CEC and/or the BACB.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations
Executive Vice President for Academics and Provost
1.2 Climate: Promote a positive and supportive climate by identifying aspects in the climate of individual units and the University which foster and/or impede a working and learning environment that fully recognizes, values, and integrates diversity in the pursuit of academic excellence.

Related Measures
M 7: Ethical and professional behavior at annual review
Students will be reviewed annually by their chair and any other faculty who have worked with the student that year using the Ethics item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form as well as on all items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of student annual evaluations will indicate they have met ethical and professional expectations (via the "Ethics" section of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of SPED doctoral program graduates met ethical and professional expectations (via the "Ethics" section of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates met ethical and professional expectations (via the "Ethics" section of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Action Plan for future**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2014-2015  
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation tasks are performed and conveyed for analysis and subsequent entry into WEAVEonline website. During the month of October 2015, the Special Education Program faculty will convene to (a) review identified student learning outcomes with corresponding measures, (b) review evaluation instruments, (c) confirm the specific faculty members who will be involved in completing evaluations for each measure and each student, (d) agree upon a timeline of when assessments will be performed and submitted to SPED Doctoral Chair, and (e) identify a date during spring semester for meeting to review findings.

*Established in Cycle:* 2014-2015  
*Implementation Status:* Finished  
*Priority:* High

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

### Action Plan for future

This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation tasks are performed and conveyed for analysis and subsequent entry into WEAVEonline website. During the month of October 2015, the Special Education Program faculty will convene to (a) review identified student learning outcomes with corresponding measures, (b) review evaluation instruments, (c) confirm the specific faculty members who will be involved in completing evaluations for each measure and each student, (d) agree upon a timeline of when assessments will be performed and submitted to SPED Doctoral Chair, and (e) identify a date during spring semester for meeting to review findings.

*Established in Cycle:* 2014-2015  
*Implementation Status:* Finished  
*Priority:* High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Articulate theories and concepts orally and in writing  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education

- **Measure:** Ethical and professional behavior at annual review  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will behave ethically in research and practice.

- **Measure:** Research rigor and quality  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.

- **Measure:** Synthesis of Research  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.

- **Measure:** Student communication  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will communicate effectively

- **Measure:** Technology for research and teaching  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will use technology proficiently.

**Implementation Description:** During the month of October 2015, the Special Education Program faculty will convene to discuss all the implementation details.

*Projected Completion Date:* 08/2016  
*Responsible Person/Group:* Special Program Faculty

### Special Education Doctoral Program

This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or exceeded doctoral-level expectations for (a) mastery of degree requirements, (b) college teaching competence, (c) research competence including reasoned arguments within dissertation, (d) communication, (e) use of technology, and (f) ethical and professional behaviors.

Accordingly, the program will continue to emphasize assignments within required core doctoral courses (e.g., SPED 619 Critical Research and Practice Issues in Special Education, SPED 624 Professional Development in Research, SPED 683 Field Practicum/College Teaching Experience) that increase students’ participation and advanced skill development in teaching and research with Special Education program faculty.

*Established in Cycle:* 2015-2016  
*Implementation Status:* Planned  
*Priority:* Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Articulate theories and concepts orally and in writing  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education

- **Measure:** Ethical and professional behavior at annual review  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will behave ethically in research and practice.

- **Measure:** Research rigor and quality  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.

- **Measure:** Teaching competency performance  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will demonstrate advanced pedagogical skills necessary to teach at the college level

- **Measure:** Technology for research and teaching  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will use technology proficiently.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

The newly formed action plan’s emphasis of grant proposal development area was selected so that students will (a) gain more of an understanding of the purpose and importance of grant writing; (b) develop an understanding of the essential components of a grant proposal; (c) gain experience writing a proposal; and (d) learn about various federal, state, local, and private funding agencies. This will allow them to have a good starting point from which to work when they begin their academic careers and respond to a request for proposals with their own submission. Additionally, we decided on a greater grant writing focus to support our efforts of becoming a higher-ranked special education program nationally.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research rigor and quality | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
Measure: Student communication | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will communicate effectively.
Measure: Synthesis of Research | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education.

Implementation Description: Specifically, students will develop a mock grant proposal on a topic related to their unique research interests using the scoring rubric (e.g., significance of the project) from the U.S. Department of Education (our common funding agency). They will have to submit a finished product (proposal) at the end of the semester. In SPED 619, students focused on foundations, concepts, principles, and theories of special education; verbal and written communication (by way of presenting reviews of research). In SPED 624, students focused on speech, language, and hearing disorders; supported responses to a request for proposals with their own submission. Additionally, we decided on a greater grant writing focus to support our efforts of becoming a higher-ranked special education program nationally.

SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development

Based on the analysis of our findings and action plans for the current and past cycles, the following change (a more targeted emphasis) is currently being made to improve our program. While our doctoral students have met or exceeded expectations across our learning outcomes, there is one area that we acknowledge needs strengthening. Some students have had opportunities to work with faculty members through SPED 683 (Field Practicum/Directed Studies) courses on aspects of grant proposal development (e.g., helping to update the literature), but few have participated in grant writing activities. While an overview is covered and examples are provided in SPED 624 (the Professional Development in Research doctoral seminar), a more important skill is needed: students need to develop grant writing abilities. The goal of this action plan emphasis area is that students will have a good starting point from which to work when they begin their academic careers and respond to a request for proposals with their own submission. Additionally, we decided on a greater grant writing focus to support our efforts of becoming a higher-ranked special education program nationally.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching competency performance | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will demonstrate advanced pedagogical skills necessary to teach at the college level.
Measure: Technology for research and teaching | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will use technology proficiently.

Implementation Description: SPED instructors for SPED 619, 624, and 683 will select targeted assignments and corresponding evaluation criteria for faculty discussion and input during the November 2016 program meeting. Any suggested changes and additions will be incorporated by April 2017 and presented during the April SPED program meeting.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2017
Responsible Person/Group: Special Education Doctoral Program Faculty including corresponding instructors for SPED 619, SPED 624, and SPED 683.

SPED 683 Grant Proposal Development

Based on the analysis of our findings and action plans for the current and past cycles, the following change (a more targeted emphasis) is currently being made to improve our program. While our doctoral students have met or exceeded expectations across our learning outcomes, there is one area that we acknowledge needs strengthening. Some students have had opportunities to work with faculty members through SPED 683 (Field Practicum/Directed Studies) courses on aspects of grant proposal development (e.g., helping to update the literature), but few have participated in grant writing activities. While an overview is covered and examples are provided in SPED 624 (the Professional Development in Research doctoral seminar), a more important skill is needed: students need to develop grant writing abilities. The goal of this action plan emphasis area is that students will have a good starting point from which to work when they begin their academic careers and respond to a request for proposals with their own submission. Additionally, we decided on a greater grant writing focus to support our efforts of becoming a higher-ranked special education program nationally.

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research rigor and quality | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
Measure: Student communication | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will communicate effectively.
Measure: Synthesis of Research | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education.

Implementation Description: Specifically, students will develop a mock grant proposal on a topic related to their unique research interests using the scoring rubric (e.g., significance of the project) from the U.S. Department of Education (our common funding agency). They will have to submit a finished product (proposal) at the end of the semester. In SPED 619, students focused on foundations, concepts, principles, and theories of special education; verbal and written communication (by way of presenting reviews of research). In SPED 624, students focused on speech, language, and hearing disorders; supported responses to a request for proposals with their own submission. Additionally, we decided on a greater grant writing focus to support our efforts of becoming a higher-ranked special education program nationally.

Projected Completion Date: 07/2018
Responsible Person/Group: SPED 683 and SPED 624 Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

The newly formed action plan’s emphasis of grant proposal development area was selected so that students will (a) gain more of an understanding of the purpose and importance of grant writing; (b) develop an understanding of the essential components of a grant proposal; (c) gain experience writing a proposal; and (d) learn about various federal, state, local, and private funding agencies. This will allow them to have a good starting point from which to work when they begin their academic careers—as they respond to requests for proposals.

It also worth noting that program faculty decided as a program to revisit our recruitment efforts. This academic year we have: (a) requested a streamlined application for our program with the Apply Texas application; (b) requested that our application deadlines be changed from December 1st to November 1st, and from April 1st to March 1st in an effort to have more time to review applications, interview candidates, and identify funding sources for incoming (as well as current) students; (c) hosted an Interview Day in January 2017 and one in April 2017 (we have admitted a cohort of 5 new students who will begin this fall); (d) developed an annual conference table and student scholarship information sheet for faculty to assist with planning and supporting program activities; (e) involved our current students in meeting with prospective as well as new/incoming students; and (f) continued with website updates for the program. We believe that making these changes will help with recognition by prospective students, and will help us with our mentoring of our current students as they prepare for careers in academia.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

Previous action plans outlined continuing to emphasize program requirements and encouraging increased student participation in advanced skill development related to teaching a research. No actionable steps were outlined in the action plan, thus no major updates are provided beyond the fact that students continue exceed expectations outlined in the
assessment plan.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Special Education Doctoral Program at Texas A&M University is to prepare future scholars to assume faculty positions in higher education through which they can promote the development, measurement, and application of evidence-based practices to improve the quality of life of individuals with diverse learning needs and their families.

Goals

G 1: CEHD Strategic Goal 7

The Special Education Doctoral Program will prepare research scholars for the professoriate. This will be measured by tracking the number of our graduates who are at Tier 1 AAU institutions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education

Graduates will effectively articulate theories, concepts, and principles germane to Special Education and their area of concentration.

Related Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Strategic Plan Associations

Texas A&M University
2 Strengthen our graduate programs.

Related Measures

M 1: Articulate theories and concepts orally and in writing

Students will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" on both their written and oral competency in the area of "Mastery of Degree Requirements" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document

Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:

90% of students will pass the Foundations of Special Education portion of the written and oral competency exams. This is measured by a score of a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the Mastery of Degree requirements item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates met or exceeded expectations for Mastery of Degree Requirements.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, they are not reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future

This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

M 6: Research rigor and quality

Student research rigor and quality will be assessed by the student’s dissertation committee based on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation as well as the Ongoing Collaborative Research and Pre-Dissertation Research items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will earn a "Meets expectations" or "above expectations" on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation.

Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation as indicated by their rating on the "Research" section on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SLO 2: Graduates will demonstrate advanced pedagogical skills necessary to teach at the college level
Graduates will have varied teaching and field experiences both face to face and online, to develop advanced pedagogical skills necessary to effectively explain the subject matter in the discipline.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

Related Measures
M 2: Teaching competency performance
Following the completion of each semester of college teaching, student performance quality for their college teaching competency will be evaluated by their mentor/supervising faculty member in the area of "Teaching/Field Experience" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form).
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will complete their college teaching competency with a rating from their supervising faculty member of "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the Doctoral Competency Evaluation rubric.

Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% (5/5) of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates met or exceeded this program competency.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SLO 3: Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education
Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures
M 3: Synthesis of Research
Student synthesis of research to develop a reasoned argument will be assessed through their dissertation proposal and defense. (See dissertation committee’s Doctoral Student Evaluation form.)
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Research" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form) based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

M 6: Research rigor and quality
Student research rigor and quality will be assessed by the student’s dissertation committee based on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation as well as the Ongoing Collaborative Research and Pre-Dissertation Research items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target:
90% of graduates will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Research" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form) based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Research" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form) based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SLO 4: Graduates will communicate effectively
Graduates will demonstrate high level of competency in both verbal and written communications.

Related Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures
M 4: Student communication
Student competency in verbal and written communication will be assessed by their committee during their dissertation defense (as recorded on the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric).

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90% of graduates will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" for the communication item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric based on their written and oral competency exams.
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Communication" on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their written and oral competency exams.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SLO 5: Graduates will use technology proficiently.
Graduates will be proficient in using technologies to communicate with others, to collaborate, to conduct research, and to solve problems.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures
M 5: Technology for research and teaching
Students will present an oral presentation at a conference or during college teaching competency. Their use of technology will be assessed by their chair using the Doctoral Student Evaluation Technology item and the College Teaching competency on the Student Competencies Evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will earn a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the technology item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their use of technology for an oral presentation for a conference or course.

Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the technology item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their use of technology for an oral presentation for a conference or course.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SLO 6: Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
Graduates will develop clear research plans through which they conduct valid, data-supported, and theoretically consistent research linked to the mission of the Special Education program.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

Related Measures
M 3: Synthesis of Research
Student synthesis of research to develop a reasoned argument will be assessed through their dissertation proposal
and defense. (See dissertation committee’s Doctoral Student Evaluation form.)

