

Program Report for the Preparation of Special Education Teachers Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) 2012 Standards - Option A

NCATE approved the CEC Standards in 2012. Programs can use either the 2001 or the 2012 standards through Fall 2014. Beginning in Spring 2015, programs submitting reports must use the 2012 standards.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

COVER SHEET

1. Institution Name

TRINITY WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

2. State

WASHINGTON, DC

3. Date submitted

MM DD YYYY

03 / 03 / 2015

4. Report Preparer's Information:

Name of Preparer:	
MEGHAN COSIER, Ph.D.	
Phone:	Ext.
(202) 884-9564	
E-mail:	
COSIERM@TRINITYDC.EDU	

5. NCATE Coordinator's Information:

Name:	
LYNN JOHNSON	
Phone:	Ext.
(202) 884-9560	
E-mail:	
JOHNSONLY@TRINITYDC.EDU	

6. Name of institution's program

SPECIAL EDUCATION

7. NCATE Category

Special Education-General Curriculum

8. Grade levels⁽¹⁾ and Exceptionalities/Severity Levels for which candidates are being prepared

K-12

(1) e.g. K-6, K-12

9. Program Type

- Advanced Teaching
- First Teaching License
- Other School Personnel
- Unspecified

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's
- Post Master's
- Specialist or C.A.S.
- Doctorate
- Endorsement only

11. Is this program offered at more than one site?

- Yes
- No

12. If your answer is "yes" to above question, list the sites at which the program is offered

13. Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared

NON-CATEGORICAL SPECIAL EDUCATION, K-12

14. Program report status:

- Initial Review
- Response to One of the Following Decisions: Further Development Required or Recognition with Probation
- Response to National Recognition With Conditions

15. Is your unit seeking

- NCATE accreditation for the first time (initial accreditation)
- Continuing NCATE accreditation

16. State Licensure requirement for national recognition:

NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section IV. Does your state require such a test?

- Yes
- No

SECTION I - CONTEXT

1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of CEC Preparation Standards. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

Trinity Washington University (Trinity) offers a Master of Arts in Teaching program in Special Education (MAT/SPED): The MAT is tailored to the needs of teachers who seek first-time teaching licensure and to be certified in Special Education. Candidates in the MAT Special Education program take 36 credit hours and qualify for an initial teaching certificate in non-categorical Special Education. .

Trinity's program is offered in an urban setting with a high demand for teachers. As a result, the program often accepts individuals who are currently teaching at a charter school without a license or at a public school under a provisional license. The MAT/SPED program accepts candidates teaching in several different school districts, including: Montgomery County, Maryland; Prince Georges County, Maryland; and the District of Columbia. Additionally, candidates who are not currently employed as teachers but are seeking SPED certification are accepted into the program to become full-time Special Education teachers. The program is organized to be as supportive as possible to candidates who are working full-time.

Trinity is centrally located in the District of Columbia, and the program is approved by the District of Columbia's Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE). OSSE has adopted the NCATE standards for program approval. Trinity's education programs are in compliance with NCATE and OSSE requirements.

As noted earlier, the program population includes teacher candidates from the entire Washington, DC, metropolitan area, including Maryland and Virginia. Each state has its own SPED certification requirements in regard to Praxis exam qualifying scores; DC (Praxis score of 146) and Maryland (Praxis composite score of 295) have established differing Praxis qualifying scores, while Virginia does not use Praxis II scores (or other standardized assessment) for licensure in Special Education.

Candidates graduating from Trinity's program, who wish to obtain certification in DC or Maryland, must take Praxis II in Special Education (#5354). Although Praxis II is a requirement for certification in DC and Maryland, Trinity does not require candidates to pass this exam as a graduation requirement. All SPED candidates are required to participate in a supervised student teaching experience.

Regarding data analyses, it is important for the reviewers to note that the MAT/SPED is small – averaging 9 graduates per year. As such, the number of candidates does not lend itself to Trinity presenting results in a statistically significant manner.

2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships. (Response limited to 8,000 characters)

Field (Clinical) Experiences prior to Student Teaching:

SPED teacher candidates are required to complete a number of field experiences prior to their student teaching assignments. These field experiences are embedded within their course of study.

Candidates have early and ongoing contact with children and youth with special needs and educators who use well-regarded practices. Candidates spend a minimum of 100 hours in field experiences outside the classroom prior to student teaching, as described below. For example, courses such as EDCC 530: Educating Exceptional Children and Youth, EDCC 605: Educational Measurement and Evaluation, and EDTE 634: Teaching Students with Intellectual disabilities have field experiences related to the content in the class, that is also aligned with CEC standards. The experiences include observations of supports and services for students along the continuum of placements, a one-on-one tutoring project using an assessment cycle, and observations of supports and services for students with significant disabilities in schools and in the community.

Student Teaching:

During their last semester prior to graduation and after the completion of all other required coursework and their comprehensive exam, SPED candidates are required to complete Student Teaching in Special Education (EDTE 675), working with a certified Special Education teacher and a university supervisor during a 14-week period. Candidates also complete the Advanced Seminar in Teaching (EDTE 689) during this semester. During the internship, candidates complete their professional portfolios, impact on student learning projects, additional teaching videos, and a case study project, all of which are presented at the end of the seminar.

The classroom cooperating teacher (teacher mentor) and the university supervisor share the responsibility for supervising the candidate. University supervisors contact candidates prior to the first school visit. When the supervisor is scheduled to visit, candidates are responsible for having materials prepared and available for review, including journals and lesson plans.

Student teaching is evaluated using the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) student teaching instrument developed by Phi Delta Kappa International & Ball State University (2011). This instrument has been aligned with the CEC standards, and candidates are required to demonstrate competency in the standards of both organizations.

3. Description of the criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the program, including required GPAs and minimum grade requirements for the content courses accepted by the program. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

Degree-seeking candidates are admitted to Trinity without regard to race, sex, religion, age, sexual orientation, national or ethnic origin, or disability. Applications from qualified candidates of diverse cultural, economic, and ethnic backgrounds are encouraged. In an effort to admit candidates with a record of academic achievement and promise, the following criteria guide the admissions process:

Criteria for Admission

Undergraduate Degree and Coursework: Candidates for admission must have completed a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited college or university with a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.8 on a 4.0 scale. Though no specific program of study at the undergraduate level is required for admission, candidates seeking teacher certification who have not had required content area courses are required to take additional coursework at the undergraduate level.

The Praxis I examination is a prerequisite for admission to the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program; passing scores are based on the of the District of Columbia requirements.

Retention

Intervention Policy

Candidates are evaluated throughout their course of study by measuring growth in three areas: (1) academic performance, (2) interpersonal skills, and (3) ethical behavior.

1. Academic Performance: Candidates are expected to maintain a 3.0 (B) GPA throughout the academic program. When candidates fall below the expected GPA, they are counseled by their advisor and placed on probation for a semester, then reevaluated. Continued poor performance can lead to dismissal. The intervention policy for the School of Education can be found in the academic policy handbook. (http://www.trinitydc.edu/academics/acadaff/academic_policies.html)

2. Interpersonal Skills: Candidates are expected to demonstrate effective interpersonal skills, including the ability to:

- Function effectively with fellow candidates and faculty;
- Be open and adaptable in relationships with fellow candidates, faculty, students, supervisors and school personnel;
- Demonstrate self-awareness by being open to self-examination, reflection, and commitment to personal growth; and
- Demonstrate a positive attitude toward the learning process.

3. Ethical Behavior: Candidates are expected to demonstrate awareness of and adherence to the ethical standards of the relevant professional associations both in field experiences and in the classroom.

Exit from Program:

Policies for graduation, leave of absence, and withdrawal can be found in the academic policy handbook. (www.trinitydc.edu/policies/EDU_Academic_Handbook.html)

4. CEC initial or advanced Preparation Standards and Specialty Sets used

Initial Preparation Standards, 2012

5. Please attach files to describe a program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet.)

Special Education Program of Study.pdf

See Attachment panel below.

6. This system will not permit you to include tables or graphics in text fields. Therefore any tables or charts must be attached as files here. The title of the file should clearly indicate the content of the file. Word documents, pdf files, and other commonly used file formats are acceptable.

7. Candidate Information

Directions: Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master's, doctorate) being addressed in this report. Data must also be reported separately for programs offered at multiple sites. Update academic years (column 1) as appropriate for your data span. Create additional tables as necessary.

Program:		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers ⁽²⁾
2014	5	4
2013	6	13
2012	10	11

(2) NCATE uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

8. Faculty Information

Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program.

Faculty Member Name	ANDRUSIK, KATRYNA
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ph.D., Special Education: Learning Disabilities; University of Maryland College Park; College Park, MD
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Adjunct Faculty
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁶⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁷⁾ : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽⁸⁾	Member: IRA/ILA, CEC, ASCD McMackin, M.C., Rauchwerk, S., Cambone, J., Curtis, M.C., Andrusik, K., & Brown, D.N. (2013, April). Preparing urban teachers: Working outside the box. Phi Delta Kappan, 94 (7), 25. Andrusik, K.N. & Samuelsen, K.A. (2014, December). Academic discourse as pre-writing strategy: The efficacy of student talk on argument writing in an urban high school English class. Literary Research Association, Annual Conference, Marco Island, FL. Andrusik, K.N. & Montanaro, E. (2013, November). Preparing special educators in alternative programs: Cohort support, coaching, and clinical experiences. Council for Exceptional Children: Teacher Education Division, Annual Conference, Fort Lauderdale, FL. Lecture: Special Education Policy. Department of Teaching and Learning, Policy, and Leadership, University of Maryland, November 2012, 2013.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Capital City Public Charter School, Instructional Coach and Curriculum Coordinator Baltimore City Public Schools, Reading Specialist, Inclusion Specialist, 6-12 English Teacher

Faculty Member Name	BOLDEN, MARK
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ph.D., Counseling Psychology; Howard University, Washington, DC.
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Full-time Faculty
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	Assistant Professor

Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾: List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	President, Washington, DC, Association of Black Psychologists, 2009, 2011-2012 Keynote Presentation: Trauma Prevention and Coping with Crisis: An African Caribbean-Informed Model for Parents, Administrators, and Children. Northern Caribbean University Psychology Department, Kingston, Jamaica 2012. Workshop series for School and Government Personnel related to suicides associated with Jamaican students' test-taking: Mindful Management of Anxiety and Stress: High-Stakes Test-Taking Strategies for Jamaican Student Success. 2012.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	

Faculty Member Name	COSIER, MEGHAN
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	Ph.D., Special Education; Syracuse University; Syracuse, NY
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Full-Time Faculty
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Assistant Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾: List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	Member, Board of Directors, The Children's Guild District of Columbia Public Charter School Cosier, M. (2014). Using "narrative and numbers" to drive inclusive school reform: A case study. In S. Danforth (Ed.). Teaching in the shape of Justice: Becoming an Inclusive educator. New York, NY: Pater Lang. Cosier, M., Gomez, A., Maghzi, K., & McKee, A. (2013). Smart phones permitted: How teachers use text messaging to collaborate in inclusive schools. Education and Information Technologies (Online First). doi: 10.1007/s10639-013-9288-2. Cosier, M., McKee, A., Gomez, A., & Derderian, C. (December, 2014). Making the common core state standards accessible to students with significant disabilities. Presentation. TASH Annual Conference, Washington, DC. Member, AERA, TASH (The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps), CAL-TASH, VA-Tash
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	San Diego Unified School District, Rosa Parks Elementary School: Special Education teacher, grades 2-3; Resource Specialist, grades 1-5 Albuquerque Public Schools, Kit Carson Elementary School: General Education teacher, grade 1

Faculty Member Name	CROWLEY, ABBY
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	Ed.D., Educational Administration; The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Adjunct Faculty
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾: List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	Member CEC, ASTD, ASCD Trainer Training: Facts Conference, 2013, 2014
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	Certificates Administration/Supervision, MD State Department of Education Elementary, Special Education K-12, MD State Department of Education

Faculty Member Name	DAWKINS, BETH KARA
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	Ph.D., Education – Early Childhood, Families and Literacy; University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Chapel Hill, NC
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Full-Time Faculty
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Assistant Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾: List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	Member, NAEYC, Head Start Association Publications Reading Selection Strategies of Lower Income, Minority Students, November 2014 Reading Selection Strategies and Reading Achievement of Economically Disadvantaged, October 2014
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	Licenses Birth thru Kindergarten, State of North Carolina Early Childhood, State of North Carolina Pre-K Teacher, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools Pre-K Teacher, American School Foundation of Guadalajara

Faculty Member Name	FANG-PAN, JENNIFER
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	M.S., Family Science/Couple and Family Therapy; University of Maryland; College Park, MD
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Adjunct Faculty
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES

Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	Pre-clinical Fellow, American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy Introduction to Couple's Therapy; Guest Lecture at University of Maryland, Baltimore; December 2013
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	

Faculty Member Name	FITZMEYER, SCOTT
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	MAT, Early Childhood Education, Trinity Washington University, Washington, DC
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Adjunct Faculty
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	Dc Teaching License, DC Office of the State Superintendent of Education DC Public Schools, classroom teacher

Faculty Member Name	JOHNSON, LYNN
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	MA, English Education, Hunter College CUNY; New York, NY
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Administrator
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Associate Dean
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	Member, National Council of Teachers of English Member, Council on English Education Member, National Business Education Association Member, Eastern Business Education Association Member, NCATE Board of Examiners Member, NCATE Board of Program Reviewers Member, DC Board of Examiners Reader, SAHE Teacher Quality Grant proposals Reader, AACTE Conference presentation proposals
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	New York State certification, English 7-12

Faculty Member Name	LITT, DEBORAH
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	Ph.D., Curriculum and Instruction; University of Maryland; College Park, Maryland
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Full-Time Faculty
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Associate Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	Proposal reviewer, conference submissions, Literacy Research Association Field council representative, Literacy Research Association International Literacy Association (formerly IRA) representative to the National Joint Council on Learning Disabilities Member, Literacy Research Association, ILA, Society for the Scientific Study of Reading, NCTE, Reading Recovery Association of North America Publications and Presentations Literacy Teacher Education: Principles and Effective Practices. With Martin, S., & Place, N. Guilford Press. 2014 Can They Read This? Word Sorts for Teachers. Presentation at the Literacy Research Association Conference, Marco Island, FL December 2014 Promising Practices in Literacy Teacher Education. Session Discussant at the Literacy Research Association Conference. Marco Island, FL December 2014
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	Advanced Professional Certificate, Elementary 1-6 and Middle School; Maryland State Department of Education Prince George's County Public Schools, Reading Specialist/Reading Recovery Teacher

Faculty Member Name	LOJKOVIC, DAVID
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	M.Ed., Special Education; Ohio University; Athens, Ohio
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Adjunct Faculty
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service⁽⁷⁾:List up to 3 major contributions in	President, Washington DC Unit of Council for Exceptional Children Member of elections standing committee, Council for Exceptional Children Izen, C. & Lojkovic, D. (2014). Entries in C.R. Reynolds & E. Fletcher-Janzen (Eds.), Encyclopedia of Special Education: A Reference for the Education of Children, Adolescents, and Adults with Disabilities and Other Exceptional Individuals (4th ED.). NY: John Wiley and Sons Bohnstedt, K.D., Kinas Jerome, M., Lojkovic, D.A., Brigham, F.J. & Behrmann, M. (2013). Instructor Interaction and Immediacy Behaviors in a Multi-Point Distance Educational Environment: Using Technology to Improve Low-Incidence

the past 3 years ⁽⁸⁾	Teacher Preparation. Journal of Special Education Technology. 28(4), 27-41. Lojkovic, D. (2012), Application I: Matching Apps for Students with Low-Incidence Disabilities (PP. 33-38). In M. Ault and M. Bausch (Eds.), Apps for All Students: A Teacher's Desktop Guide, Alexandria, VA: Arlington, VA: Technology and Media Division of The Council for Exceptional Children (TAM).
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	NYC Department of Education, Special Education Teacher Certificates/Licenses Categorical Special Education, Mental Retardation, K-12; District of Columbia Public Schools Categorical Special Education, Specific Learning Disabilities, K-12; District of Columbia Public Schools Non-Categorical Special Education, K-12; District of Columbia Public Schools Students with Disabilities Generalist, 5-9; District of Columbia Public Schools Students with Disabilities 1-6, Childhood Education; District of Columbia Public Schools

Faculty Member Name	MOORE, KELVIN
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	M.S., Education Leadership; NOVA Southeastern University; Ft. Lauderdale, FL
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Adjunct Faculty
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁶⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁷⁾ : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽⁸⁾	Building Capacity; presented at ASCH Summer Conference, July 2012
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Certificate/License Admin 1 and 2; Maryland State Department of Education Orange County Schools, Florida; Behavior Specialist Orange County Schools, Florida; Special Education teacher

Faculty Member Name	MORANT, TAMYKA
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	MAT, Teaching; Johns Hopkins University; Baltimore, MD
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Adjunct Faculty
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁶⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁷⁾ : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽⁸⁾	Member, NCTM, NWSA, AERA Consortium of Race, Class, Gender, Ethnicity Interdisciplinary Scholar-Fellow NWSA Women of Color Leadership Project-Fellow Publications/Presentations AERA: Towards a Portable Family Pedagogy. April 2014 NWSA Conference: Understanding the Multidimensionality of Mentorship for Underrepresented Scholars: A Labor of Love. November 2014
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Certificate/License MD Educator Advanced Professional Certificate; Maryland State Department of Education DC Public Schools, Instructional Coach Manager Community Academy Public Charter Schools, Instructional Coach Community Academy Public Charter Schools, Elementary Teacher Baltimore City Public Schools, Elementary Teacher

Faculty Member Name	STEEN, BWEIKIA
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ed.D., International Multicultural Education; University of San Francisco; San Francisco, CA
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Full-time Faculty
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	Assistant Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁶⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁷⁾ : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽⁸⁾	Committee member, NAEYC Council for Accreditation Member, Appeals panel, NAEYC Presentations Oral Language Development in Pre-K, Oh my!; November 2014 Hear Our Voices; ACEI; March 2014 Publications Starting Young: Counting the PreK to Prison Pipeline. Journal of Black Psychologists. 2014
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	New Haven Unified School District; grades K-2

Faculty Member Name	STOCKS, JANET
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ph.D., Sociology; University of Pittsburgh; Pittsburgh, PA
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Administrator
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	Dean
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁶⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service	Member, Council on Undergraduate Research Member, American Educational Research Association Member, American Sociological Association Member, AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Chair, Board of Governors, National Conferences on Undergraduate Research 2006-2008 Anselm Strauss Award, for Nyman, Reimikainen & Stocks, 2013, awarded by the Qualitative Family Research Network, Research and Theory Section, National Council on Family Relations to recognize significant work in the area of family theory,

(7):List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾	methods, and research that comes from a qualitative tradition. November 2014 Chatliott Nyman, Lasse Reinikainen & Janet Stocks, 2013, Reflections on a cross-national qualitative study of within-household finances. Journal of Marriage and Family 75 (June): 640-650. June 2013 Janet Stocks, 2012, Characteristics of Excellence in Undergraduate Research at Different Institutions, In Undergraduate Research, Washington DC: Council on Undergraduate Research. 2012.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	

Faculty Member Name	WILLIAMS-HORTON, INGRID
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	Ed.D., Administration; Bowie State University; Bowie, MD
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Adjunct Faculty
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service^{(7):List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾}	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	Certificate/License MD Teaching Certificate; Maryland State Department of Education Fairfax County Public Schools, Teacher Prince George's County Public Schools, Teacher Prince George's County Public Schools, HR Specialist Prince George's County Public Schools, Assistant Principal Prince George's County Public Schools, Principal

Faculty Member Name	WILSON, ELNORA
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	M.S., Secondary School Administration/Supervision; Bowie State University; Bowie, MD
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	Adjunct Faculty
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service^{(7):List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾}	Publications Business Writing Teacher, 2009-present Writing Center Tutor, 2013-present
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	Certificate/License Pupil Personnel Worker, Maryland State Department of Education English/Language Arts, 5-12; Maryland State Department of Education Art Education, 5-12; Maryland State Department of Education Prince George's County Public Schools, Elementary School Principal Prince George's County Public Schools, Assistant Principal Prince George's County Public Schools, English/Language Arts Teacher Prince George's County Public Schools, Art Teacher

Faculty Member Name	WINTHER, CHRISTOPHER
Highest Degree, Field, & University⁽³⁾	M.Ed., Education; DePaul University; Chicago, IL
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member⁽⁴⁾	Adjunct Faculty
Faculty Rank⁽⁵⁾	
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship⁽⁶⁾, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service^{(7):List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years⁽⁸⁾}	Volunteer Moderator, DC Area High School ethics Bowl, Fall 2013 Volunteer Judge, Baltimore Network for Teaching entrepreneurship Business Plan Competition, Spring 2011
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools⁽⁹⁾	Certificate/License Network for Teaching Entrepreneurship Certified Teacher Village Learning Place, Lead and Assistant Teacher Boys' Latin Charter High School, Lead Teacher Truman College High School, Lead Teacher

(3) e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.