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
[Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric](#)

**Target:**
90% of graduates will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" for the research item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" for the research item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Action Plan for future**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

**Special Education Doctoral Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

**M 6: Research rigor and quality**
Student research rigor and quality will be assessed by the student's dissertation committee based on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation as well as the Ongoing Collaborative Research and Pre-Dissertation Research items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Connected Document**
[Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric](#)

**Target:**
90% of students will earn a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Research" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

**Connected Document**
[Doctoral Competency Evaluations](#)

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Research" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Action Plan for future**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

**Special Education Doctoral Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

**SLO 7: Graduates will behave ethically in research and practice.**
Students will recognize ethical issues related to research and practice and will adhere to professional guidelines such as those specified by CEC and/or the BACB.

**Relevant Associations:**
- Graduate Outcome Associations
  2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.
- Strategic Plan Associations
  - Executive Vice President for Academics and Provost
  1.2 Climate: Promote a positive and supportive climate by identifying aspects in the climate of individual units and the University which foster and/or impede a working and learning environment that fully recognizes, values, and integrates diversity in the pursuit of academic excellence.

**Related Measures**
- **M 7: Ethical and professional behavior at annual review**
  Students will be reviewed annually by their chair and any other faculty who have worked with the student that year using the Ethics item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form as well as on all items on the Doctoral Student
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Action Plan for future**

*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*

This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation tasks are performed and conveyed for analysis and subsequent entry into WEAVEonline website. During the month of October 2015, the Special Education Program faculty will convene to (a) review identified student learning outcomes with corresponding measures, (b) review evaluation instruments, (c) confirm the specific faculty members who will be involved in completing evaluations for each measure and each student, (d) agree upon a timeline of when assessments will be performed and submitted to SPED Doctoral Chair, and (e) identify a date during spring semester for meeting to review findings.

*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*

This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or exceeded doctoral-level expectations for (a) mastery of degree requirements, (b) college teaching competence, (c) research competence including reasoned arguments within dissertation, (d) communication, (e) use of technology, and (f) ethical and professional behaviors.

Accordingly, the program will continue to emphasize assignments within required core doctoral courses (e.g., SPED 619 Critical Research and Practice Issues in Special Education, SPED 624 Professional Development in Research, SPED 683 Field Practicum/College Teaching Experience) that increase students' participation and advanced skill development in teaching and research with Special Education program faculty.
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Articulate theories and concepts orally and in writing | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education
- **Measure:** Ethical and professional behavior at annual review | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will behave ethically in research and practice.
- **Measure:** Research rigor and quality | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
  - Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education
- **Measure:** Student communication | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will communicate effectively
- **Measure:** Synthesis of Research | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
  - Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education
- **Measure:** Teaching competency performance | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will demonstrate advanced pedagogical skills necessary to teach at the college level
- **Measure:** Technology for research and teaching | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will use technology proficiently.

Implementation Description: SPED instructors for SPED 619, 624, and 683 will select targeted assignments and corresponding evaluation criteria for faculty discussion and input during the November 2016 program meeting. Any suggested changes and additions will be incorporated by April 2017 and presented during the April SPED program meeting.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2017
Responsible Person/Group: Special Education Doctoral Program Faculty including corresponding instructors for SPED 619, SPED 624, and SPED 683.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.**

We are continuing to provide SPED doctoral students with opportunities to present at conferences, teach courses, participate in grant proposal development, and work on research teams to address the following measures: 'Articulate Theories and Concepts Orally and in Writing,' 'Teaching Competency Performance,' and 'Synthesis of Research' goals. While all of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates met or exceeded expectations, we continue to look for opportunities for current and future students to actively engage in this apprenticeship model.

**Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.**

Based on the finding that all of our 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates were able to meet or exceed expectations with regard to their program competencies, we will continue to conduct annual reviews of our doctoral students to quickly identify areas that need development or more support to ensure progress toward meeting stated objectives.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Special Education Doctoral Program at Texas A&M University is to prepare future scholars to assume faculty positions in higher education through which they can promote the development, measurement, and application of evidence-based practices to improve the quality of life of individuals with diverse learning needs and their families.

Goals

G 1: CEHD Strategic Goal 7

The Special Education Doctoral Program will prepare research scholars for the professoriate. This will be measured by tracking the number of our graduates who are at Tier 1 AAU institutions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education

Graduates will effectively articulate theories, concepts, and principles germane to Special Education and their area of concentration.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Strategic Plan Associations

Texas A&M University

2 Strengthen our graduate programs.

Related Measures

M 1: Articulate theories and concepts orally and in writing

Students will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" on both their written and oral competency in the area of "Mastery of Degree Requirements" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document

Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:

90% of students will pass the Foundations of Special Education portion of the written and oral competency exams. This is measured by a score of a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the Mastery of Degree requirements item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates met or exceeded expectations for Mastery of Degree Requirements.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, they are not reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future


This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

M 6: Research rigor and quality

Student research rigor and quality will be assessed by the student’s dissertation committee based on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation as well as the Ongoing Collaborative Research and Pre-Dissertation Research items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students will earn a "Meets expectations" or "above expectations" on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation.

Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation as indicated by their rating on the "Research" section on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Action Plan for future**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

**Special Education Doctoral Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SLO 2: Graduates will demonstrate advanced pedagogical skills necessary to teach at the college level
Graduates will have varied teaching and field experiences both face to face and online, to develop advanced pedagogical skills necessary to effectively explain the subject matter in the discipline.

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

**Related Measures**
M 2: Teaching competency performance
Following the completion of each semester of college teaching, student performance quality for their college teaching competency will be evaluated by their mentor/supervising faculty member in the area of "Teaching/Field Experience" (via dissertation committee’s Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

**Target:**
90% of students will complete their college teaching competency with a rating from their supervising faculty member of "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the Doctoral Competency Evaluation rubric.

Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
100% (5/5) of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates met or exceeded this program competency.

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Action Plan for future**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

**Special Education Doctoral Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2015-2016*
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SLO 3: Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education
Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education.

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

**Related Measures**
M 3: Synthesis of Research
Student synthesis of research to develop a reasoned argument will be assessed through their dissertation proposal and defense. (See dissertation committee’s Doctoral Student Evaluation form.)
Target: 90% of graduates will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Research" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form) based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Research" (via dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form) based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

M 6: Research rigor and quality
Student research rigor and quality will be assessed by the student’s dissertation committee based on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation as well as the Ongoing Collaborative Research and Pre-Dissertation Research items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Reasoned Arguments" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SLO 4: Graduates will communicate effectively
Graduates will demonstrate high level of competency in both verbal and written communications.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures

M 4: Student communication
Student competency in verbal and written communication will be assessed by their committee during their dissertation defense (as recorded on the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric).

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target: 90% of graduates will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" for the communication item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric based on their written and oral competency exams.
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" in the area of "Communication" on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their written and oral competency exams.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SLO 5: Graduates will use technology proficiently.
Graduates will be proficient in using technologies to communicate with others, to collaborate, to conduct research, and to solve problems.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.

Related Measures
M 5: Technology for research and teaching
Students will present an oral presentation at a conference or during college teaching competency. Their use of technology will be assessed by their chair using the Doctoral Student Evaluation Technology item and the College Teaching competency on the Student Competencies Evaluation form.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric
Target:
90% of students will earn a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the technology item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their use of technology for an oral presentation for a conference or course.
Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" on the technology item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form based on their use of technology for an oral presentation for a conference or course.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SLO 6: Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
Graduates will develop clear research plans through which they conduct valid, data-supported, and theoretically consistent research linked to the mission of the Special Education program.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

Related Measures
M 3: Synthesis of Research
Student synthesis of research to develop a reasoned argument will be assessed through their dissertation proposal
and defense. (See dissertation committee's Doctoral Student Evaluation form.)

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document: Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of graduates will earn a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" for the research item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a score of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" for the research item of the Doctoral Student Evaluation rubric based on their written dissertation and oral defense of their dissertation.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

M 6: Research rigor and quality
Student research rigor and quality will be assessed by the student's dissertation committee based on their written dissertation and their oral defense of the dissertation using the Research item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation as well as the Ongoing Collaborative Research and Pre-Dissertation Research items on the Doctoral Student Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document: Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of students will earn a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Research" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Connected Document: Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
100% of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates earned a "meets expectations" or "above expectations" for "Research" for their written dissertation and oral dissertation defense (via the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year's action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation ta...

Special Education Doctoral Program
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or...

SLO 7: Graduates will behave ethically in research and practice.
Students will recognize ethical issues related to research and practice and will adhere to professional guidelines such as those specified by CEC and/or the BACB.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations
Executive Vice President for Academics and Provost
1.2 Climate: Promote a positive and supportive climate by identifying aspects in the climate of individual units and the University which foster and/or impede a working and learning environment that fully recognizes, values, and integrates diversity in the pursuit of academic excellence.

Related Measures

M 7: Ethical and professional behavior at annual review
Students will be reviewed annually by their chair and any other faculty who have worked with the student that year using the Ethics item on the Doctoral Student Evaluation form as well as on all items on the Doctoral Student
Competencies Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

Connected Document
Doctoral Student Evaluation Rubric

Target:
90% of student annual evaluations will indicate they have met ethical and professional expectations (via the "Ethics" section of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Connected Document
Doctoral Competency Evaluations

Finding
2015-2016 - Target: Met
100% of 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates met ethical and professional expectations (via the "Ethics" section of the Doctoral Student Evaluation form).

Finding
2014-2015 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are available for this cycle. Therefore, it will not be reported in this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Action Plan for future
This year’s action plan focuses on establishing procedures and specified timelines to ensure that doctoral student evaluation tasks are performed and conveyed for analysis and subsequent entry into WEAVEonline website. During the month of October 2015, the Special Education Program faculty will convene to (a) review identified student learning outcomes with corresponding measures, (b) review evaluation instruments, (c) confirm the specific faculty members who will be involved in completing evaluations for each measure and each student, (d) agree upon a timeline of when assessments will be performed and submitted to SPED Doctoral Chair, and (e) identify a date during spring semester for meeting to review findings.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Special Education Doctoral Program

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Articulate theories and concepts orally and in writing | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education
  Measure: Ethical and professional behavior at annual review | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will behave ethically in research and practice.
  Measure: Research rigor and quality | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
  | Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education | Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education.
  Measure: Student communication | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will communicate effectively.
  Measure: Synthesis of Research | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
  | Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education.
  Measure: Teaching competency performance | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will demonstrate advanced pedagogical skills necessary to teach at the college level.
  Measure: Technology for research and teaching | Outcome/Objective: Graduates will use technology proficiently.

Implementation Description: During the month of October 2015, the Special Education Program faculty will convene to discuss all the implementation details.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Special Program Faculty

Special Education Doctoral Program

This action plan is based on the current evaluation cycle findings that 100% of the Special Education program graduates met or exceeded doctoral-level expectations for (a) mastery of degree requirements, (b) college teaching competence, (c) research competence including reasoned arguments within dissertation, (d) communication, (e) use of technology, and (f) ethical and professional behaviors.

Accordingly, the program will continue to emphasize assignments within required core doctoral courses (e.g., SPED 619 Critical Research and Practice Issues in Special Education, SPED 624 Professional Development in Research, SPED 683 Field Practicum/College Teaching Experience) that increase students’ participation and advanced skill development in teaching and research with Special Education program faculty.
Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure:** Articulate theories and concepts orally and in writing | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will understand foundations, concepts, principles and theories of Special Education
- **Measure:** Ethical and professional behavior at annual review | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will behave ethically in research and practice.
- **Measure:** Research rigor and quality | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
  - Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education
- **Measure:** Student communication | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will communicate effectively
- **Measure:** Synthesis of Research | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will conduct rigorous, theoretically sound, and institutionally appropriate research.
  - Graduates will create reasoned arguments based on synthesis and evaluation of the literature base in Special Education
- **Measure:** Teaching competency performance | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will demonstrate advanced pedagogical skills necessary to teach at the college level
- **Measure:** Technology for research and teaching | **Outcome/Objective:** Graduates will use technology proficiently.

**Implementation Description:** SPED instructors for SPED 619, 624, and 683 will select targeted assignments and corresponding evaluation criteria for faculty discussion and input during the November 2016 program meeting. Any suggested changes and additions will be incorporated by April 2017 and presented during the April SPED program meeting.