(4) e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator

(5) e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor

(6) Scholarship is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel.

Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.

(7) Service includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission.

(8) e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.

(9) Briefly describe the nature of recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

SECTION II - LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

1. In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the CEC standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program. (Response limited to 250 characters each field)

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment ⁽¹²⁾	Type or Form of Assessment ⁽¹³⁾	When the Assessment Is Administered ⁽¹⁴⁾
Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)	PRAXIS II	Licensure Assessment	Prior to Certification
Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in special education (required)	Presentation Project	Project, content knowledge	EDTE 630 Career Education for Exceptional Children/Youth Human Relations in Special Education
Assessment #3: Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction (required)	IEP	Case Study	EDTE 637 Preparation of Individualized Learning Prescriptions
Assessment #4: Assessment of student teaching (required)	Student Teaching Evaluation	Practicum Evaluation	EDTE 675 Supervised Student Teaching In Special Education
Assessment #5: Assessment of candidate effect on student learning (required)	Action Research Case Study	Case Study	EDTE 689 Advanced Seminar In Teaching
Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses CEC standards (required)	Communication Case Study	Case Study	EDTE 629 Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities, Teaching Students with Emotional Disturbances
Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses CEC standards (optional)	Comprehensive Exam	Comprehensive Exam, content knowledge	Prior to Student Teaching
Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses CEC standards (optional)	Portfolio Position Papers	Portfolio	EDTE 689 Advanced Seminar In Teaching

(12) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.

(13) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).

(14) Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

For each CEC standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple CEC standards.

1. FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE STANDARD

Special education candidates progress through a series of developmentally sequenced field experiences for the full range of ages, types and levels of abilities, and collaborative opportunities that are appropriate to the license or roles for which they are preparing. These field and clinical experiences are supervised by qualified professionals.

Information should be provided in Section I (Context) to address this standard.

2. Standard 1: Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences

#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8

Beginning special education professionals understand how exceptionalities may interact with development and learning and use this knowledge to provide meaningful and challenging learning experiences for individuals with exceptionalities.								
(1.1) Beginning special education professionals understand how language, culture, and family background influence the learning of individuals with exceptionalities.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(1.2) Beginning special education professionals use understanding of development and individual differences to respond to the needs of individuals with exceptionalities.								

3. Standard 2: Learning Environments

#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8

Beginning special education professionals create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments so that individuals with exceptionalities become active and effective learners and develop emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and self-determination.								
(2.1) Beginning special education professionals through collaboration with general educators and other colleagues create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments to engage individuals with exceptionalities in meaningful learning activities and social interactions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2.2) Beginning special education professionals use motivational and instructional interventions to teach individuals with exceptionalities how to adapt to different environments.								
(2.3) Beginning special education professionals know how to intervene safely and appropriately with individuals with exceptionalities in crisis.								

4. Standard 3: Curricular Content Knowledge

#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8

Beginning special education professionals use knowledge of general⁽¹⁵⁾ and specialized⁽¹⁶⁾ curricula to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities.								
(3.1) Beginning special education professionals understand the central concepts, structures of the discipline, and tools of inquiry of the content areas they teach, and can organize this knowledge, integrate cross-disciplinary skills, and develop meaningful learning progressions for individuals with exceptionalities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(3.2) Beginning special education professionals understand and use general and specialized content knowledge for teaching across curricular content areas to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities.								
(3.3) Beginning special education professionals modify general and specialized curricula to make them accessible to individuals with exceptionalities.								

(15) As used, "general curricula", means the academic content of the general curriculum including math, reading, English/language arts, science, social studies, and the arts.

(16) As used, "specialized curricula" means the content of specialized interventions or sets of interventions including, but not limited to academic, strategic, communicative, social, emotional, and independence curricula.

5. Standard 4: Assessment

#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8

Beginning special education professionals use multiple methods of assessment and data-sources in making educational decisions.								
(4.1) Beginning special education professionals select and use technically sound formal and informal assessments that minimize bias.								
(4.2) Beginning special education professionals use knowledge of measurement principles and practices to interpret assessment results and guide educational decisions for individuals with exceptionalities.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(4.3) Beginning special education professionals in collaboration with colleagues and families use multiple types of assessment information in making decisions about individuals with exceptionalities.								
(4.4) Beginning special education professionals engage individuals with exceptionalities to work toward quality learning and performance and provide feedback to guide them.								

6. Standard 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies

#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8

Beginning special education professionals select, adapt, and use a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies⁽¹⁵⁾ to advance learning of individuals with exceptionalities.								
(5.1) Beginning special education professionals consider an individual's abilities, interests, learning environments, and cultural and linguistic factors in the selection, development, and adaptation of learning experiences for individual with exceptionalities.								
(5.2) Beginning special education professionals use technologies to support instructional assessment, planning, and delivery for individuals with exceptionalities.								
(5.3) Beginning special education professionals are familiar with augmentative and alternative communication								

systems and a variety of assistive technologies to support the communication and learning of individuals with exceptionalities.							
(5.4) Beginning special education professionals use strategies to enhance language development and communication skills of individuals with exceptionalities							
(5.5) Beginning special education professionals develop and implement a variety of education and transition plans for individuals with exceptionalities across a wide range of settings and different learning experiences in collaboration with individuals, families, and teams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(5.6) Beginning special education professionals teach to mastery and promote generalization of learning.							
(5.7) Beginning special education professionals teach cross-disciplinary knowledge and skills such as critical thinking and problem solving to individuals with exceptionalities							

(17) Instructional strategies, as used throughout this form, include Intervention used in academic and specialized curricula.

7. Standard 6: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
Beginning special education professionals use foundational knowledge of the field and their professional Ethical Principles and Practice Standards to inform special education practice, to engage in lifelong learning, and to advance the profession.								
(6.1) Beginning special education professionals use professional Ethical Principles and Professional Practice Standards to guide their practice								
(6.2) Beginning special education professionals understand how foundational knowledge and current issues influence professional practice								
(6.3) Beginning special education professionals understand that diversity is a part of families, cultures, and schools, and that complex human issues can interact with the delivery of special education services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(6.4) Beginning special education professionals understand the significance of lifelong learning and participate in professional activities and learning communities.								
(6.5) Beginning special education professionals advance the profession by engaging in activities such as advocacy and mentoring								
(6.6) Beginning special education professionals provide guidance and direction to paraprofessionals, tutors, and volunteers.								

8. Standard 7: Collaboration

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
Beginning special education professionals collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, individuals with exceptionalities, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways to address the needs of individuals with exceptionalities across a range of learning experiences.								
(7.1) Beginning special education professionals use the theory and elements of effective collaboration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(7.2) Beginning special education professionals serve as a collaborative resource to colleagues								
(7.3) Beginning special education professionals use collaboration to promote the well-being of individuals with exceptionalities across a wide range of settings and collaborators								

SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: For each program assessment listed in Section II, use one file to provide a description of the assessment of not more than two pages along with the program assessment, scoring rubric, and data tables.

Taken as a whole, the program assessments must demonstrate candidate mastery of the CEC Preparation Standards. The program assessments used must be required of all candidates. Assessments, scoring guides, and data should be aligned with the CEC Preparation Standards. This means that the concepts in the CEC Preparation Standards should be apparent in the program assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the CEC Preparation Standards. Data should also be aligned with the CEC Preparation Standards. The data should be presented at the same level it is collected. For example, if a rubric is used to collect data on several elements each relating to specific CEC Preparation Standard, then the data should report the data on each of the elements rather than reporting a single cumulative score.

In the description of each program assessment below, CEC has identified potential program assessments that would be appropriate. Program assessments have been organized into the following three areas to be aligned with the elements in CAEP's unit standard 1:

- Content knowledge (Program assessments 1 and 2)
- Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Program assessments 3 and 4)
- Focus on student learning (Program assessment 5)

While faculty may align state credentialing assessment (Program Assessment 1) to numerous CEC Preparation Standards, it may not be cited as the sole assessment for any CEC Preparation Standards.

Note that in special education, the primary content knowledge for the professional discipline includes and is inextricable from professional knowledge. Therefore, program assessments that combine content and professional knowledge will be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each program assessment, the report developer should prepare one document that includes the following items :

(1) Two-page narrative including:

- A brief description of the program assessment and its use in the program;
- A description of how this program assessment specifically aligns with the standards for which it is cited in Section III. Cite CEC Preparation Standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
- A brief analysis of the data findings;
- An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific CEC Preparation Standards by number, title, and/or standard wording;

(2) Program assessment documentation including:

- The program assessment tool itself or a rich description of the program assessment (often the directions given to candidates);
 - The scoring guide or rubric for the program assessment; and
 - Candidate performance data derived from the program assessment in tables that display the scores in alignment with the CEC Preparation Standards.
- The responses for e, f, and g (above) routinely should be limited to the equivalent of five text pages each. Exceptionally, some program assessment instruments or scoring guides may go beyond five pages.

1. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Data from required state licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge CEC Preparation Standards addressed in this program assessment could include Standards 1 through 7. If the state does not require a credentialing test(s) or professional examinations in the content area, another program assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment 1 Praxis II.pdf

See Attachment panel below.

2. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

CEC Preparation Standards addressed in this program assessment could include Standards 1 through 7. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations; written interpersonal/presentational tasks; capstone projects or research reports addressing cross-disciplinary content; philosophy of teaching statement that addresses the role of culture, literature, and cross-disciplinary content; and other portfolio tasks (18).

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 2 Presentation Project.pdf

See Attachment panel below.

(18) A portfolio is a collection of candidate work. The information to be reported here requires an assessment of candidates' content knowledge as revealed in the work product contained in a portfolio. If the portfolio contains pieces that are interdependent and the portfolio is evaluated by faculty as one assessment using a scoring guide, then the portfolio could be counted as one assessment. Often the assessment addresses an independent product within the portfolio rather than the complete portfolio. In the latter case, the assessment and scoring guide for the independent product should be presented.