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2017

**Responsible Person/Group:** Special Education Doctoral Program Faculty including corresponding instructors for SPED 619, SPED 624, and SPED 683.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

We are continuing to provide SPED doctoral students with opportunities to present at conferences, teach courses, participate in grant proposal development, and work on research teams to address the following measures: 'Articulate Theories and Concepts Orally and in Writing,' 'Teaching Competency Performance,' and 'Synthesis of Research' goals.

While all of the 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates met or exceeded expectations, we continue to look for opportunities for current and future students to actively engage in this apprenticeship model.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

Based on the finding that all of our 2015 SPED doctoral program graduates were able to meet or exceed expectations with regard to their program competencies, we will continue to conduct annual reviews of our doctoral students to quickly identify areas that need development or more support to ensure progress toward meeting stated objectives.
Mission / Purpose

The TAMU doctoral school psychology program offers training in school psychology. It endorses and subscribes to the scientist-practitioner model for the training of professional/health service psychologists. The primary mission of the program is the development of psychologists who recognize the importance of scholarly inquiry and the application of various methods to the resolution of problems encountered in their professional practice, teaching, continuing professional development and their discipline at large. The program endeavors to train psychologists capable of contributing to the health care of children and adolescents, from perspectives of prevention and intervention, related to mental, academic, emotional, and behavioral difficulties, especially as related to schools and the educational process, at the individual and organization level. Since children and families may be encountered in a variety of settings and contexts, the training program attempts to equip students to work in a variety of private and institutional settings, in addition to public and private schools. The program emphasizes and promotes diversity issues related to the practice of psychology, as well as addressing achievement and mental health disparities among minority populations. The program uses a prevention and implementation science as a framework for the curriculum. Rigorous academic standards are maintained, and teaching, supervision, and research experiences are made available so students may successfully compete for academic positions at colleges and universities throughout the country.

The scientist practitioner model is consistent with the Standards of Accreditation of the American Psychological Association. The scientist component is most consistent with the research mission of Texas A&M University; the practitioner component is most consistent with the land grant mission and training of professionals to meet the needs of the State of the Texas.

Goals

G 1: Professional Competencies
Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional issues, including ethical, legal, diversity, communication, and quality assurance principles necessary for professional competencies

G 2: Scientific Knowledge
Students will demonstrate scientific knowledge, methods, and critical thinking relevant to the practice and science of psychology

G 3: Diversity
The program will continue to emphasize diversity (of all types) in the training program, the recruitment of students, and the practices and processes associated with student grading, support, and mentoring

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Degree requirements
Students will be able to meet degree requirements

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations

2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
Degree Requirements
Broad Knowledge in Discipline
Critical Thinking
Communicate Effectively
Ethical and Legal Issues
Research
Teaching/Supervision
Professional Field Experiences
Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% of students will meet expectations for adequate progress to complete program in timely manner.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Met
The target of 90% was NOT MET; only 71.4% of the currently enrolled students will graduate in 5 years as
measured by self and faculty evaluation and review of transcripts. Many students already delayed continue to 
be delayed until graduation; of those currently completing their 4th year (n=33), 90.9% are currently expected 
to graduate in 5 years. As those currently in years 5, 6, 7, are expected to graduate in the 2018-2019 year, it 
is expected that we will meet the 90% objective by that time.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met**
80% of students met this requirement upon completing the annual expectations review. Therefore the target 
was not met. This goal was established 3 years ago. There is steady progress with a significant increase in the 
percentage of students able to complete the program in 5 years (73.9% in 2015-2016).

**SLO 2: Knowledge Evidence**
Students will be able to evidence expected mastery of broad and general knowledge in the field.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a 
coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply 
subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following 
categories:
Degree Requirements
Broad Knowledge in Discipline
Critical Thinking
Communicate Effectively
Ethical and Legal Issues
Research
Teaching/Supervision
Professional Field Experiences
Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% of students will meet expectations for demonstrating broad knowledge in discipline.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
The target of 90% was MET; 97.6% were found to evidence expected mastery of broad and general knowledge 
as measured by self and faculty evaluation and objective measures (Adv. Psych GRE, Praxis II).

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
93.5% of students met expectations for demonstrating broad knowledge in the discipline based on the rubric 
guidelines.

**M 2: Praxis II Exam**
Praxis II for School Psychologists is an exam based on the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) 
Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological SErvices and is designed for candidates seeking 
licensure or certification as school psychologists in educational settings. Students need to successfully pass this 
exam at the end of the second year of their program in order to move forward with dissertation proposal and written 
comprehensive exams.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
90% of students will pass the exam on their first attempt. All students are required to pass the exam based on 
national accreditation through the American Psychological Association.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
Target was met. 97.6% of students passed the Praxis II exam. Students who fail to pass this exam fall below 
program expectancy and are placed on probation. This year’s findings are consistent with previous student 
performance.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
93.5% of students passed their Praxis II exam on the first attempt. Therefore this target was met. Students 
continue to demonstrate discipline specific knowledge at expected levels; however, many delay in taking the 
required exams and/or do not have good test-taking skills

**M 3: Advanced Psychology GRE Exam**
Students will take the Advanced Psychology GRE, which covers competencies and knowledge within all areas of 
psychology. Students need to successfully pass this exam at the end of the second year of their program in order to 
move forward with dissertation proposal and written comprehensive exams.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target:
90% of students will pass the exam on their first attempt. All students are required to pass the exam based on 
national accreditation through the American Psychological Association.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
Target was met. 97.6% of student passed the Advanced Psychology GRE exam. Performance on exam is 
consistent with previous assessment cycles.
Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
93.5% of students passed their Psych GRE exam on the first attempt. Therefore this target was met. Students continue to demonstrate discipline specific knowledge at expected levels; however, many delay in taking the required exams and/or do not have good test-taking skills.

SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills
Students will be able to demonstrate critical thinking skills.

Related Measures

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
Degree Requirements
Broad Knowledge in Discipline
Critical Thinking
Communicate Effectively
Ethical and Legal Issues
Research
Teaching/Supervision
Professional Field Experiences
Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% of students will meet expectations for demonstrating critical thinking at time of annual review.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
The target of 90% was MET; 97.6% of the currently enrolled students demonstrate critical thinking skills as measured by self and faculty evaluation.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
Based on faculty review and completion of critical reviews of research, 100% of students meet this goal. Therefore this target was met.

SLO 4: Effective Communication
Students will be able to communicate effectively orally and in written form.

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
2.3 Communicate effectively.

Related Measures

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
Degree Requirements
Broad Knowledge in Discipline
Critical Thinking
Communicate Effectively
Ethical and Legal Issues
Research
Teaching/Supervision
Professional Field Experiences
Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% of students will meet expectations to communicate effectively in written, oral, and interpersonal form at annual review.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
The target of 90% was MET; 97.6% of currently enrolled students demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form as measured by self and faculty evaluation. Students continue to make progress in oral and written communication skills.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
93.5% of students demonstrated the ability to communicate effectively in oral and written form based on rubric. As in the past, the goal was met, with some concerns with writing for a few students. [Preview Formatting]

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Research Colloquium:
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Research Colloquium: Beginning in Fall 2017, we will offer students the opportunity to present their research (SLO Research) wit...

**M 4: Practicum Student Evaluation Form**
This form measures students' performance during a year long field experience. It's completed by a field site supervisor and a faculty supervisor.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Connected Document
Practicum Evaluation Form

Target:
90% of students will receive satisfactory scores in the following categories:
- Demonstrates effective interpersonal skills and is able to manage difficult communications
- Ability to communicate ideas verbally and in written form
- Ability to listen and be empathic with others

Connected Document
Practicum Evaluation Form

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
93.5% of students demonstrated the ability to communicate effectively in oral and written form based on rubric. As in the past, the goal was met, with some concerns with writing for a few students.

**SLO 5: Ethical and Legal Action**
Students will be able to demonstrate understanding and application of ethical and legal courses of action

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations

2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
Degree Requirements
Broad Knowledge in Discipline
Critical Thinking
Communicate Effectively
Ethical and Legal Issues
Research
Teaching/Supervision
Professional Field Experiences
Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% of students will demonstrate knowledge and application of ethical and legal issues in clinical practice at annual review.

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
The target of 90% was MET; 100% of currently enrolled students demonstrate understanding and application of ethical and legal courses of action as measures by self and faculty evaluation. The opportunities and feedback to students consistently over the course of the program has been effective with any minor issues resolved prior to subsequent field experiences, and usually within the first year of the program.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
97.7% of students demonstrated knowledge and application of ethical and legal issues in clinical practice at annual review. Legal/ethical concerns were only evident for one student.

**SLO 6: Knowledge of Research**
Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge, understanding and application of research design, measurement, statistics for year in program.

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations

2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

**Related Measures**
**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**

Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:

- Degree Requirements
- Broad Knowledge in Discipline
- Critical Thinking
- Communicate Effectively
- Ethical and Legal Issues
- Research
- Teaching/Supervision
- Professional Field Experiences
- Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**

RubricsSPSYPhD

**Target:**
90% of students will meet expectations in their ability to demonstrate knowledge and application of research at annual review.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
The target of 90% was MET; 95.2% of currently enrolled students demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and application of research design, measurement, and statistics, are involved in one or more research activities, and depending on year in program are involved in presentation and publication in some capacity as measured by self and faculty evaluation. Overall, by the time they reach dissertation, these practices have been successful in preparing students to engage in independent research (dissertation) and to present and publish.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Duplicate. Please delete.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
95.6% of students met expectations for demonstrating knowledge and application of research at annual review. As in the past, the majority of students are involved in research activities, and co-authoring presentations; less are co-authoring publications prior to 3rd year.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Research Colloquium:**
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Research Colloquium: Beginning in Fall 2017, we will offer students the opportunity to present their research (SLO Research) with...

---

**SLO 7: Teaching and Supervision Skills**

Students will be able to demonstrate teaching and supervision skills.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**

Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:

- Degree Requirements
- Broad Knowledge in Discipline
- Critical Thinking
- Communicate Effectively
- Ethical and Legal Issues
- Research
- Teaching/Supervision
- Professional Field Experiences
- Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**

RubricsSPSYPhD

**Target:**
90% of students will meet Teaching and Supervision expectations at annual review.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
The target of 90% was MET; 100% of currently enrolled students have demonstrated the ability to transmit knowledge through teaching assistantships, guest lectures, class presentations, in-services, and/or provision of supervision as measured by self and faculty evaluation.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
100% of students had the opportunity to teach via class presentations with approximately 8 by the end of 2nd year. In 3rd or 4th year students provide clinical supervision in conjunction with the university supervisor.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Research Colloquium:**
*Established in Cycle: 2016-2017*
Research Colloquium: Beginning in Fall 2017, we will offer students the opportunity to present their research (SLO Research) wit...

**SLO 8: Professional Field Experience**
Students will be able to engage in professional field experiences in various settings to demonstrate competencies in assessment, intervention, and consultation.

**Relevant Associations:**
- Graduate Outcome Associations
  
  **2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.**

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
- Degree Requirements
- Broad Knowledge in Discipline
- Critical Thinking
- Communicate Effectively
- Ethical and Legal Issues
- Research
- Teaching/Supervision
- Professional Field Experiences
- Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**
[RubricsSPSYPhD](#)

**Target:**
90% of students will meet knowledge and application of evidence-based intervention, knowledge and education of evidence-based assessment, and knowledge and application of consultation expectations at time of annual review.

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met**
The target of 90% was MET; 93.5% of currently enrolled students demonstrate clinical competencies in assessment, intervention, and consultation appropriate for year in program as measured by self and faculty evaluation.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
93.5% of students will met knowledge and application of evidence-based intervention, knowledge and education of evidence-based assessment, and knowledge and application of consultation expectations at time of annual review.

**M 4: Practicum Student Evaluation Form**
This form measures students’ performance during a year long field experience. It's completed by a field site supervisor and a faculty supervisor.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Connected Document**
[Practicum Evaluation Form](#)

**Target:**
90% of students will score satisfactory in all Professional and Ethical/Legal Behavior, Appreciation of Individual/Cultural Diversity, and Knowledge characteristics (page 2 of rubric).

**Connected Document**
[Practicum Evaluation Form](#)

**Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Not reported this cycle.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**
93.5% of students scored satisfactory on the rubric. Therefore this target was met. Concerns were noted with three students, struggling in their application of skills in one or more field experiences.

**SLO 9: Additional Competencies**
Students will be able to demonstrate additional competencies for clinical practice, including professionalism, reflective practice, and appreciation of individual/cultural diversity.

**Relevant Associations:**
- Graduate Outcome Associations
  
  **2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.**

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
- Degree Requirements
- Broad Knowledge in Discipline
- Critical Thinking
- Communicate Effectively
- Ethical and Legal Issues
- Research
- Teaching/Supervision
- Professional Field Experiences
- Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% of students will meet professionalism, reflective practice, and individual/cultural diversity expectations at annual review

Finding (2017-2018) - Target: Met
The target of 90% was MET; 90.4% of the currently enrolled students demonstrate additional professional competencies, reflective practice, and appreciation of individual/cultural diversity as measured by self and faculty evaluation. All professional competencies continue to be evaluated each semester through formative and summative University/field supervisor and self-evaluations. We gather information from field supervisors regarding their professionalism with no ethical or legal concerns. Students have exposure to working with diverse populations in diverse settings through strategic practicum and case assignments.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
91.3% of students met expectations for professionalism, reflective practice, and individual/cultural diversity expectations at annual review. Concerns were noted with regard to time management, use of technology during lecture, peer interactions, responsiveness to feedback.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Remediation Plan - Additional Competencies
Established in Cycle: 2017-2018
While this target was met, with 90% of students demonstrating additional competencies, we have developed remediation plans to add...

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Additional Competencies (APA)
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating professionalism, reflective practice, and cultural competencies. Continued efforts will involve course work specific to ethical and legal practice, culture and diversity, along with lessons integrating these topics into each course within our program. Students will gain exposure to collaborating with diverse professionals in community, school, and other settings. In addition, mental health services will be provided by our students to children and families of differing cultural, racial, gender, SES, religious, disability, and other backgrounds. Mandated weekly supervision meetings for practicum students fosters reflective practice. Students will engage in self-evaluation of clinical practices and service delivery with feedback from faculty and on-site supervisors.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Hgh
Implementation Description: Monitor annually in April.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Broad and General Knowledge
This objective was met with 97.7 % of students demonstrating appropriate mastery of broad and general knowledge. To continue to maintain this level, we will continue to deliver coursework that provides comprehensive knowledge and skills essential to the field of school psychology. Our course sequence includes a range of courses designed to establish competency across a variety of domains in assessment, evidence-based intervention, and research methodology. Our courses ensure that students learn important theories of child development, as well as the theoretical bases of psychopathology and the assessment and intervention approaches that are needed for research and practice.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Hgh
Implementation Description: Monitor annually
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Communication
This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form. The program will continue to address communication skills throughout our courses, practica, and research experiences. The majority of the courses in our program require students to complete at least one oral presentation as well as written assignments in the form of papers, assessment reports, and other products. School- and clinic-based practica involve written assessment reports and case notes, as well as the opportunity to interact and communicate with students, parents and other professionals across a range of contexts. In school-based practica and other
### Critical Thinking
This objective was met as well with all students demonstrating critical thinking skills. Critical thinking skills will continue to be addressed with the goal to (1) evaluate, analyze, and integrate information from a variety of sources, (2) use appropriate strategies and tools to represent, analyze and integrate information, and (3) develop critical, reasoned positions on in-class projects. These activities are incorporated into all courses, practica, and research experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Monitor Progress in April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>08/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Program Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethical and Legal
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of ethical and legal courses of action. Students will continue to be required to complete RB training within the first semester in the program. Additionally, these critical competencies will continue to be addressed a) as a component of all coursework, b) as a component of all field experiences, c) as a component of research, and d) as evaluated by University and field supervisors with each field experience. In practica settings and supervision, ethical and legal courses of action will continue to be emphasized. As currently, we will also continue to encourage students to participate in professional conferences where ethical and legal courses of action are discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Monitor annually in April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>08/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Program Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduation within five years
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has increased over the past 10 years to 5.6 years predominantly due to completion of dissertation. Of the students currently enrolled, 23% will not meet the 5 year graduation mark.

To address the issue of time to degree, program faculty plan to a) more clearly articulate benchmarks to program completion, b) look at reducing course requirements to allow additional time for research activities and completion of the dissertation, and c) encourage students to use faculty existing data sets or public use datasets in lieu of collecting their own data.

For those students not meeting program benchmarks, the program will consider a) blocking registration for any elective courses or field experiences, and if necessary, b) blocking registration for the following semester(s) with a remediation plan consistent with the Student Handbook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Curriculum analysis, early identification of people who might be delayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>08/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Program Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Field Experience
This objective was met by 97.7% of our students demonstrating competencies in assessment, intervention, consultation, and professional experiences. To continue this level of achievement, students will continue to be required to engage in field practicum experiences supervised by a licensed psychologist within school and community settings. Each practicum builds on clinical skills learned through course work and previous practicum placements. Students are exposed to and engage in assessment, consultation, therapy, and crisis intervention. These required practicums provide students the minimal number of direct and indirect service hours to obtain a professional internship towards licensure. Outside of the required field practicum course load, students will be encouraged to seek field-based practicums through partnerships in settings that may include hospitals, residential treatment centers, counseling centers, and community clinics, which provides additional experiences to enhance competency. These increased opportunities help students to be highly competitive for their professional internship, post-doctoral residencies, and the job market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Monitor Annually in April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>08/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Program Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research, Measurement, and Statistics
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of research design, measurement, and statistics for respective year in program. Students will continue to be required to take at least 12 credits of RMS coursework. In addition, continued efforts will involve students becoming involved in faculty-led research.
research teams within their first year of entering the program, co-authoring a conference presentation and manuscript submission for publication, and being involved in grant proposal development during their tenure in the program. Students will continue to write a mock grant for a prevention science program as a course component as well.


| Implementation Status: Finished |
| Priority: High |
| Implementation Description: Monitor annually in April 2016 |
| Projected Completion Date: 08/2016 |
| Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty |

### Teaching and supervision skills

This objective was met with 95.5% of students demonstrating teaching/supervision (e.g., the ability to transfer knowledge/skills to others). Continued efforts will involve students making presentations during graduate coursework, providing in-services in the community, and providing guest lectures. All students now participate in a supervision practicum. For those students with an interest, more intensive structured teaching experiences will be provided and/or they can serve as a teaching assistant.


| Implementation Status: Finished |
| Priority: High |
| Implementation Description: Monitor annually |
| Projected Completion Date: 08/2016 |
| Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty |

### Continued - 5 year degree completion

Results for 2015-2016 cycle show that this cycle was not met. As this is only the second year of the outcome we are still working to address the issue of time to degree and plan to continue was outlined in 2014-2015 action plan for graduation within 5 years. (Also listed below).

"To address the issue of time to degree, program faculty plan to a) more clearly articulate benchmarks to program completion, b) look at reducing course requirements to allow additional time for research activities and completion of the dissertation, and c) encourage students to use faculty existing data sets or public use data sets in lieu of collecting their own data. For those students not meeting program benchmarks, the program will consider a) blocking registration for any elective courses or field experiences, and if necessary, b) blocking registration for the following semester(s) with a remediation plan consistent with the Student Handbook."

### Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

| Implementation Status: Planned |
| Priority: High |
| Projected Completion Date: 05/2018 |

### Research Colloquium:

Research Colloquium: Beginning in Fall 2017, we will offer students the opportunity to present their research (SLO Research) with either critical review of existing research, original research, or proposed research each semester to demonstrate their research skills. This will enhance the learning of broad and general knowledge in the field (SLO Knowledge) of their peers. Finally, this will provide students with an additional opportunity to demonstrate their ability to disseminate and communicate knowledge to others (SLO Communication and SLO Teaching) with feedback provided on content and presentation.

### Established in Cycle: 2016-2017

| Implementation Status: Finished |
| Priority: High |

### Remediation Plan - Additional Competencies

While this target was met, with 90% of students demonstrating additional competencies, we have developed remediation plans to address unsatisfactory performance. Remediation plans targeting issues of time management, follow-through, meeting deadlines, proofing work/not rushing through, have been put into place for the 4 students having difficulty in this area. Chairs and supervisors will be working more closely with students exhibiting difficulties with time management and prompt them to not take on additional activities until the required activities are completed. These plans are designed to assist students in reaching a place of satisfactory professional and academic performance, as these skills are essential to effective psychology work in schools.

### Established in Cycle: 2017-2018

| Implementation Status: Planned |
| Priority: High |

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

Our annual evaluation process (self and faculty) allows each faculty member to provide input on each student's progress in developing broad and general knowledge of the field. This process has been amended to cover the new APA standards effective April 2015, and is working well at measuring academic learning, professional competencies, and clinical competencies. This annual evaluation also allows us to identify and re-mediate students encountering challenges in the program quickly and efficiently. While all other outcomes were met, we continue to experience challenges with meeting
goals for graduation within four years. Faculty continue to look at the curriculum to determine where adjustments can be made. We will have two students ABD due to health reasons who plan to defend in December 2018.

All clinical and professional competencies continued to be evaluated each semester through formative and summative university/field supervisor and self-evaluations. The high rate of acceptance to competitive internships demonstrate student competencies and attest to our high quality training. Additionally, we gather information from field supervisors regarding their professionalism with no ethical or legal concerns. This will continue to be a practice.

*CRITICAL* Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

Research Colloquium: Students consistently demonstrate understanding and application of research design, measurement, and statistics expected for respective year in program. Students will continue to be required to take at least 12 credits of RMS coursework. In addition, continued efforts will involve students becoming involved in faculty-led research teams within their first year of entering the program, co-authoring a conference presentation and manuscript submission for publication, and being involved in grant proposal development during their tenure in the program. Research Colloquium: Beginning in Fall 2017, we offered students the opportunity to present their research (either critical review of existing research, original research, or proposed research) each semester to demonstrate their research skills. The Research Colloquium in Fall and Spring provided 13 students with the opportunity to share their research ideas and, for some, results, with faculty and students.
Mission / Purpose

The TAMU doctoral school psychology program offers training in school psychology. It endorses and subscribes to the scientist-practitioner model for the training of professional/health service psychologists. The primary mission of the program is the development of psychologists who recognize the importance of scholarly inquiry and the application of various methods to the resolution of problems encountered in their professional practice, teaching, continuing professional development and their discipline at large. The program endeavors to train psychologists capable of contributing to the health care of children and adolescents, from perspectives of prevention and intervention, related to mental, academic, emotional, and behavioral difficulties, especially as related to schools and the educational process, at the individual and organization level. Since children and families may be encountered in a variety of settings and contexts, the training program attempts to equip students to work in a variety of private and institutional settings, in addition to public and private schools. The program emphasizes and promotes diversity issues related to the practice of psychology, as well as addressing achievement and mental health disparities among minority populations. The program uses a prevention and implementation science as a framework for the curriculum. Rigorous academic standards are maintained, and teaching, supervision, and research experiences are made available so students may successfully compete for academic positions at colleges and universities throughout the country.

The scientist practitioner model is consistent with the Standards of Accreditation of the American Psychological Association. The scientist component is most consistent with the research mission of Texas A&M University; the practitioner component is most consistent with the land grant mission and training of professionals to meet the needs of the State of Texas.

Goals

G 1: Professional Competencies
Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional issues, including ethical, legal, diversity, communication, and quality assurance principles necessary for professional competencies

G 2: Scientific Knowledge
Students will demonstrate scientific knowledge, methods, and critical thinking relevant to the practice and science of psychology

G 3: Diversity
The program will continue to emphasize diversity (of all types) in the training program, the recruitment of students, and the practices and processes associated with student grading, support, and mentoring

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Degree requirements
Students will be able to meet degree requirements

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
Degree Requirements
Broad Knowledge in Discipline
Critical Thinking
Communicate Effectively
Ethical and Legal Issues
Research
Teaching/Supervision
Professional Field Experiences
Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% of students will meet expectations for adequate progress to complete program in timely manner.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Met
80% of students met this requirement upon completing the annual expectations review. Therefore the target
was not met. This goal was established 3 years ago. There is steady progress with a significant increase in the percentage of students able to complete the program in 5 years (73.9% in 2015-2016).