3. PLANNING: PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS

Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan instruction as individualized for a single individual. CEC Preparation Standards that typically could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Examples of program assessments include the evaluation of candidates' abilities to develop individualized lesson or unit plans, individualized educational plans, needs assessments, or intervention plans.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment 3 IEP.pdf

See Attachment panel below.

4. TEACHING: PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS

Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice. CEC Preparation Standards that typically could be addressed in this program assessment include but are not limited to Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7. The program assessment instrument used in student teaching or the internship should be submitted.

Provide program assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment 4 Student Teaching.pdf

See Attachment panel below.

5. EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING

CEC Preparation Standards that typically could be addressed in this program assessment include but are not limited to Standards 4-7. Examples of program assessments include those based on student work samples, portfolio tasks, case studies, follow-up studies, and employer surveys.

Provide program assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment 5 Impact on Student Learning.pdf

See Attachment panel below.

6. ADDITIONAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Examples of program assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, and licensure tests not reported in 1.

Provide program assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment 6 Communication Case Study.pdf

See Attachment panel below.

7. ADDITIONAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Examples of program assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, and licensure tests not reported in 1.

Provide program assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment 7 Comprehensive Exam.pdf

See Attachment panel below.

8. ADDITIONAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Examples of program assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, and licensure tests not reported in 1.

Provide program assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment 8 Portfolio Position Papers.pdf

See Attachment panel below.

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

Content Knowledge

The results of the most recent program review suggest that the candidates would be better prepared with more "content area" curriculum covered throughout the courses. As special educators, they will need to be familiar with grade level content in English Language Arts and

Mathematics in order to make the content in all areas of study accessible for students with disabilities. Thus, one significant change to the course content in three courses is a focus on improving knowledge of the College and Career Ready Standards as associate curriculum in both Language Arts and Mathematics.

Beginning in fall 2015, EDTE 629: Teaching Students with High Incidence Disabilities (formerly known as Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities and Emotional Disturbances), will include content on teaching mathematics to students with disabilities. Not only will this involve pedagogical approaches (described below), it will also introduce candidates to some content area knowledge, so that they are familiar with the scope and sequence of the District of Columbia Common Core State Standards. Similarly, EDTE 634: Teaching Students with Significant Disabilities (formerly known as "Teaching Students with Intellectual Disabilities") will cover the Common Core State Standards and Language Arts curriculum. The focus will be on how to adapt and extend these standards and curricula for students with more significant disabilities. Lastly, EDTE 630: Career Educational for Exceptional Children/Youth Human Relations in Special Education will include content related to writing curricula as a way to introduce candidates to curricula and methods used in schools.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Pedagogical Skills in Teaching Reading, Writing, and Mathematics

As mentioned above, our program would be strengthened by providing candidates with more on content area knowledge. In addition, our program would be strengthened by providing more specific instruction in pedagogical approaches to teaching reading, writing, and mathematics. Although we cover pedagogy in these areas, including more detailed approaches throughout the program will allow the candidates to provide intensive intervention for students with disabilities. Thus, beginning fall 2015, the Program of Study includes a course on emergent literacy and beginning reading. In addition, we added supplemental materials to EDTE 634 and 630 (listed above) that focus on specific intervention approaches for mathematics and writing respectively.

Positive Behavioral Supports

The results of the program review suggest that our candidates require more intensive instruction in using positive behavioral supports and effective classroom management strategies. Therefore, beginning in fall 2015, the Special Education Program of Study will include a course on positive behavioral supports and classroom management. This course reviews the history, theory, and implementation of providing positive behavioral supports to children with and without disabilities in a context of ethical interaction and reflective practice. Candidates will learn a variety of observational and planning tools for construction of authentic and responsive intervention strategies that lead to productive and inclusive learning communities.

Assessment

The results of the most recent program review indicate that candidates require more support in developing and utilizing summative and formative assessments. Thus, beginning in Fall 2015, the program of study will include a revised assessment course. The course will focus more on using the cycle of assessment throughout instruction.

Student Learning

Overall, the key assessments act as quality indicators of whether our candidates are meeting the professional standards established. One assessment we found could be better aligned with all of the updated 2012 CEC standards was the comprehensive exam. The current comprehensive exam does allow the candidates to show knowledge and application of a variety of indicators including learner development and planning for instruction respectively. However, this alignment could be clearer. Hence, beginning in Spring 2015 we have revised the comprehensive exam to more clearly align with the updated 2012 CEC standards.

SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

1. For Revised Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the standards that were not met in the original submission. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Revised Report are available on the NCATE web site at <http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/ProgramReportSubmission/RevisedProgramReports/tabid/453/Default.aspx>

For Response to Conditions Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the conditions cited in the original recognition report. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Response to Conditions Report are available on the NCATE web site at <http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/ProgramReportSubmission/ResponseToConditionsReport/tabid/454/Default.aspx>

(Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.



Trinity

MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING - SPECIAL EDUCATION

rev. May 7, 2012; June 15, 2012; August, 2014

Student Name:		ID:		Advisor:	
Email:		Admission Date:			

* PRAXIS I, ACT, SAT, GRE: (Specify test; check OSSE score requirement)	Reading (test:)	Writing (test:)	Mathematics (test:)
	Score:	Score:	Score:
Praxis II/Core Knowl & App: Key Assessment #1			

All candidates must successfully complete Praxis I or OSSE-identified alternative prior to admission

Candidates who do not successfully complete the Writing Assessment in EDCC 601—Transitions to Graduate School Seminar are required to take and pass EDCC 511—Introduction to Professional Writing or an equivalent course within their first year of study.

COURSE #	COURSE NAME	Prerequisite	Grade Req'd	Plan	Completed	Notes/ Approved Change	Key Assessment
EDCC 601	Orientation: Tools for Success		AU	Req 1 st sem			
EDCC 511	Introduction to Professional Writing						
EDCC 510	Human Growth and Development						
EDCC 530	Education of Exceptional Children/Youth						
EDCC 541	Foundations of Education: The Art of Teaching & Learning						
EDCC 600	Educational Research						
EDCC 605	Educational Measurement and Evaluation	EDCC 510, 541					
EDTE 629	Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities Teaching Students with Emotional Disturbances	EDCC 510, 530, 541	B	Spring			Key #6 Communication Case Study
EDTE 630	Career Education for Exceptional Children/Youth Human Relations in Special Education	EDCC 510, 530, 541	B	Summer			Key #2 Presentation Project
EDTE 634	Teaching Students with Intellectual Disabilities	EDCC 510, 530, 541	B	Fall			
EDTE 636	Psychology of Exceptional Children and Youth	EDCC 510, 530, 541	B				
EDTE 637	Preparation of Individualized Learning Prescriptions	EDCC 510, 530, 541, 605 Pre- or co-requisite EDTE 629, 630	B	Fall			Key #3 IEP
KEY ASSESSMENT: COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION IN SPECIAL EDUCATION							
EDTE 675	**Supervised Student Teaching in Special Education	Co-requisite EDTE 689 All EDCC, EDTE courses; All General Education	B				Key #4 Teaching
EDTE 689	Advanced Seminar in Teaching	Co-requisite EDTE 675 All EDCC, EDTE courses; All General Education	B				Key #5 & #8 Impact & Portfolio
				36 CREDITS			

Any change in this schedule may result in additional time in school. Application for the Internship is due a semester prior to experience. All placements must be approved by the Program Director for Teacher Education.

This acknowledges the candidate has had the program of study explained and understands all program requirements.

Date: _____ Gen Ed: _____

Advisor: _____ Candidate: _____

Notes: _____

Key #7 : Comprehensive Examination (date) _____ ()

#1 (Required)-CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Data from licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge.

Assessment 1: Praxis II in Special Education

1. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program

Although not a graduation requirement, candidates seeking Special Education certification (Non-Categorical, K-12) in Washington, DC, are required to test successfully on the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Praxis II exam #5354. This content measure was adopted by the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), effective September 1, 2011. The test contains 120 questions in the following areas and may be taken on computer or in a paper format:

- Development and Characteristics of Learners (16%)
- Planning and the Learning Environment (23%)
- Instruction (23%)
- Assessment (18%)
- Foundations and Professional Responsibilities (20%)

This is based on reported results. Candidates tend to receive licensure in various jurisdictions (e.g. Maryland, DC, Virginia). In these jurisdictions PRAXIS II is required for certification. Thus, candidates often send these scores to their jurisdiction. Since this test is not required for graduation, Trinity experiences some difficulty in collecting scores. In addition, not all schools require licensure (e.g. charter schools). Thus, some candidates may choose not to take the exam.

2. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III.

Test Category	CEC Standard
<p>Development and Characteristics of Learners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Human development and behavior - Theoretical approaches to student learning and motivation - Basic characteristics and defining factors for each of the major disability categories - Impact of disabilities on individuals, families and society across the life span - Impact of language, cultural, and gender differences on the identification process - Co-occurring conditions - How family systems contribute to the development of individuals with disabilities - Environmental and societal influences on student development and achievement 	<p>Standard 1</p>
<p>Planning and the Learning Environment</p>	<p>Standards 5, 2</p>

Test Category	CEC Standard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Characteristics of good lesson plans - Basic elements of effective lesson plans - Learning objectives that are measurable and appropriately challenging - Means of providing access to the curriculum - Organizing the learning environment - Understands how to manage student behavior - Theory and practice of effective classroom management - Design and maintenance of a safe and supportive classroom environment that promotes student achievement 	
<p>Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Instructional strategies/techniques that are appropriate, considering students' ages and abilities - Instructional strategies for ensuring individual academic success in one-to-one, small group, and large group settings - Instructional strategies that facilitate maintenance and generalization of concepts - Selection and implementation of research-based interventions of individual students - Selection and implementation of supplementary and/or functional curriculum - Options for assistive technology - Instructional strategies/techniques that support transition goals <p>Preventive strategies and intervention strategies for at-risk learners</p>	Standards 1, 5
<p>Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence-based assessments that are effective and appropriate - Defines and uses various assessments - Interprets assessment results - Understands and uses the results of assessments 	Standard 4
<p>Foundations and Professional Responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Federal definitions - Federal requirements for the pre-referral, referral, and identification - Components of a legally defensible individualized education plan - Major legislation - Roles and responsibilities of the special education teacher - Roles and responsibilities of other professionals who deliver special education services - Strengths and limitations of various collaborative approaches - Communication with stakeholders 	Standards 6, 7

Test Category	CEC Standard
- Potential bias issues that may impact teaching and interactions with students and their families	

Analysis of the Data Findings

10 candidates reported scores for test #5354 (adopted by OSSE in September 2011) during the Fall 2012, Spring 2013, and Fall 2013 semesters. 100% earned qualifying scores. While the required score is 151, the average score for these graduates was 175. This is well above the required score.

Semester/Year	# Test Takers	Passing Scores		Average Score (minimum to pass is 151)
		#	%	
Fall 2012	3	3	100	172
Spring 2013	3	3	100	180
Fall 2013	4	4	100	173

#2 (Required)-CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Assessment of content knowledge in Special Education.

Assessment 2: Presentation Project

Description of the Assignment and its Use in the Program

The presentation project was added as a content measure in Summer 2012 and is, typically, completed by candidates towards the end of their program. The assessment is part of EDTE 630, Career Education for Exceptional Children and Youth, Human Relations in Special Education. In addition to researching and addressing six specific Special Education themes, candidates present their research in class.

This assignment allows candidates to demonstrate their understanding of local and federal laws and regulations related to students with disabilities.

A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III.

Candidates are required to research, prepare, and present on the following issues as they relate to Special Education services in Washington, DC, as follows:

- Special Education Laws and Policies (CEC Standard 6, Professional Practice)
- Characteristics and Development (CEC Standard 1, Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences)
- Assessment and Placement Issues (CEC Standard 4, Assessment)
- Impact of Exceptional Conditions on Children and Family (CEC Standards 1 & 2, Learner Development and Learning Environments)
- Interaction of Culture and Language with Diagnosis and Treatment (CEC Standard 6, Professional Practice)
- Collaboration (CEC Standard 7)

Description of the Assignment

You, as a special educator, are asked to speak before a group of parents, child advocates, and city administrators about special education. They have specifically requested that you speak to the following issues:

1. The mandates (laws) effecting or requiring special education services for children with disabilities in the District of Columbia.
2. Characteristics and development of children with special needs (e.g., common characteristics and categories of children identified with special needs, educating

children with medical or physical/speech disabilities, educational transitions from pre-Kindergarten through high school).

3. The educational assessment and placement procedures established under IDEA.
4. The impact of an exceptional condition on the child's life.
5. The interaction of culture and language with diagnosis and treatment of exceptional conditions.
6. The importance of collaboration between school, families, and community support systems.

Your speech should be written for a delivery time of approximately one hour. A manuscript of the speech should be submitted.

Rubric

Criteria	Approaches	Meets	Exceeds
Overall organization and presentation	The presentation may not be well organized or does not include a knowledge and in-depth focus on each topic. Points made in the presentation may be overly vague, general or unfocused. The presentation may include inaccuracies or notable omissions. It may not be clearly tailored to the range of stakeholders or include enough focus on special education practices in the District itself.	The overall organization and presentation is adequate and covers most issues with some degree of breadth and depth. The speech is well written and appropriate to an audience that includes the range of stakeholders listed. The introduction to the presentation makes it clear why the speaker is qualified to speak to all topics.	The presentation is very well organized and written, and covers all issues comprehensively yet succinctly, with a clear focus on urban special education and District law. The presentation moves smoothly from topic to topic.
Issue #1: Special Education Laws and Policies (CEC Standard 6, Professional Practice)	The presentation includes omissions or errors in interpretation of D.C. laws and mandates for special education. Explanations may be unclear or not conveyed in ways that can easily be understood by the non-educators. The presentation may not focus on the rights of families and children to education services.	The presentation adequately provides information on most key aspects of D.C. law and regulations governing special education, and explains the relevance of those laws to all stakeholders, with an emphasis on the rights of students and families with special educational needs. The presentation may contain one or more minor errors or omissions.	The presentation thoroughly and knowledgeably summarizes D.C. law related to special education services, clearly explaining the impact of those laws on children and families in particular. Explanations are clearly stated. No factual errors or critical omissions are noted.
Issue #2: Characteristics and Development (CEC Standard 1, Development and varying abilities and behavior)	The presentation may include noticeable errors or omissions that could lead to confusion or conveying misinformation to the audience. The descriptions of special education categories may not reflect a clear	The presentation adequately summarizes information on the range of special education categories used in the D.C. school system, and describes characteristics of students at different	The presentation clearly and knowledgeably summarizes information on the range of special education categories and characteristics of students who are placed in one or more

Criteria	Approaches	Meets	Exceeds
	understanding of characteristics or developmental aspects of a range of special needs. The tone may not be sensitive or respectful in describing characteristics of students.	age levels. One or two omissions or minor errors may be noted.	category. The tone of this discussion is knowledgeable and respectful, with an emphasis on the individuality of each child taking precedence over categorization or diagnosis. No factual errors or critical omissions are noted.
<p>Issue #3: Assessment and Placement Issues</p> <p>(CEC Standard 4, Multiple types of assessment)</p>	The presentation may include noticeable errors or omissions that could lead to confusion or conveying misinformation to the audience. The presentation may not focus on the most critical issues related to assessment and placement of students with special needs.	The presentation adequately summarizes IDEA and D.C. law related to diagnostic assessments and placement decisions, with an emphasis on parental rights as that applies to requests for testing, placement decisions, development, maintenance, and legal aspects of IEPs. One or two omissions or minor errors may be noted.	The presentation clearly and knowledgeably summarizes laws and practices related to assessment and placements, with good and concise explanations of key terms, concepts, and assessments used. No factual errors or critical omissions are noted.
<p>Issue #4: Impact of Exceptional Condition on Child and Family</p> <p>(CEC Standard 1, Effect of exceptional condition on an individual's life, & CEC Standard # 6, Professional Learning and Practice)</p>	The presentation gives short shrift to this topic, or may not clearly address the range of complications and concerns that are commonly faced by children and parents of children with exceptional needs. The presentation may not include examples that illustrate complications in concrete terms.	The presentation adequately targets the audience about main factors that exceptional conditions have on the life of both the child and family, including but not limited to learning, health and medical issues, career goals, and impact on siblings and parents. The presentation includes concrete examples of factors.	The presentation comprehensively and compassionately deals with the topic of exceptionality and quality of life, and may include suggestions and resources related to family support systems and parent-school collaboration.
<p>Issue #5: Interaction of Culture and Language with Diagnosis and Treatment</p>	The presentation may not adequately address this topic, or reflects a biased or stereotyped	The presentation adequately addresses and includes examples of factors, related to	The presentation sensitively and compassionately addresses how cultural

Criteria	Approaches	Meets	Exceeds
(CEC Standard 1, Cultural perspectives and interaction with families)	approach to cultural norms. The coverage of this topic may be overly abstract.	cultural or religious differences, family dynamics, and/or socioeconomic background, that may interact with diagnosis and treatment (e.g. shame, acceptance, limited resources, different religious or cultural attitudes toward cognitive disability).	and family differences must be taken into consideration in diagnosis and treatment. The presentation may include suggestions or alternatives for school-family collaboration that deal respectfully and knowledgeably with a range of family and cultural differences.
Issue #6: Interaction of Culture and <u>Language</u> (CEC Standard 1, Educating ELN students whose primary language is not English)	The presentation may not adequately address this issue, or may not clearly articulate the problems faced by children with exceptional needs who are also English language learners (ELLs), as well as the services provided by schools in this area.	The presentation adequately addresses complications as well as solutions for educating children with exceptional needs who are also ELLs, or whose parents speak limited English.	The presentation reflects strong knowledge of both the problems and resources available in educating children who are ELLs, or whose parents speak limited English. The presentation may address how language barriers can mask or be mistaken for learning disabilities.
Issue #7: Collaboration (CEC Standard 7, Collaborating with families and other service providers)	The presentation may not adequately address this issue, or may not make a clear or strong argument for the importance of collaboration and the role of collaboration.	The presentation adequately addresses the important role of school, family, related service providers, and community collaboration in educating children with special needs.	The presentation presents a strong argument for collaboration as key to successfully integrating children with ELNs, and underlines the responsibilities of both family and schools in meeting this responsibility.

Analysis of the Data Findings

The Presentation Project was added as a content measure in summer 2012. During summer 2012, 100 percent of candidates met or exceeded the standards noted, with most exceeding each standard. During summer 2013, 60-100 percent of candidates met or exceeded each standard, with 0-40 percent approaching each standard. Specifically, from 2012-2013 the number of candidates exceeding the standards dropped in the areas of Assessment (standard #4), characteristics and development (standard #1), and law and policy (standard #6). Candidates remained strong in the

areas of Child and Family impact (standard #1 & standard 6), culture and language (standard 1), English Language Learners (standard #1), and Collaboration (standard #7), with most candidates exceeding the standard in these areas.

The results of the 2013 assessment should be interpreted with caution as one candidate represented all the scores in the approaches column. We have met with this candidate individually to address concerns and work on these competencies, and she repeated the course in Summer 2014.

All candidates in the Summer 2014 course met or exceeded the standards. Candidates showed relative strengths in issues 2, 3, 4, and 6. These issues dealt with development, assessment, impact of disability on children and families, and collaboration. Issues 1 and 5 (legal issues and culture/language issues respectively) were general areas where some students received a "meets" as opposed to exceeds.

When candidates "met" the standard, rather than exceeding it, the candidates' presentations demonstrated adequate knowledge of the standard and the requirement of the presentation. However, the responses lacked detail to meet the "exceeded" range. We have subsequently revised the course for summer 2014 to focus more on law and policy, assessment, and characteristics and development in order to support continued growth of candidates in this area.

Data Table

Criteria	Summer 2012						Summer 2013						Summer 2014							
	Approach		Meets		Exceeds		Approach		Meets		Exceeds		Approach		Meets		Exceeds			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Overall Organization and Presentation	0	0	3	24	10	76	1	20	2	40	2	40	0	0	0	0	2	33	4	66
Issue #1 CEC Standard 6 (Law and Policy)	0	0	3	24	10	76	1	20	3	60	1	20	0	0	0	0	2	33	4	66
Issue #2 CEC Standard 1 (Char. & Dev.)	0	0	0	0	13	100	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	1	16	5	84
Issue #3 CEC Standard 4 (Assessment)	0	0	2	15	11	85	1	20	2	40	2	40	0	0	0	0	1	16	5	84
Issue #4 CEC Standards 1 & 6	0	0	0	0	13	100	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	100
Issue #5 CEC Standard 1	0	0	2	15	11	85	1	20	0	0	4	80	0	0	0	0	2	33	4	66
Issue #6 CEC Standard 1	0	0	0	0	13	100	1	20	0	0	4	80	0	0	0	0	1	16	5	84

#3 (Required)-PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan and implement appropriate teaching and learning experiences.