**SLO 2: Knowledge Evidence**

Students will be able to evidence expected mastery of broad and general knowledge in the field.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**

Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:

- Degree Requirements
- Broad Knowledge in Discipline
- Critical Thinking
- Communicate Effectively
- Ethical and Legal Issues
- Research
- Teaching/Supervision
- Professional Field Experiences
- Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**

RubricsSPSYPhD

**Target:**

90% of students will meet expectations for demonstrating broad knowledge in discipline.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**

93.5% of students met expectations for demonstrating broad knowledge in the discipline based on the rubric guidelines.

**M 2: Praxis II Exam**

Praxis II for School Psychologists is an exam based on the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological Services and is designed for candidates seeking licensure or certification as school psychologists in educational settings. Students need to successfully pass this exam at the end of the second year of their program in order to move forward with dissertation proposal and written comprehensive exams.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**

90% of students will pass the exam on their first attempt. All students are required to pass the exam based on national accreditation through the American Psychological Association.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**

93.5% of students passed their Praxis II exam on the first attempt. Therefore this target was met. Students continue to demonstrate discipline specific knowledge at expected levels; however, many delay in taking the required exams and/or do not have good test-taking skills.

**M 3: Advanced Psychology GRE Exam**

Students will take the Advanced Psychology GRE, which covers competencies and knowledge within all areas of psychology. Students need to successfully pass this exam at the end of the second year of their program in order to move forward with dissertation proposal and written comprehensive exams.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target:**

90% of students will pass the exam on their first attempt. All students are required to pass the exam based on national accreditation through the American Psychological Association.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**

93.5% of students passed their Psych GRE exam on the first attempt. Therefore this target was met. Students continue to demonstrate discipline specific knowledge at expected levels; however, many delay in taking the required exams and/or do not have good test-taking skills.

**SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills**

Students will be able to demonstrate critical thinking skills.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**

Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following
**SLO 4: Effective Communication**

Students will be able to communicate effectively orally and in written form.

**Relevant Associations:**

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.3 Communicate effectively.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**

Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:

- Degree Requirements
- Broad Knowledge in Discipline
- Critical Thinking
- Communicate Effectively
- Ethical and Legal Issues
- Research
- Teaching/Supervision
- Professional Field Experiences
- Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**

RubricsSPSYPhD

**Target:**

90% of students will meet expectations to communicate effectively in written, oral, and interpersonal form at annual review.

**Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met**

93.5% of students demonstrated the ability to communicate effectively in oral and written form based on rubric. As in the past, the goal was met, with some concerns with writing for a few students.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Research Colloquium:**

Established in Cycle: 2016-2017

Research Colloquium: Beginning in Fall 2017, we will offer students the opportunity to present their research (SLO Research) wit...

**M 4: Practicum Student Evaluation Form**

This form measures students' performance during a year long field experience. It's completed by a field site supervisor and a faculty supervisor.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Connected Document**

Practicum Evaluation Form

**Target:**

90% of students will receive satisfactory scores in the following categories:

- Demonstrates effective interpersonal skills and is able to manage difficult communications
- Ability to communicate ideas verbally and in written form
- Ability to listen and be emphatic with others
Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
93.5% of students demonstrated the ability to communicate effectively in oral and written form based on rubric. As in the past, the goal was met, with some concerns with writing for a few students.

SLO 5: Ethical and Legal Action
Students will be able to demonstrate understanding and application of ethical and legal courses of action

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures
M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
Degree Requirements
Broad Knowledge in Discipline
Critical Thinking
Communicate Effectively
Ethical and Legal Issues
Research
Teaching/Supervision
Professional Field Experiences
Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% of students will demonstrate knowledge and application of ethical and legal issues in clinical practice at annual review.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
97.7% of students demonstrated knowledge and application of ethical and legal issues in clinical practice at annual review. Legal/ethical concerns were only evident for one student.

SLO 6: Knowledge of Research
Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge, understanding and application of research design, measurement, statistics for year in program.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

Related Measures
M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
Degree Requirements
Broad Knowledge in Discipline
Critical Thinking
Communicate Effectively
Ethical and Legal Issues
Research
Teaching/Supervision
Professional Field Experiences
Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% of students will meet expectations in their ability to demonstrate knowledge and application of research at annual review.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
95.6% of students met expectations for demonstrating knowledge and application of research at annual review. As in the past, the majority of students are involved in research activities, and co-authoring presentations; less are co-authoring publications prior to 3rd year.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Duplicate. Please delete.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Research Colloquium:
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Research Colloquium: Beginning in Fall 2017, we will offer students the opportunity to present their research (SLO Research) with...

SLO 7: Teaching and Supervision Skills
Students will be able to demonstrate teaching and supervision skills.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

Related Measures
M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
Degree Requirements
Broad Knowledge in Discipline
Critical Thinking
Communicate Effectively
Ethical and Legal Issues
Research
Teaching/Supervision
Professional Field Experiences
Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Connected Document RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% of students will meet Teaching and Supervision expectations at annual review.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
100% of student had the opportunity to teach via class presentations with approximately 8 by the end of 2nd year. In 3rd or 4th year students provide clinical supervision in conjunction with the university supervisor.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Research Colloquium:
Established in Cycle: 2016-2017
Research Colloquium: Beginning in Fall 2017, we will offer students the opportunity to present their research (SLO Research) with...

SLO 8: Professional Field Experience
Students will be able to engage in professional field experiences in various settings to demonstrate competencies in assessment, intervention, and consultation.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures
M 4: Practicum Student Evaluation Form
This form measures students' performance during a year long field experience. It's completed by a field site supervisor and a faculty supervisor.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
Connected Document Practicum Evaluation Form

Target:
90% of students will score satisfactory in all Professional and Ethical/Legal Behavior and Knowledge characteristics (page 2 of rubric).

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
93.5% of students scored satisfactory on the rubric. Therefore this target was met. Concerns were noted with three students, struggling in their application of skills in one or more field experiences.

SLO 9: Additional Competencies
Students will be able to demonstrate additional competencies for clinical practice, including professionalism, reflective practice, and appreciation of individual/cultural diversity.

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply
subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
- Degree Requirements
- Broad Knowledge in Discipline
- Critical Thinking
- Communicate Effectively
- Ethical and Legal Issues
- Research
- Teaching/Supervision
- Professional Field Experiences
- Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% of students will meet professionalism, reflective practice, and individual/cultural diversity expectations at annual review.

Finding (2016-2017) - Target: Met
91.3% of students met expectations for professionalism, reflective practice, and individual/cultural diversity expectations at annual review. Concerns were noted with regard to time management, use of technology during lecture, peer interactions, responsiveness to feedback.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Additional Competencies (APA)
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating professionalism, reflective practice, and cultural competencies. Continued efforts will involve course work specific to ethical and legal practice, culture and diversity, along with lessons integrating these topics into each course within our program. Students will gain exposure to collaborating with diverse professionals in community, school, and other settings. In addition, mental health services will be provided by our students to children and families of differing cultural, racial, gender, SES, religious, disability, and other backgrounds. Mandated weekly supervision meetings for practicum students foster reflective practice. Students will engage in self-evaluation of clinical practices and service delivery with feedback from faculty and on-site supervisors.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Monitor annually in April.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Broad and General Knowledge
This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating appropriate mastery of broad and general knowledge. To continue to maintain this level, we will continue to deliver coursework that provides comprehensive knowledge and skills essential to the field of school psychology. Our course sequence includes a range of courses designed to establish competency across a variety of domains in assessment, evidence-based intervention, and research methodology. Our courses ensure that students learn important theories of child development, as well as the theoretical bases of psychopathology and the assessment and intervention approaches that are needed for research and practice.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Monitor annually
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Communication
This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form. The program will continue to address communication skills throughout our courses, practica, and research experiences. The majority of the courses in our program require students to complete at least one oral presentation as well as written assignments in the form of papers, assessment reports, and other products. School- and clinic-based practica involve written assessment reports and case notes, as well as the opportunity to interact and communicate with students, parents and other professionals across a range of contexts. In school-based practica and other practica, students have the opportunity to provide professional development (in-service) trainings to teachers and staff. Research experiences also afford students additional experience in manuscript preparation, as well as presenting research at professional conferences. Finally, students will continue to receive extensive mentoring through the completion of their dissertation. Throughout all of these experiences, students receive mentoring and evaluative, constructive feedback aimed at further developing their oral and written communication skills.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Monitor in April 2016
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty
Critical Thinking
This objective was met as well with all students demonstrating critical thinking skills. Critical thinking skills will continue to be addressed with the goal to (1) evaluate, analyze, and integrate information from a variety of sources, (2) use appropriate strategies and tools to represent, analyze and integrate information, and (3) develop critical, reasoned positions on in-class projects. These activities are incorporated into all courses, practica, and research experiences.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Monitor Progress in April 2016
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Ethical and Legal
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of ethical and legal courses of action. Students will continue to be required to complete IRB training within the first semester in the program. Additionally, these critical competencies will continue to be addressed a) as a component of all coursework, b) as a component of all field experiences, c) as a component of research, and d) as evaluated by University and field supervisors with each field experience. In practica settings and supervision, ethical and legal courses of action will continue to be emphasized. As currently, we will also continue to encourage students to participate in professional conferences where ethical and legal courses of action are discussed.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Monitor annually in April 2016
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Graduation within five years
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has increased over the past 10 years to 5.6 years predominantly due to completion of dissertation. Of the students currently enrolled, 23% will not meet the 5 year graduation mark.

To address the issue of time to degree, program faculty plan to a) more clearly articulate benchmarks to program completion, b) look at reducing course requirements to allow additional time for research activities and completion of the dissertation, and c) encourage students to use faculty existing data sets or public use datasets in lieu of collecting their own data.

For those students not meeting program benchmarks, the program will consider a) blocking registration for any elective courses or field experiences, and if necessary, b) blocking registration for the following semester(s) with a remediation plan consistent with the Student Handbook.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Curriculum analysis, early identification of people who might be delayed
Projected Completion Date: 08/2018
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Professional Field Experience
This objective was met by 97.7% of our students demonstrating competencies in assessment, intervention, consultation, and professional experiences. To continue this level of achievement, students will continue to be required to engage in field practicum experiences supervised by a licensed psychologist within school and community settings. Each practicum builds on clinical skills learned through course work and previous practicum placements. Students are exposed to and engage in assessment, consultation, therapy, and crisis intervention. These required practicums provide students the minimal number of direct and indirect service hours to obtain a professional internship towards licensure. Outside of the required field practicum course load, students will be encouraged to seek field-based practicums through partnerships in settings that may include hospitals, residential treatment centers, counseling centers, and community clinics, which provides additional experiences to enhance competency. These increased opportunities help students to be highly competitive for their professional internship, post-doctoral residencies, and the job market.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Monitor Annually in April 2016.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Research, Measurement, and Statistics
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of research design, measurement, and statistics for respective year in program. Students will continue to be required to take at least 12 credits of RMS coursework. In addition, continued efforts will involve students becoming involved in faculty-led research teams within their first year of entering the program, co-authoring a conference presentation and manuscript submission for publication, and being involved in grant proposal development during their tenure in the program. Students will continue to write a mock grant for a prevention science program as a course component as well.

Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Monitor annually in April 2016
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Teaching and supervision skills
This objective was met as well with 95.5% of students demonstrating teaching/supervision (e.g., the ability to transfer
knowledge/skills to others). Continued efforts will involve students making presentations during graduate coursework, providing in-services in the community, and providing guest lectures. All students now participate in a supervision practicum. For those students with an interest, more intensive structured teaching experiences will be provided and/or they can serve as a teaching assistant.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Monitor annually  
**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2016  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

### Continued - 5 year degree completion

Results for 2015-2016 cycle saw that this cycle was not met. As this is only the second year of the outcome we are still working to address the issue of time to degree and plan to continue was outlined in 2014-2015 action plan for graduation within 5 years. (Also listed below).

“To address the issue of time to degree, program faculty plan to a) more clearly articulate benchmarks to program completion, b) look at reducing course requirements to allow additional time for research activities and completion of the dissertation, and c) encourage students to use faculty existing data sets or public use data sets in lieu of collecting their own data. For those students not meeting program benchmarks, the program will consider a) blocking registration for any elective courses or field experiences, and if necessary, b) blocking registration for the following semester(s) with a remediation plan consistent with the Student Handbook.”

**Established in Cycle:** 2015-2016  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2018

### Research Colloquium:

Research Colloquium: Beginning in Fall 2017, we will offer students the opportunity to present their research (SLO Research) with either critical review of existing research, original research, or proposed research each semester to demonstrate their research skills. This will enhance the learning of broad and general knowledge in the field (SLO Knowledge) of their peers. Finally, this will provide students with an additional opportunity to demonstrate their ability to disseminate and communicate knowledge to others (SLO Communication and SLO Teaching) with feedback provided on content and presentation.

**Established in Cycle:** 2016-2017  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure:** Faculty and Self Evaluation  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Effective Communication  
- Knowledge of Research  
- Teaching and Supervision Skills

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?

Although we continue to meet targets in these areas, we chose the research colloquium because research continues to be a key factor for scientist practitioner programs such as School Psychology. Therefore, it was important to find additional means from which to enhance the depth and breadth of research skills. This will enhance the learning of broad and general knowledge in the field (SLO Knowledge) of their peers. Finally, this will provide students with an additional opportunity to demonstrate their ability to disseminate and communicate knowledge to others (SLO Communication and SLO Teaching) with feedback provided on content and presentation.

We also decided to phase out the Critical Thinking outcome, as we decided it was adequately captured in other outcomes without requiring additional measures.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.

Continued 5-year degree action plan: Our biggest challenge continues to be 5-year program completion, particularly since there are minimal courses offered in the summer. After viewing the course listings, it was decided not to reduce the amount of course requirements because of the dual demands of research and practice.

The other action plans implemented in the 2015-2016 cycle were outlined to further maintain students’ performance since we met all established targets for that cycle.
**Mission / Purpose**

The TAMU doctoral school psychology program offers training in school psychology. It endorses and subscribes to the scientist-practitioner model for the training of professional/health service psychologists. The primary mission of the program is the development of psychologists who recognize the importance of scholarly inquiry and the application of various methods to the resolution of problems encountered in their professional practice, teaching, continuing professional development and their discipline at large. The program endeavors to train psychologists capable of contributing to the health care of children and adolescents, from perspectives of prevention and intervention, related to mental, academic, emotional, and behavioral difficulties, especially as related to schools and the educational process, at the individual and organization level. Since children and families may be encountered in a variety of settings and contexts, the training program attempts to equip students to work in a variety of private and institutional settings, in addition to public and private schools. The program emphasizes and promotes diversity issues related to the practice of psychology, as well as addressing achievement and mental health disparities among minority populations. The program uses a prevention and implementation science as a framework for the curriculum. Rigorous academic standards are maintained, and teaching, supervision, and research experiences are made available so students may successfully compete for academic positions at colleges and universities throughout the country.

The scientist practitioner model is consistent with the Standards of Accreditation of the American Psychological Association. The scientist component is most consistent with the research mission of Texas A&M University; the practitioner component is most consistent with the land grant mission and training of professionals to meet the needs of the State of the Texas.

**Goals**

**G 1: Professional Competencies**
Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional issues, including ethical, legal, diversity, communication, and quality assurance principles necessary for professional competencies

**G 2: Scientific Knowledge**
Students will demonstrate scientific knowledge, methods, and critical thinking relevant to the practice and science of psychology

**G 3: Diversity**
The program will continue to emphasize diversity (of all types) in the training program, the recruitment of students, and the practices and processes associated with student grading, support, and mentoring

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**SLO 1: Degree Requirements**
Meet degree requirements and

**Relevant Associations:**
Graduate Outcome Associations
- 2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
- Degree Requirements
- Broad Knowledge in Discipline
- Critical Thinking
- Communicate Effectively
- Ethical and Legal Issues
- Research
- Teaching/Supervision
- Professional Field Experiences
- Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**: RubricaSPSYPhD

**Target:**
90% meet expectations at annual review

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Met**
73.9% (34/46) met degree requirements. Therefore, the target is not met.
72.7% (32/44) met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; Meeting program objectives and timeline with proposal completed by October 1 of their fourth year. Therefore, the target is not met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Broad and General Knowledge
This objective was met with 97.7 % of students demonstrating appropriate mastery of broad and general knowledge. To continue to ...

Graduation within five years
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has...

SLO 2: Knowledge Evidence
Evidence expected mastery of broad and general knowledge in the field

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures
M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
Degree Requirements
Broad Knowledge in Discipline
Critical Thinking
Communicate Effectively
Ethical and Legal Issues
Research
Teaching/Supervision
Professional Field Experiences
Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% meet expectations at annual review

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
95.6% (44/46) passed objective tests Praxis II, Advanced Psychology GRE tests to attain this outcome. Therefore, the target is met.

97.7% (43/44) met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; GPR and results of advanced PSYCH GRE and PRAXIS-II. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Critical Thinking
This objective was met as well with all students demonstrating critical thinking skills. Critical thinking skills will continue...

Research, Measurement, and Statistics
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of research design, measurement...

SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills
Demonstrate critical thinking skills

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to
analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
- Degree Requirements
- Broad Knowledge in Discipline
- Critical Thinking
- Communicate Effectively
- Ethical and Legal Issues
- Research
- Teaching/Supervision
- Professional Field Experiences
- Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**
RubricsSPSYPhD

**Target:**
90% will meet expectations at annual review

- **Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
  100% achieved critical thinking skills. Therefore, the target is met.

- **Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
  100% met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; grade on critical evaluation of existing research in classes. Therefore, the target is met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Additional Competencies (APA)**

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015

This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating professionalism, reflective practice, and cultural compet...

**Broad and General Knowledge**

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015

This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating appropriate mastery of broad and general knowledge. To continue to ...

**Communication**

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015

This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form. ...

**Critical Thinking**

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015

This objective was met as well with all students demonstrating critical thinking skills. Critical thinking skills will continue...

**Ethical and Legal**

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015

This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of ethical and legal courses o...

**Research, Measurement, and Statistics**

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015

This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of research design, measurement...

**Teaching and supervision skills**

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015

This objective was met as well with 95.5% of students demonstrating teaching/supervision (e.g., the ability to transfer knowledg...

**SLO 4: Effective Communication**

Demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form

**Relevant Associations:**

2.3 Communicate effectively.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
- Degree Requirements
- Broad Knowledge in Discipline
- Critical Thinking
- Communicate Effectively
SLO 5: Ethical and Legal Action
Demonstrate understanding and application of ethical and legal courses of action

**Relevant Associations:**

**Graduate Outcome Associations**

- 2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
- Degree Requirements
- Broad Knowledge in Discipline
- Critical Thinking
- Communicate Effectively
- Ethical and Legal Issues
- Research
- Teaching/Supervision
- Professional Field Experiences
- Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**

RubricsSPSYPhD

**Target:**
90% will meet expectations at annual review

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**
95.6% (44/46) achieved this outcome through supervisor evaluation. Therefore, the target is met.
97.7% (43/44) met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; grade in SPSY 611 and supervisor evaluations. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Additional Competencies (APA)
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating professionalism, reflective practice, and cultural competencies.

Critical Thinking
This objective was met as well with all students demonstrating critical thinking skills. Critical thinking skills will continue...

Ethical and Legal
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of ethical and legal courses.

Graduation within five years
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has...

Research, Measurement, and Statistics
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of research design, measurement, and statistics.

SLO 6: Knowledge of Research
Demonstrate knowledge, understanding and application of research design, measurement, statistics

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.

Related Measures
M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
Degree Requirements
Broad Knowledge in Discipline
Critical Thinking
Communicate Effectively
Ethical and Legal Issues
Research
Teaching/Supervision
Professional Field Experiences
Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% will meet expectations at annual review
Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
95.6% (44/46) achieved this outcome through GPA. Therefore, the target is met.
97.7% (43/44) met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; grades in all statistics classes; number of submitted and presented papers at national conferences; no of manuscripts submitted or published. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Broad and General Knowledge
This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating appropriate mastery of broad and general knowledge. To continue to ...

Communication
This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form. ...

Critical Thinking
This objective was met as well with all students demonstrating critical thinking skills. Critical thinking skills will continue...

Graduation within five years
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has...

Research, Measurement, and Statistics
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of research design, measurement...

SLO 7: Teaching and Supervision Skills
Demonstrate teaching and supervision skills

Relevant Associations:
Graduate Outcome Associations
  2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.

Related Measures

M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
Degree Requirements
Broad Knowledge in Discipline
Critical Thinking
Communicate Effectively
Ethical and Legal Issues
Research
Teaching/Supervision
Professional Field Experiences
Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% will meet expectations at annual review

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
95.6% (44/46) achieved this outcome. Therefore, the target is met.

95.5% (42/44) met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; class presentations, guest lectures, in-service presentations in the community and supervision practicum. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Additional Competencies (APA)
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating professionalism, reflective practice, and cultural competence...

Communication
This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form. ...

Ethical and Legal
This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of ethical and legal courses o...

Graduation within five years
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has...

Teaching and supervision skills
This objective was met as well with 95.5% of students demonstrating teaching/supervision (e.g., the ability to transfer knowledge...
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.

Related Measures

M 2: Evaluation
Faculty/Site Supervisor and self-evaluation
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
90% will meet expectations at annual review

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
95.6% achieved this outcome through GPA, Objective test - Praxis II. Therefore, the target is met.

97.7% (43/44) met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; supervisor evaluations for each practicum completed. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Ethical and Legal
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of ethical and legal courses o...

Graduation within five years
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has...

Professional Field Experience
This objective was met by 97.7% of our students demonstrating competencies in assessment, intervention, consultation, and prof...

Teaching and supervision skills
This objective was met as well with 95.5% of students demonstrating teaching/supervision (e.g., the ability to transfer knowledg...

SLO 9: Additional Competencies
Demonstrate additional competencies for clinical practice, including professionalism, reflective practice, and appreciation of individual/cultural diversity

Relevant Associations:

Graduate Outcome Associations
2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.

Related Measures

M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation
Faculty and self-evaluation Annual Review of Academic Expectations and Clinical Competencies, within the following categories:
Degree Requirements
Broad Knowledge in Discipline
Critical Thinking
Communicate Effectively
Ethical and Legal Issues
Research
Teaching/Supervision
Professional Field Experiences
Other Professional Competencies

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% will meet expectations at annual review

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
93.5% (44/46) achieved this outcome. Therefore, the target is met.

97.7% (43/44) met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; field supervisor evaluations completed after every practicum. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Ethical and Legal
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Additional Competencies (APA)**

This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating professionalism, reflective practice, and cultural competencies. Continued efforts will involve course work specific to ethical and legal practice, culture and diversity, along with lessons integrating these topics into each course within our program. Students will gain exposure to collaborating with diverse professionals in community, school, and other settings. In addition, mental health services will be provided by our students to children and families of differing cultural, racial, gender, SES, religious, disability, and other backgrounds. Mandated weekly supervision meetings for practicum students fosters reflective practice. Students will engage in self-evaluation of clinical practices and service delivery with feedback from faculty and on-site supervisors.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Faculty and Self Evaluation  
- Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills  
- Effective Communication  
- Ethical and Legal Action  
- Teaching and Supervision Skills

**Implementation Description:** Monitor annually in April.

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2016  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

**Broad and General Knowledge**

This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating appropriate mastery of broad and general knowledge. To continue to maintain this level, we will continue to deliver coursework that provides comprehensive knowledge and skills essential to the field of school psychology. Our course sequence includes a range of courses designed to establish competency across a variety of domains in assessment, evidence-based intervention, and research methodology. Our courses ensure that students learn important theories of child development, as well as the theoretical bases of psychopathology and the assessment and intervention approaches that are needed for research and practice.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Faculty and Self Evaluation  
- Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills  
- Degree Requirements  
- Effective Communication  
- Knowledge Evidence  
- Knowledge of Research

**Implementation Description:** Monitor annually

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2016  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

**Communication**

This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form. The program will continue to address communication skills throughout our courses, practica, and research experiences. The majority of the courses in our program require students to complete at least one oral presentation as well as written assignments in the form of papers, assessment reports, and other products. School- and clinic-based practica involve written assessment reports and case notes, as well as the opportunity to interact and communicate with students, parents and other professionals across a range of contexts. In school-based practica and other practica, students have the opportunity to provide professional development (in-service) trainings to teachers and staff. Research experiences also afford students additional experience in manuscript preparation, as well as presenting research at professional conferences. Finally, students will continue to receive extensive mentoring throughout the completion of their dissertation. Throughout all of these experiences, students receive mentoring and evaluative, constructive feedback aimed at further developing their oral and written communication skills.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Faculty and Self Evaluation  
- Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills  
- Knowledge Evidence  
- Knowledge of Research  
- Effective Communication  
- Teaching and Supervision Skills

**Implementation Description:** Monitor annually in April.

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2016  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

**Critical Thinking**

This objective was met as well with all students demonstrating critical thinking skills. Critical thinking skills will continue to be addressed with the goal to (1) evaluate, analyze, and integrate information from a variety of sources, (2) use appropriate strategies and tools to represent, analyze and integrate information, and (3) develop critical, reasoned positions on in-class projects. These activities are incorporated into all courses, practica, and research experiences.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Faculty and Self Evaluation  
- Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills  
- Ethical and Legal Action  
- Knowledge Evidence  
- Knowledge of Research

**Implementation Description:** Monitor Progress in April 2016

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2016  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty
**Ethical and Legal**

This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of ethical and legal courses of action. Students will continue to be required to complete IRB training within the first semester in the program. Additionally, these critical competencies will continue to be addressed a) as a component of all coursework, b) as a component of all field experiences, c) as a component of research, and d) as evaluated by University and field supervisors with each field experience. In practica settings and supervision, ethical and legal courses of action will continue to be emphasized. As currently, we will also continue to encourage students to participate in professional conferences where ethical and legal courses of action are discussed.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Evaluation  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Professional Field Experience  
- **Measure:** Faculty and Self Evaluation  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Additional Competencies  
- **Critical Thinking Skills**  
- **Ethical and Legal Action**  
- **Teaching and Supervision Skills**

**Implementation Description:** Monitor annually in April 2016  
**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2020  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

**Graduation within five years**

This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has increased over the past 10 years to 5.6 years predominantly due to completion of dissertation. Of the students currently enrolled, 23% will not meet the 5 year graduation mark.