Assessment 3: Individualized Education Program (IEP)

Description of the Assignment and its Use in the Program

The IEP assessment was added in Fall 2011 in order to evaluate candidates' ability to plan and implement appropriate teaching and learning experiences. The assessment is part of EDTE 637, Preparation of Individualized Learning Prescriptions, and is completed in candidates' second academic year. In addition to researching and addressing six specific areas related to Individualized Education Program (IEP) implementation and development, candidates present their research in class. The assessment document is modeled on forms currently used by District of Columbia Public Schools. This assignment is intended to assess a candidate's ability to thoroughly complete an IEP.

A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III

Through the completion of the following Individualized Education Program components, candidates are able to demonstrate their ability to meet the following CEC standards:

- Identification of IEP team participants (CEC Standard 7)
- Academic Concerns – Needs and Impact Statements (CEC Standard 1)
- Academic Concerns – Annual Goals and Baselines (CEC Standard 5)
- Communication Concerns (CEC Standard 1)
- Emotional, Social, and Behavioral Development (CEC Standard 1)
- Justification for Instructional Services apart from the General Education Setting (CEC Standard 5)
- Classroom Accommodations (CEC Standard 5)
- Assessment Accommodations (CEC Standard 4)
- Transition Plan (CEC Standard 5)
- Assessment Interpretation and Application (CEC Standard 4)

Description of the Assignment

Instructions: Below is a simulation of the IEP form used in the District of Columbia. It contains basic information about a hypothetical student, Maria James, who is 18 years old and in twelfth grade in a D.C. public high school. Your task is to read the parts of the IEP that are completed, and fill in the sections that are shaded in yellow, based on the information provided. (Feel free to add lines as needed to list additional goals, accommodations, etc.) As you work on this, remember that there are no "right" answers,

only informed answers that reflect a careful interpretation of information provided and your professional knowledge and judgment as a special educator.

Read all the way through the completed sections of the IEP before beginning to fill out the required sections. Your work will be scored on a rubric that is based on the CEC Standards. The rubric aligns to the numbers in red in the IEP.

District of Columbia
PUBLIC SCHOOLS
 Office of Special Education

Individualized Education Program (IEP)

STUDENT INFORMATION

Student Name	Grade	Gender	DOB	Language
Maria James	Ungraded	F	02/06/1994	English

ELIGIBILITY / IEP INFORMATION

Last Eligibility Meeting Date	Last IEP Annual Review	Primary Disability
01/31/2010	02/08/2011	Multiple Disabilities

1 Signatures of IEP Team Participants

IEP MEETING PARTICIPANTS			
<i>The list below documents the individuals who participated (attended and had opportunity to provide input) in the development of this IEP; signatures do not constitute agreement or disagreement with the content of this IEP, or authorize consent for Part B services. Parents indicate consent for service implementation by signing the Consent for Initial Provision of Services Form when the student is initially deemed eligible for IDEA, Part B services.</i>			
Participant Role	Name	Attended Meeting?	Signature
Student			

PRESENT LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE AND ANNUAL GOALS (by area of concern)

AREA OF CONCERN
Academic – Mathematics
Present Level of Educational Performance
Based on WJ III tests conducted on 12/8/11, Maria's mathematics calculation skills are comparable to those of the average individual in the sixth grade. Her standard score is within the low average range (76-84), mathematics calculation skills are limited and she struggles with concerns about the 9 th grade. Her grade level equivalences for mathematics subtests are as follows: Broad Math 7.0; Brief Math 7.2; Math calculation skills 6.5 – 6.8; Math fluency 6.4; and

Applied Problems 7.8.

Based on STAR MATH diagnostic assessments conducted on 9/15/11, Maria had a grade equivalent score of 5.4, which is comparable to that of an average fifth grader in the fourth month of the school year. This score suggests that Maria knows some fractions and decimals, and has an understanding of how to determine a rule that relates to variables and how to find factors and multiples and should be able to multiply and divide large numbers. She also has an understanding of how to determine a rule that relates two variables and how to determine missing figures in patterns, as well as an understanding of how to classify angles and polygons.

2, 10 Needs:	2 Impact on the student:
---------------------	---------------------------------

3, 10 Annual Goal 1:

3, 10 Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement 6/15/12	10 Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:
------------------------	---	---

3, 10 Annual Goal 2:

3, 10 Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement 6/15/12	10 Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:
------------------------	---	---

**AREA OF CONCERN
Academic – Written Expression**

Present Level of Educational Performance

According to the WJ III given in December 2011, Maria has the following scores in writing: Broad Written Language SS 75 (GE 5.5), Brief Writing SS 87 (GE 7.5), Written Expression SS 68 (GE 4.1), Spelling SS 93 (GE 8.7), Writing Fluency SS 59 (GE 3.0), Writing Samples SS 84 (GE 6.0).

According to CBM writing samples obtained weekly in class, Maria can write 35 correct sequences in five minutes with 20 errors. The number of errors has decreased from the beginning of the school year from 34 to 21, and her correct sequences increased from 30 to 35.

Strengths: Maria is polite, diligent, and has a positive attitude. She has a strong interest in creative writing in the form of songs, rap, and poetry. She is cooperative and readily accepts help and suggestions. Independently, she can write simple sentences with a clear subject and predicate, and can create a topic sentence if given a model.

Challenges: Maria does not understand the writing process and needs help in all of its aspects. She needs assistance generating ideas, constructing an outline, writing a rough draft, editing, revising and publishing.

2, 10 Needs:	2, 10 Impact on the student:
---------------------	-------------------------------------

3, 10 Annual Goal 1:		
3, 10 Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement 6/15/12	10 Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:
3, 10 Annual Goal 2:		
3 Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement 6/15/12	10 Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:

4 AREA OF CONCERN Communication – Speech and Language		
Present Level of Educational Performance A speech-language evaluation had been recommended for Maria, as evidenced in previous IEPs dating back to 2006, but to date an evaluation has not been completed. Maria's current therapist will complete the Test of Auditory Processing Skills to keep on record for Maria's future academic or vocational endeavors.		
A WJ III was completed in December 2011. Based on previous psychological and educational evaluation reports, results of the WJ III, and informal assessments and observations, Maria demonstrates areas of concern in auditory processing, expressive language, and receptive language. She demonstrates relative strengths in decoding and encoding (see educational performance for reading). Maria's processing deficits (Processing Speed Index=62, WISC-IV, 05/30/2008) impact her comprehension and writing across the curriculum. Maria demonstrates increased difficulty when information is presented verbally without supplementary visuals. She has been making progress in learning and applying functional vocabulary words. She has also been working on utilizing her knowledge of targeted vocabulary words to complete job applications and resumes, and to prepare for job interviews. She has also been working on improving comprehension strategies targeted at test-taking. Additionally, she has been demonstrating progress identifying the number of steps and key words presented in verbal directions.		
10 Needs:	10 Impact on the student:	
10 Annual Goal 1:		
Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement 6/15/12	Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:
10 Annual Goal 2:		

Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement 6/15/12	Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:
------------------	---	--

5 AREA OF CONCERN
Emotional, Social, and Behavioral Development

Present Level of Educational Performance

Maria is a hard-working and well behaved student who, at least in the past, has wanted to do well in all her classes. Socially, she interacts well with peers and has several friends. She is warm, charming, and engaging. In group therapy sessions, she listens attentively to the discussion, consistently volunteers comments, brings up topics to discuss and can offer insightful and respectful feedback to peers and staff.

Maria seems overwhelmed this year by her classes and seems unable to grasp much of the academic content. When doing classwork, she is frequently one step behind her peers, is inconsistent in asking for help, and is often unable to complete classwork or homework. When questioned about the noncompletion of work, she often becomes defensive instead of engaging in problem-solving with the teacher. She frequently seems unable to understand directions, but does not seem to recognize when clarification is necessary. She also does not seem to retain information from previous instruction. Particularly in the past few months, she has seemed more distracted and careless in her efforts than previously.

Maria's organizational skills have not improved over time, and seem to worsen when her anxiety level is high. She is increasingly focused on the need to find full-time employment once she has completed school, but fails to follow through on job leads and has missed at least one scheduled interview because she had written down the wrong date. Her mother is very concerned about Maria's ability to find employment and is also concerned about whether she will obtain a high school diploma at the end of the year. This concern may be a stressor that is playing a role in Maria's difficulties this school year.

Although Maria is quite vocal about her concerns with finding a job, she fails to take initiative in searching for a job on her own. In general, Maria is not goal-oriented and lacks self-initiative in most areas of her academic and personal life.

Needs:	Impact on the student:
---------------	-------------------------------

Annual Goal 1:

Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement 6/15/12	Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:
------------------	---	--

Annual Goal 2:

Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement 6/15/12	Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:
------------------	---	--

SPECIAL EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES

Special Education Services

Service	Setting	Begin Date	End Date	Time/Frequency
Specialized Instruction	Outside of General Education Classes	12/19/11	6/15/12	27.5 hrs per wk

Related Services

Service	Setting	Begin Date	End Date	Time/Frequency
Speech-Language Pathology	School Building	2/1/12	TBD	1.5 hr per wk
Behavioral Support Services	School Building	12/19/11	6/15/12	2 hrs per wk

LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT

This section describes student needs that require removal from general education to receive the following special education and related services. Note: The nature of the disability must be such that the student can only make progress on IEP goals and objectives by being removed from the general education classroom to receive these services.

Service	Time/Frequency	6 Justification
Specialized Instruction	27.5 hrs per wk	
Speech-Language Pathology	1.5 hrs per wk	
Behavioral/Occupational Support Services	2 hrs per week	

Describe supplemental supports and services that were previously attempted in a general education setting.

Maria did not receive special education services until she entered middle school (Grade 6), and she was unsuccessful in making a transition from learning in a single classroom with one teacher to a multiple classroom setting. Prior to Grade 6, her academic performance was consistently weak across subject areas but sufficient for her to be promoted each year.

After failing in all subjects in the first semester of Grade 6 despite a near perfect attendance record, Maria was deemed eligible for special education services in the second semester of that grade. In the second semester she was given specialized instruction in mathematics and ELA, while the rest of her instruction took place in the general classroom. Her performance improved somewhat in math and ELA, but she again failed all other subjects, and was not promoted to Grade 7. During that year Maria was also tested for cognitive and learning disabilities, but no definitive diagnosis was made other than a finding of her having average intelligence scores in all areas and probable Attention Deficit Disorder (non Hyperactive). Her mother, however, was opposed to Maria's receiving further consultation or treatment related to

that possible diagnosis.