To address the issue of time to degree, program faculty plan to a) more clearly articulate benchmarks to program completion, b) look at reducing course requirements to allow additional time for research activities and completion of the dissertation, and c) encourage students to use faculty existing data sets or public use datasets in lieu of collecting their own data.

For those students not meeting program benchmarks, the program will consider a) blocking registration for any elective courses or field experiences, and if necessary, b) blocking registration for the following semester(s) with a remediation plan consistent with the Student Handbook.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Evaluation  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Professional Field Experience  
- **Measure:** Faculty and Self Evaluation  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Degree Requirements  
- **Effective Communication**  
- **Ethical and Legal Action**  
- **Knowledge Evidence**  
- **Teaching and Supervision Skills**

**Implementation Description:** Curriculum analysis, early identification of people who might be delayed  
**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2018  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

**Professional Field Experience**

This objective was met by 97.7% of our students demonstrating competencies in assessment, intervention, consultation, and professional experiences. To continue this level of achievement, students will continue to be required to engage in field practicum experiences supervised by a licensed psychologist within school and community settings. Each practicum builds on clinical skills learned through course work and previous practicum placements. Students are exposed to and engage in assessment, consultation, therapy, and crisis intervention. These required practicums provide students the minimal number of direct and indirect service hours to obtain a professional internship towards licensure. Outside of the required field practicum course load, students will be encouraged to seek field-based practicums through partnerships in settings that may include hospitals, residential treatment centers, counseling centers, and community clinics, which provides additional experiences to enhance competency. These increased opportunities helps students to be highly competitive for their professional internship, post-doctoral residencies, and the job market.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Evaluation  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Professional Field Experience  
**implementation Description:** Monitor Annually in April 2016.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2016  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

**Research, Measurement, and Statistics**

This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of research design, measurement, and statistics for respective year in program. Students will continue to be required to take at least 12 credits of RMS coursework. In addition, continued efforts will involve students becoming involved in faculty-led research teams within their first year of entering the program, co-authoring a conference presentation and manuscript submission for publication, and being involved in grant proposal development during their tenure in the program. Students will continue to write a mock grant for a prevention science program as a course component as well.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Faculty and Self Evaluation  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking Skills  
- **Effective Communication**  
- **Ethical and Legal Action**  
- **Knowledge Evidence**  
- **Knowledge of Research**

**Implementation Description:** Monitor annually in April 2016
Teaching and supervision skills

This objective was met as well with 95.5% of students demonstrating teaching/supervision (e.g., the ability to transfer knowledge/skills to others). Continued efforts will involve students making presentations during graduate coursework, providing in-services in the community, and providing guest lectures. All students now participate in a supervision practicum. For those students with an interest, more intensive structured teaching experiences will be provided and/or they can serve as a teaching assistant.

Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Professional Field Experience
- Measure: Faculty and Self Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
- Effective Communication | Teaching and Supervision Skills

Implementation Description: Monitor annually
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Continued - 5 year degree completion

Results for 2015-2016 cycle saw that this cycle was not met. As this is only the second year of the outcome we are still working to address the issue of time to degree and plan to continue was outlined in 2014-2015 action plan for graduation within 5 years. (Also listed below).

"To address the issue of time to degree, program faculty plan to a) more clearly articulate benchmarks to program completion, b) look at reducing course requirements to allow additional time for research activities and completion of the dissertation, and c) encourage students to use faculty existing data sets or public use data sets in lieu of collecting their own data. For those students not meeting program benchmarks, the program will consider a) blocking registration for any elective courses or field experiences, and if necessary, b) blocking registration for the following semester(s) with a remediation plan consistent with the Student Handbook."

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2018

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

With few exceptions, students continue to meet the objectives in terms of clinical competencies, research involvement and experiences, professional field based experiences, teaching/supervision experiences, and professionalism. The only area we continue to address is the tendency for students to take more than 5 years to complete degree requirements including the required internship and defense, which was a new target established in 2014-2015. An action plan, also established last reporting cycle, plans to address the issue of time to degree, by clearly articulate program expectations, identify areas where course requirements can be reduced to allow more time for research activities, and encourage students to use faculty existing data sets or public use datasets in lieu of collecting their own data. The goal is to meet the targets for this outcome is 2018 and will continue to manage progress each year.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

The action plans for each objective/outcome are continuing. All expectations are clearly identified for students and options other than collecting their own data (e.g., using existing public data sets, using faculty data sets) to assist with dissertation completion. Competencies and expectations are being modified to comply with the new standards of the American Psychological Association Commission on Accreditation in preparation of our upcoming self-study and accreditation process.
Mission / Purpose
The TAMU doctoral school psychology program offers training in school psychology. It endorses and subscribes to the scientist-practitioner model for the training of professional/health service psychologists. The primary mission of the program is the development of psychologists who recognize the importance of scholarly inquiry and the application of various methods to the resolution of problems encountered in their professional practice, teaching, continuing professional development and their discipline at large. The program endeavors to train psychologists capable of contributing to the health care of children and adolescents, from perspectives of prevention and intervention, related to mental, academic, emotional, and behavioral difficulties, especially as related to schools and the educational process, at the individual and organization level. Since children and families may be encountered in a variety of settings and contexts, the training program attempts to equip students to work in a variety of private and institutional settings, in addition to public and private schools. The program emphasizes and promotes diversity issues related to the practice of psychology, as well as addressing achievement and mental health disparities among minority populations. The program uses a prevention and implementation science as a framework for the curriculum. Rigorous academic standards are maintained, and teaching, supervision, and research experiences are made available so students may successfully compete for academic positions at colleges and universities throughout the country.

The scientist practitioner model is consistent with the Standards of Accreditation of the American Psychological Association. The scientist component is most consistent with the research mission of Texas A&M University; the practitioner component is most consistent with the land grant mission and training of professionals to meet the needs of the State of the Texas.

Goals

G 1: Professional Competencies
Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional issues, including ethical, legal, diversity, communication, and quality assurance principles necessary for professional competencies

G 2: Scientific Knowledge
Students will demonstrate scientific knowledge, methods, and critical thinking relevant to the practice and science of psychology

G 3: Diversity
The program will continue to emphasize diversity (of all types) in the training program, the recruitment of students, and the practices and processes associated with student grading, support, and mentoring

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Degree Requirements
Meet degree requirements and

Related Measures

M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation
Faculty and self-evaluation
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% meet expectations at annual review

72.7% (32/44) met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; Meeting program objectives and timeline with proposal completed by October 1 of their fourth year. Therefore, the target is not met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Broad and General Knowledge
This objective was met with 97.7 % of students demonstrating appropriate mastery of broad and general knowledge. To continue to...

Graduation within five years
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has...

SLO 2: Knowledge Evidence
Evidence expected mastery of broad and general knowledge in the field

Related Measures
M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation
Faculty and self-evaluation
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
RubricsSPSYPhD

Target:
90% meet expectations at annual review

97.7% (43/44) met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; GPR and results of advanced PSYCH GRE and PRAXIS-II. Therefore, the target is met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Broad and General Knowledge
This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating appropriate mastery of broad and general knowledge. To continue to ...

Critical Thinking
This objective was met as well with all students demonstrating critical thinking skills. Critical thinking skills will continue...

Graduation within five years
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has...

Research, Measurement, and Statistics
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of research design, measurement...

SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills
Demonstrate critical thinking skills

Related Measures
Teaching and supervision skills  
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*  
This objective was met as well with 95.5% of students demonstrating teaching/supervision (e.g., the ability to transfer knowledge...)

**SLO 4: Effective Communication**  
Demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**  
Faculty and self-evaluation  
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**

RubricsSPSYPhD

**Target:**  
90% will meet expectations at annual review

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**  
97.7% (43/44) met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; grades on written products, evaluations by field supervisors. Therefore, the target is met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Additional Competencies (APA)**  
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*  
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating professionalism, reflective practice, and cultural competence...

**Broad and General Knowledge**  
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*  
This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating appropriate mastery of broad and general knowledge. To continue to...

**Communication**  
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*  
This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form... 

**Graduation within five years**  
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*  
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has...

**Research, Measurement, and Statistics**  
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*  
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of research design, measurements...

**Teaching and supervision skills**  
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*  
This objective was met as well with 95.5% of students demonstrating teaching/supervision (e.g., the ability to transfer knowledge...)

**SLO 5: Ethical and Legal Action**  
Demonstrate understanding and application of ethical and legal courses of action

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**  
Faculty and self-evaluation  
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**

RubricsSPSYPhD

**Target:**  
90% will meet expectations at annual review

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**  
97.7% (43/44) met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; grades in SPSY 611 and supervisor evaluations. Therefore, the target is met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Additional Competencies (APA)**  
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*  
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating professionalism, reflective practice, and cultural competen...
Ethical and Legal
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of ethical and legal courses o...

Graduation within five years
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has...

Research, Measurement, and Statistics
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of research design, measurement...
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating professionalism, reflective practice, and cultural competen...

**Communication**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form.

**Ethical and Legal**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of ethical and legal courses.

**Graduation within five years**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has...

**Teaching and supervision skills**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This objective was met as well with 95.5% of students demonstrating teaching/supervision (e.g., the ability to transfer knowledge).

**SLO 8: Professional Field Experience**
Engage in professional field experiences in various settings to demonstrate competencies in assessment, intervention, and consultation

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Evaluation**
Faculty/Site Supervisor and self-evaluation
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
90% will meet expectations at annual review

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
97.7% (43/44) met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; supervisor evaluations for each practicum completed. Therefore, the target is met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Ethical and Legal**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of ethical and legal courses.

**Graduation within five years**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has...

**Teaching and supervision skills**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
This objective was met as well with 95.5% of students demonstrating teaching/supervision (e.g., the ability to transfer knowledge).

**SLO 9: Additional Competencies**
Demonstrate additional competencies for clinical practice, including professionalism, reflective practice, and appreciation of individual/cultural diversity

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty and Self Evaluation**
Faculty and self-evaluation
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
90% will meet expectations at annual review

**Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met**
97.7% (43/44) met this objective based on program review and self-evaluation; field supervisor evaluations completed after every practicum. Therefore, the target is met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Ethical and Legal**
*Established in Cycle: 2014-2015*
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

### Additional Competencies (APA)

This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of ethical and legal courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty and Self Evaluation</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Requirements</td>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Monitor annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>08/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Program Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Broad and General Knowledge

This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating appropriate mastery of broad and general knowledge. To continue to maintain this level, we will continue to deliver coursework that provides comprehensive knowledge and skills essential to the field of school psychology. Our course sequence includes a range of courses designed to establish competency across a variety of domains in assessment, evidence-based intervention, and research methodology. Our courses ensure that students learn important theories of child development, as well as the theoretical bases of psychopathology and the assessment and intervention approaches that are needed for research and practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty and Self Evaluation</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Requirements</td>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Monitor annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>08/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Program Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication

This objective was met with 97.7% of students demonstrating the ability to communicate effectively orally and in written form. The program will continue to address communication skills throughout our courses, practica, and research experiences. The majority of the courses in our program require students to complete at least one oral presentation as well as written assignments in the form of papers, assessment reports, and other products. School- and clinic-based practica involve written assessment reports and case notes, as well as the opportunity to interact and communicate with students, parents and other professionals across a range of contexts. In school-based practica and other practica, students have the opportunity to provide professional development (in-service) trainings to teachers and staff. Research experiences also afford students additional experience in manuscript preparation, as well as presenting research at professional conferences. Finally, students will continue to receive extensive mentoring through the completion of their dissertation. Throughout all of these experiences, students receive mentoring and evaluative, constructive feedback aimed at further developing their oral and written communication skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty and Self Evaluation</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Requirements</td>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Monitor annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>08/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Program Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Critical Thinking

This objective was met as well with all students demonstrating critical thinking skills. Critical thinking skills will continue to be addressed with the goal to (1) evaluate, analyze, and integrate information from a variety of sources, (2) use appropriate strategies and tools to represent, analyze and integrate information, and (3) develop critical, reasoned positions on in-class projects. These activities are incorporated into several classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Faculty and Self Evaluation</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Requirements</td>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Monitor Progress in April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>08/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Program Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethical and Legal
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of ethical and legal courses of action. Students will continue to be required to complete IRB training within the first semester in the program. Additionally, these critical competencies will continue to be addressed a) as a component of all coursework, b) as a component of all field experiences, c) as a component of research, and d) as evaluated by University and field supervisors with each field experience. In practica settings and supervision, ethical and legal courses of action will continue to be emphasized. As currently, we will also continue to encourage students to participate in professional conferences where ethical and legal courses of action are discussed.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Professional Field Experience
- Measure: Faculty and Self Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Additional Competencies
- Critical Thinking Skills | Ethical and Legal Action | Teaching and Supervision Skills

Implementation Description: Monitor annually in April 2016
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Graduation within five years
This is a new measure instituted in February 2015 in preparation for external program review. The mean years to completion has increased over the past 10 years to 5.6 years predominantly due to completion of dissertation. Of the students currently enrolled, 23% will not meet the 5 year graduation mark.

To address the issue of time to degree, program faculty plan to a) more clearly articulate benchmarks to program completion, b) look at reducing course requirements to allow additional time for research activities and completion of the dissertation, and c) encourage students to use faculty existing data sets or public use datasets in lieu of collecting their own data.

For those students not meeting program benchmarks, the program will consider a) blocking registration for any elective courses or field experiences, and if necessary, b) blocking registration for the following semester(s) with a remediation plan consistent with the Student Handbook.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Professional Field Experience
- Measure: Faculty and Self Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Degree Requirements
- Effective Communication | Ethical and Legal Action | Knowledge Evidence | Knowledge of Research | Teaching and Supervision Skills

Implementation Description: Curriculum analysis, early identification of people who might be delayed
Projected Completion Date: 08/2018
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Professional Field Experience
This objective was met by 97.7% of our students demonstrating competencies in assessment, intervention, consultation, and professional experiences. To continue this level of achievement, students will continue to be required to engage in field practicum experiences supervised by a licensed psychologist within school and community settings. Each practicum builds on clinical skills learned through course work and previous practicum placements. Students are exposed to and engage in assessment, consultation, therapy, and crisis intervention. These required practicums provide students the minimal number of direct and indirect service hours to obtain a professional internship towards licensure. Outside of the required field practicum course load, students will be encouraged to seek field-based practicums through partnerships in settings that may include hospitals, residential treatment centers, counseling centers, and community clinics, which provides additional experiences to enhance competency. These increased opportunities helps students to be highly competitive for their professional internship, post-doctoral residencies, and the job market.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Professional Field Experience
- Critical Thinking Skills | Ethical and Legal Action | Teaching and Supervision Skills

Implementation Description: Monitor annually in April 2016
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Research, Measurement, and Statistics
This objective was met as well with 97.7% of students demonstrating understanding and application of research design, measurement, and statistics for respective year in program. Students will continue to be required to take at least 12 credits of RMS coursework. In addition, continued efforts will involve students becoming involved in faculty-led research teams within their first year of entering the program, co-authoring a conference presentation and manuscript submission for publication, and being involved in grant proposal development during their tenure in the program. Students will continue to write a mock grant for a prevention science program as a course component as well.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty and Self Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
- Effective Communication | Ethical and Legal Action | Knowledge Evidence | Knowledge of Research

Implementation Description: Monitor annually in April 2016
Teaching and supervision skills

This objective was met as well with 95.5% of students demonstrating teaching/supervision (e.g., the ability to transfer knowledge/skills to others). Continued efforts will involve students making presentations during graduate coursework, providing in-services in the community, and providing guest lectures. All students now participate in a supervision practicum. For those students with an interest, more intensive structured teaching experiences will be provided and/or they can serve as a teaching assistant.

Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Professional Field Experience
  - Measure: Faculty and Self Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills
  - Effective Communication | Teaching and Supervision Skills

Implementation Description: Monitor annually
Projected Completion Date: 08/2016
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

For meeting degree requirements (Not Met): As this is a new objective and students already delayed will continue to be delayed until graduation, it is expected that meeting the 90% objective will take more than 1-2 years. Faculty will look closely at the curriculum to determine where adjustments can be made in the coming year with a trajectory approaching the target goal over the next few years.

For all other objectives (Met), program will continue to monitor to encourage progress in these areas in coming years. Action plan have already been in place for that.

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

All objectives and action plan has been changed. Therefore, there is no update for any action plan at this time.
Mission / Purpose
The TAMU doctoral school psychology program offers training in school psychology. It endorses and subscribes to the scientist-practitioner model for the training of professional psychologists. The primary goal of the program is the development of psychologists who recognize the importance of scholarly inquiry and the application of various methods to the resolution of problems encountered in their professional practice, teaching, continuing professional development and their discipline at large. The program endeavors to train psychologists capable of contributing to the health care of children and adolescents, from perspectives of prevention and intervention, related to mental, academic, emotional, and behavioral difficulties, especially as related to schools and the educational process, at the individual and organization level. Since children and families may be encountered in a variety of settings and contexts, the training program attempts to equip students to work in a variety of private and institutional settings, in addition to public and private schools. The program emphasizes and promotes diversity issues related to the practice of psychology, as well as addressing achievement and mental health disparities among minority populations. The program uses a prevention and implementation science as a framework for the curriculum. Rigorous academic standards are maintained, and teaching, supervision, and research experiences are made available so students may successfully compete for academic positions at colleges and universities throughout the country.

Goals

G 1: Professional Competencies
Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional issues, including ethical, legal, diversity, communication, and quality assurance principles necessary for professional competencies

G 2: Scientific Knowledge
Students will demonstrate scientific knowledge, methods, and critical thinking relevant to the practice and science of psychology

G 3: Diversity
The program will continue to emphasize diversity (of all types) in the training program, the recruitment of students, and the practices and processes associated with student grading, support, and mentoring

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Conference Presentation
Students will present research at a conference that uses a variety of strategies and tools, evaluates multiple points, and explains subject matter in their discipline

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively
4. Practice personal and social responsibility
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
6. Prepare to engage in lifelong learning
7. Work collaboratively

Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
2.3 Communicate effectively.
2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.
2.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.
2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 1: Conference Presentation Evidence
Evidence of presenting at a conference
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
90% of graduating students will present research at a conference

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% of graduating PhD students presented at a conference. Therefore, the target is met.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of graduating PhD students presented at a conference. Therefore, the target is met.
SLO 2: Manuscript Submission
Students will submit a manuscript for publication

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively
4. Practice personal and social responsibility
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
6. Prepare to engage in lifelong learning
7. Work collaboratively

Graduate Outcome Associations
2.2. Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
2.4. Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.
2.5. Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
2.6. Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.
2.7. Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 2: Manuscript Submission Evidence
Evidence of submitting a manuscript to a journal
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target: 90% of graduating students will submit a manuscript to a journal
Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met
75% of graduating PhD students submitted manuscript to a journal. Therefore, the target is not met.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
93% of graduating PhD students submitted manuscript to a journal. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 3: Professional Experience
Students will gain professional experience in the field and apply the knowledge and skills they have synthesized across coursework in settings with consideration of cultural and linguistic diversity

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively
4. Practice personal and social responsibility
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
6. Prepare to engage in lifelong learning
7. Work collaboratively

Graduate Outcome Associations
2.1. Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.
2.2. Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
2.3. Communicate effectively.
2.5. Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
2.6. Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.
2.7. Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Related Measures

M 3: Professional Activity Evidence
Evidence of participating in a professional activity
Source of Evidence: Professional standards

Target:
90% of graduating students will have a professional experience
Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
92% of graduating PhD students have a professional experience. Therefore, the target is met.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
93% of graduating PhD students have a professional experience. Therefore, the target is met.

SLO 4: Completion Rate
All students will make adequate progress toward degree completion in relation to the same standards for competency, with supports as needed, regardless of race, ethnicity, language, disability, sexual orientation, gender, marital status, or other element of diversity

Relevant Associations:
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1. Master the depth of knowledge required for a degree
2. Demonstrate critical thinking
3. Communicate effectively
4. Practice personal and social responsibility
5. Demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence
6. Prepare to engage in lifelong learning
7. Work collaboratively

Graduate Outcome Associations

2.1 Master degree program requirements, including theories, concepts, principles, and practice; develop a coherent understanding of the subject matter through synthesis across courses and experiences; and apply subject matter knowledge to solve problems and make decisions.
2.2 Apply a variety of strategies and tools, use a variety of sources, and evaluate multiple points of view to analyze and integrate information and to conduct critical, reasoned arguments.
2.3 Communicate effectively.
2.4 Develop clear research plans, conduct valid, data-supported, theoretically consistent, and institutionally appropriate research and effectively disseminate the results of the research in appropriate venues to a range of audiences.
2.5 Use appropriate technologies to communicate, collaborate, conduct research, and solve problems.
2.6 Teach and explain the subject matter in their discipline.
2.7 Choose ethical courses of action in research and practice.

Strategic Plan Associations

Executive Vice President for Academics and Provost

1.1 Accountability: Establish structures, processes, and policies that hold the unit accountable and eligible for rewards for demonstrating their current standing, plans, and progress in creating an environment where the diversity of individual identities and ideas are treated equitably in a climate that fosters success and achievement by all.
1.2 Climate: Promote a positive and supportive climate by identifying aspects in the climate of individual units and the University which foster and/or impede a working and learning environment that fully recognizes, values, and integrates diversity in the pursuit of academic excellence.
1.3 Equity: Integrate into the mission and goals of the unit that students, staff, and faculty (tenure and non-tenure track), regardless of identity, are all treated equitably.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Increase Conference Presentations

Funds were identified to be used for limited travel awards for students who do first author presentations at national conferences in 2011-2012

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: An awards committee is implementing this; it will be announced to students
Responsible Person/Group: Nate Clemens, Jamilia Blake

Readiness for ESPY 640

In order to better place students into the RMS sequence, a 'placement' test will be developed and used for incoming students

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Online test will be established and incoming students will take the test to determine if they should register for EPSY 635 or EPSY 640; this is still in process
Projected Completion Date: 08/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Bob Hall is responsible for creating the online measure

Increase student publication (submitted and published)

Faculty will mentor students more in the area of publication and turning presentations into publications. We also will consider offering a writing course for those students who need assistance. Funding was provided for students who were interested in taking the writing course through CEHD this summer. At least 2 students took advantage of this.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Each faculty is implementing their own mentoring plan with advisees and those working on their research projects
Projected Completion Date: 09/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Each tenured/tenure track faculty member
Additional Resources: none

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

Based on the analysis of your findings, what changes are you currently making to improve your program? Identify the specific findings you analyzed and how they led to your decision.

We are increasing mentoring of students in the area of publication and the department has revised the research expectation document

Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Highlight your improvements.

We are still trying to get a 'placement' test for statistics. With regard to publication, we were planning on having a writing
course this summer, but instead have recommended students take the writing course being offered by the college.

## Annual Report Section Responses

### Program Contributions
The program continues to contribute to the diversity of the department, the CEHD, and the University; students are involved in research projects almost immediately upon entering the doctoral program.