Beginning with the next school year, Maria repeated Grade 6, receiving all her instruction outside the general education classroom. Her repeat of Grade 6 was generally successful, and by the end of the year she tested at the 5th or 6th grade level in all subjects. Based on her successful completion of Grade 6, Maria was again placed in general classroom settings for all but mathematics, for which she continued to receive specialized instruction. However, after her first quarterly report card in Grade 7 revealed her to be failing all subjects, she was immediately returned to specialized instruction for all subject areas except for art, music, and physical education, and has remained in that situation until the present. She is currently classified as having an ungraded status, but is expected to graduate in June 2012 with a general diploma.

Since Grade 7 and through high school, Maria has made continuous, although limited, academic progress and has mostly flown "under the radar" of the school system. In large part this is due to the fact that Maria is a positive and diligent student of average intelligence, is fairly articulate, participates in class discussion and activities, and presents no behavioral problems other than a lack of organization and occasional tardiness. Her mother, who participates in most IEP meetings and attends some parent conferences, makes no demands for further services and testing, and in fact has been mostly opposed to any suggestion that further testing may be warranted.

CLASSROOM ACCOMMODATIONS AND STATE ASSESSMENT (DC-CAS) PARTICIPATION

Accommodations are made as appropriate to allow the student to advance toward attaining his/her annual goals and be involved and progress in the general curriculum. Accommodations in general and special education settings may include several areas (e.g. transportation, school discipline policy, conditional behavioral intervention, assistive technology, grading modifications, curriculum, materials and equipment, limited English proficiency services, professional services, and other services). Any accommodations listed are in effect for the duration of the IEP unless otherwise indicated.

Student will participate in: Regular statewide assessment without accommodations
 Regular Statewide assessment with accommodations
 Alternate assessment

7 Classroom Accommodations	8 Statewide Accommodations
<i>Presentation</i>	<i>Presentation</i>
<i>Response</i>	<i>Response</i>
<i>Setting</i>	<i>Setting</i>
<i>Timing and scheduling</i>	<i>Timing and scheduling</i>

--	--

POST SECONDARY TRANSITION PLAN

STUDENT INPUT

<p>Academic Interests: Maria enjoys her music class the most because she has a natural ability for it. Math is her least favorite subject.</p>
<p>Functional Interests: Maria enjoys creative writing, listening to music, singing, and performing. She is an avid reader of music and popular magazines. She has never participated in any school clubs or extracurricular activities.</p>
<p>Employment Interests: Maria would like to be a singer/songwriter, a sound engineer, or a preschool teacher.</p>

AGE-APPROPRIATE TRANSITION ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Assessment Type	Date Completed	Provider or Reviewer
Vocational	12/6/11	[school guidance counselor]
Assessment Tool(s): Informal meeting with student and observations		
<p>Interpretation of Results Summary for Post-Secondary Education and Training Maria expresses a vague interest in attending college, although her response indicates that expressing a desire to attend college is the "right answer," as opposed to something she wants to do. We discussed the process for applying to the early childhood education or music program at Montgomery College (MC) and/or UDC, and have so far looked at the placement test required for admission to MC. Her special education teacher is taking her and some other students to visit UDC and meet with a counselor there sometime next month. We also explored a local program at a for-profit technical institute leading to a certificate in audio engineering, but both the high tuition and location of that particular program made that an impractical goal. This may be a goal for which Maria should be encouraged to do further research.</p> <p>It appears that Maria's real plan is to gain full-time employment at "any job," while continuing to pursue a musical career in her spare time. To that end, her special education teacher and I have helped her write a resume, and complete job applications for Giant Food, Whole Foods, Safeway, Burger King, CVS, and others. To date, one potential employer has called her in for an interview, which she missed because she had written down the wrong date. However, organizational problems aside, Maria is responsible and hard-working, although she has difficulty following instructions and – even though her school attendance is near perfect – she is tardy at least once a week. We have frequently discussed her need to develop strategies related to these tendencies once she enters the workforce. It should be noted that, to date, Maria has never held a job of any kind.</p> <p>Although we will work with Maria toward application and admission to MC, it is difficult to imagine her being successful in college without consistent academic support, and without a strong drive to attain a career that, to her mind, requires a college education. It appears more productive to work with her this year on skills necessary to obtain and retain employment that may in time lead to internal promotion. This in turn may allow Maria to gain the self-confidence, maturity, and motivation needed to pursue higher education or postsecondary training.</p>		

Summary for Independent Living

Maria, who is the oldest child in a single parent household and assumes quite a few childcare and housework responsibilities, expresses no interest or desire to move out of her mother's home until she "gets married." Her mother, however, is insistent that Maria get a job post-high school and contribute to the family income. Although her mother is not opposed to Maria's attending college (although she expresses no enthusiasm for her doing so), she expects her to also hold a job at the same time. Maria is also anxious to have a job so she can have spending money and achieve some level of autonomy and independence, as well as contribute to household income.

9 COORDINATED SET OF ACTIVITIES FOR POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The Transition section should identify appropriate, measurable post-secondary outcomes/goals. Goals should be based upon age-appropriate transition assessments related to employment, education and/or training, and where appropriate, independent living skills.

AREA: Post-secondary education and training

Long Range Goal(s):

SHORT-TERM MEASURABLE GOALS

Short Term Measurable Goals:

Baseline:

Anticipated date of achievement: 06/15/12

TRANSITION SERVICES FOR POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Service	Setting	Time	Projected Begin Date	Projected End Date
Maria will continue to work on study skills, time management, and organization.	School	1 hr per week	12/19/11	6/15/12
Maria will complete FAFSA form with help from parent/transition coordinator.	School and home	1 hr per month	12/19/11	6/15/12
			12/19/11	6/15/12

COORDINATED SET OF ACTIVITIES FOR EMPLOYMENT

The transition section should identify appropriate, measureable post-secondary outcomes/goals. Goals should be based upon age-appropriate transition assessments related to employment, education and/or training, and where appropriate, independent living skills.

AREA: Employment

Long Range Goal(s):

SHORT-TERM MEASURABLE GOALS

Short-Term Measurable Goal:

Baseline:

Anticipated date of achievement: 06/15/12

TRANSITION SERVICES FOR EMPLOYMENT

Service	Setting	Time	Projected Begin Date	Projected End Date
			12/19/11	6/15/12
			12/19/11	6/15/12
			12/19/11	6/15/12

AREA: Independent Living

Long Range Goal(s):

SHORT-TERM MEASURABLE GOALS

Short-Term Measurable Goal:	
Baseline:	Anticipated date of achievement: 06/15/12

TRANSITION SERVICES FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING

Service	Setting	Time	Projected Begin Date	Projected End Date
			12/19/11	6/15/12
			12/19/11	6/15/12

RUBRICS

Rubric criteria are numbered to align to sections of the IEP above in which the CEC standard is addressed.

Criteria	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
<p>1. Identification of IEP team participants</p> <p>(CEC Standard 7, Collaboration)</p>	<p>The IEP does not identify at least three participants other than the student who would most likely be on the IEP team. Or, the role of one or more participants is not clearly stated or supported by IEP information.</p>	<p>The IEP identifies at least three participants, besides the student, who would likely be on the IEP team for this particular student. Titles of participants clearly describe their roles.</p>	<p>In addition, the IEP identifies at least two other participants who would be useful contributors to the IEP team for the student. Their participation is supported by information in the IEP.</p>
<p>2. Academic Concerns - Needs and Impact Statements</p> <p>(CEC Standard 1, Individual Learning Differences)</p>	<p>The needs and impact statements may be incomplete and/or fail to address the expected focus of those statements. Statements may not be well supported by academic information provided, or may misinterpret test or other data.</p>	<p>The student's academic needs, and the impact of those needs on the student, are adequately summarized for math, reading, and writing. Summarized statements accurately reflect information provided, although some may be more well developed than others. Statements reflect the candidate's ability to apply test results to instructional considerations.</p>	<p>All summarized statements of needs and impact represent a concise and thorough synthesis of the assessment of educational performance provided. Statements incorporate a range of factors beyond academic performance provided.</p>
<p>3. Academic Concerns – Annual Goals and Baselines</p> <p>(CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning)</p>	<p>In a given academic area, one or more goals may not be clearly grounded in data provided, or may represent an inaccurate interpretation of data. Several goals statements are not clear or are not written in such a way that they are measurable. Many goals may be overly</p>	<p>Statements of annual goals and baselines in math, reading, and writing are adequately designed to address student needs in each area. Statements reflect a generally accurate interpretation of and attention to test data and other information. Baseline statements are accurate and sufficiently concrete to</p>	<p>All goals statements are well designed to, in their entirety, capture the priorities and focus of student learning needs in each area. Goals are written in terms that allow for them to be evaluated, but are sufficiently broad or deep to identify the areas of academic need and focus. Baseline statements</p>

	narrow or overly broad. Or goals in any single academic area may not capture the priorities or focus of the student's most critical academic weaknesses.	represent how student learning gains will be measured. Some statements of goals may be overly narrow, or too ambitious or broad to be accomplished within the timeframe cited.	in all cases are well suited to support the measurement of goals.
4. Communication Concerns (CEC Standard 1, Learner Development and Individual Differences)	Needs and impact statements may be incomplete, unclear or unfocused. They may not clearly address the function those statements are intended to serve in the IEP. Or, the statements may not be adequately supported by student information related to communication abilities. It is not clear from statements provided in this section that the candidate has a clear understanding of student needs and abilities in this area.	Needs and impact statements adequately summarize the student's needs in the area of communication and language abilities. Goals and baselines are reasonably well designed for measuring gains. Statements, goals, and baselines generally reflect an accurate interpretation and application of student information provided, including test information. It is clear that the candidate has an adequate grasp of student needs and abilities as that relates to areas of concern in the area of speech, language, or other communicative functions.	Needs and impact statements are concise yet thorough, taking into consideration or synthesizing the full range of information provided about the student. Goals and baseline statements are also concise, thorough, and professionally written in measurable terms. It is clear that goals capture the most salient and critical factors of student needs in this area.
5. Emotional, Social and Behavioral Development (CEC Standard 1, Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences)	Needs and impact statements may be incomplete, unclear, or unfocused. Statements may not clearly address the intent or focus intended for those statements in the IEP. Or, the statements themselves may not be adequately	Needs and impact statements adequately summarize the behavioral improvements that will encourage the student toward greater self-empowerment and more productive behaviors. Annual	Needs and impact statements are concise yet thorough, taking into consideration or synthesizing all information about the student including academic, communication, and behavioral concerns, as well as student

	supported by the student information provided.	goals and baselines are reasonably well designed for measuring gains in behavioral or other changes. Statements, goals, and baselines generally reflect an accurate interpretation and application of student information provided, including test information.	motivations, interests, and family background. Goals are also concise, thorough, and professionally written in measurable terms.
6. Justification for Instructional Services apart from the General Education setting (CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning)	Justifications are missing, incomplete, or do not clearly support the provision of specialized services based on information provided about the student.	Justifications generally support the service to be provided and are supported by information about the student. Some or all of the statements would benefit from greater focus or specificity.	Justification statements are concise but thorough statements that reflect a sound conceptual understanding of the services to be provided as well as student information.
7. Classroom Accommodations (CEC Standard 5, Instructional Strategies)	Accommodations may be incomplete, or some accommodations may not adequately reflect the definition of terms in that section of the IEP. Many or most of the accommodations selected do not appear to be specifically crafted or of any clear benefit to the student, as the student's characteristics and needs are described.	All accommodations reflect acceptable practice. Most accommodations are clearly supported by characteristics and needs of the student and reflect a general understanding of a repertoire and appropriate selections of instructional adaptations. It is clear that most accommodations are likely to benefit the student.	All accommodations are appropriate and based on sound practice and knowledge of instructional strategies and adaptations that are appropriate for a student with the characteristics as described by the IEP. Accommodations are professionally written and appear to be based on a sound and broad knowledge of instructional strategies and adaptations.

<p>8. Assessment Accommodations (CEC Standard 4, Assessment)</p>	<p>Some accommodations may not be clearly enough stated, or the benefits of the accommodations suggested may not have any obvious relationship to student characteristics as described. One or more accommodations may be impractical and/or not designed to achieve the goal of having equitable access to participation in statement assessments.</p>	<p>All accommodations are acceptable, and serve the purpose of giving the student equitable access to the general curriculum. Most accommodations identified are clearly enough described, and are based on student information provided and reflect an adequate understanding of supports and adaptations needed to help students with ELN be successful on statement assessment programs.</p>	<p>All accommodations appear professionally grounded in terms of appropriate assessment modifications. All accommodations are clearly targeted to the academic, learning, and behavioral characteristics of the student described.</p>
<p>9. Transition Plan (CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning)</p>	<p>The candidate has, overall, not designed an adequate, professionally sound, practical package of goals and strategies for transitional planning. It is not clear that the candidate took into consideration all student information in designing the plan. Or the plan may reflect bias in terms of the student's potential, interests, or abilities to work toward goals that are best suited for the student's meeting her maximum potential and personal goals.</p>	<p>The candidate has used student information to design appropriate planning strategies related to the student's postsecondary career and educational options as that relates to education, employment, and independent living considerations.</p>	<p>The candidate's strategies and goals related to transitional planning are detailed, sensitive, and responsive to a range of factors including the student's desires, abilities, and potential. All goals and strategies are well designed to, in their entirety, provide the student with the best possible support for transition into adulthood and postsecondary career or educational opportunities.</p>

<p>10. Assessment Interpretation and Application</p> <p>(CEC Standard 4, Assessment)</p>	<p>In one or more of the three areas of academic concern or the concern related to communication, the candidate incorrectly interpreted or overlooked critical assessment information. Or the candidate may have done, overall, an inadequate job of interpreting and integrating assessment information. It is not evident that the candidate has sufficient ability to interpret, select, or design measurable outcomes.</p>	<p>Across the three areas of academic concern, as well as in the concerns related to communication, the candidate adequately interpreted standardized test information, and identified goals, baselines and evaluation procedures that were appropriately measurable for the time period cited. Overall, the IEP indicates the candidate has an adequate grasp of concepts related to the uses of assessment, selection of appropriate assessments as a measure of goals, and the interpretation of assessment results.</p>	<p>Across all areas, the candidate exhibited a professionally accomplished ability to interpret the most critical aspects of standardized test results and integrate that information with other characteristics or informal assessment of the student. It is clear that the candidate has a strong understanding and knowledge of various types of assessments and their uses.</p>
---	--	---	---

Analysis of the Data Findings

The IEP assessment was added in Fall 2011 in order to evaluate candidates' ability to plan and implement appropriate teaching and learning experiences specific to Special Education and the preparation of IEPs. It was subsequently administered in Fall 2012 and Fall 2013. One hundred percent of candidates met or exceeded the standards noted for all three semesters included in the data table below. On average, 89 percent exceeded the standards and 11 percent met the standards, as follows"

- Identification of IEP participants (Standard 7): 85 percent Exceeds, 15 percent meets;
- Academic Concerns (Standard 1): 89 percent exceeds, 11 percent meets;
- Academic Concerns-Annual Goals (Standard 1): 89 percent exceeds, 11 percent meets;
- Communication Concerns (Standard 1): 89 percent exceeds, 11 percent meets;
- Emotional, Social, and Behavioral Development (Standard 1): 89 percent exceeds, 11 percent meets;
- Justification for Instructional Services (Standard 5): 93 percent exceeds, 7 percent meets;
- Classroom Accommodations (Standard 5): 93 percent exceeds, 7 percent meets;
- Assessment Accommodations (Standard 5): 93 percent exceeds, 7 percent meets;
- Transition Plan (Standard 5): 93 percent exceeds, 7 percent meets;
- Assessment Interpretation and Application (Standard 4): 89 percent exceeds, 11 percent meets.

In Fall 2011, the one candidate who consistently "met" the standard, rather than exceeding it, demonstrated adequate knowledge of the standards measured but lacked specificity in his responses. When asked to include additional details, the candidate was able to do so verbally and commented that he thought these details were obvious and, therefore, didn't need to be included in the IEP document. The candidate and his advisor have met to review the need for detail in every section of the IEP, in order that all participants are fully aware of goals and expectations.

Based on the data, candidates had the most difficulty in identifying the appropriate IEP participants. However, most candidates still exceeded in this area. Due to the high number of candidates exceeding standards on this assignment, we will review the assignment for rigor and potentially add sections that will challenge candidates.

Data Table

Criteria	Fall 2011				Fall 2012				Fall 2013									
	Approach		Meets		Exceeds		Approach		Meets		Exceed		Approach		Meets		Exceeds	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Identification of IEP team participants	0	0	1	7	14	93	0	0	2	25	6	75	0	0	1	20	4	80
CEC Standard 7																		
Academic Concerns	0	0	1	7	14	93	0	0	2	25	6	75	0	0	0	0	5	100
CEC Standard 1																		
Academic Concerns	0	0	1	7	14	93	0	0	2	25	6	75	0	0	0	0	5	100
CEC Standard 5																		
Communication Concerns	0	0	1	7	14	93	0	0	2	25	6	75	0	0	0	0	5	100
CEC Standard 1																		
Emotional, Social and Behavioral Development	0	0	1	7	14	93	0	0	2	25	6	75	0	0	0	0	5	100
CEC Standard 1																		
Justification for Instructional Services	0	0	1	7	14	93	0	0	1	12	7	88	0	0	0	0	5	100

#4 (Required)-PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice.

Assessment 4: Student Teaching Evaluation

1. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program.

Each Special Education candidate completes a semester of Student Teaching. Student Teaching in Special Education (EDTE 675) and its co-requisite course, Advanced Seminar in Teaching (EDTE 689) are essential components of the program; combined, these courses assess candidates' abilities to transform the content gathered during their methods courses into cohesive, high quality, developmentally appropriate teaching practice.

2. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III.

During student teaching, candidates assume the role of a classroom teacher. Beginning with observations during week 1, candidates gradually take on more classroom activities and have complete responsibility for the class by week 8. During week 13, candidates begin to return control to their cooperating teacher. University supervisors visit approximately 6 times regularly to assess the candidate's teaching and, in partnership with the cooperating/mentor teacher at the site, to support the candidate's teaching practice. However, the supervisor may visit more often to provide continued support if necessary. Candidates receive a formal lesson evaluation at least four times throughout the semester. In addition, the supervisor conducts a mid-term and final conference with the candidate and mentor teacher to assess progress towards program standards.

During student teaching, candidates are responsible for the following activities:

- Setting up the learning environment;
- Planning and guiding learning activities;
- Observing, assessing, and documenting the learning and development of students;
- Interacting with parents, community members, and co-workers;
- Assessing the learning needs of students and determining how to meet those needs in partnership with parents; and
- Reflecting on their own teaching practice.

Description of the Assignment/Rubric

The university supervisor, in collaboration with the mentor teacher and student teaching candidate, completes the rubric below for each lesson observation and site visit. At the end of the student teaching placement, the university supervisor uses that information to assess the candidate's overall performance in the areas specified in the rubric (see rubric below). This allows program coordinators at the university to assess a candidate's competency in areas critical for success in working with individuals with diverse learning needs.

Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric for University Supervisors, Special Education

Criteria	Approaches (1)	Meets (2)	Exceeds (3)
Knowledge of content CEC Standard 3, Instructional Strategies	May be able to effectively teach some curriculum areas, but does not demonstrate adequate content and contextual knowledge across all general curriculum areas.	Can identify and teach essential concepts, vocabulary and content across the general curriculum.	Can teach effectively across curriculum areas, and researches areas of lesser knowledge in order to create rich learning experiences for students. Takes initiative to locate resources or keep abreast of research in order to enhance instruction.
CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning and Strategies Use of interdisciplinary approaches when teaching content	Displays limited awareness of interdisciplinary approaches to teaching and learning and incorporates only some of these strategies.	Is very aware of interdisciplinary approaches to teaching and learning and regularly incorporates these strategies.	Incorporates interdisciplinary strategies on a regular basis and utilizes the knowledge/skills of colleagues and students to enhance learning.
Developmental characteristics of students CEC Standard 1, Developmental Characteristics	Does not always design or teach lessons in a way that reflects understanding of the cognitive and social/behavioral developmental level of the student.	Assesses individual and group performance in order to design instruction that meets learners' needs (cognitive, social, emotional, and physical).	Designs and individualizes instruction and/or behavioral strategies that reflect strong awareness of the child's developmental characteristics.
Activates prior knowledge and	Does demonstrate some awareness	Consistently helps students make	Lessons include deliberate

experiences	of the importance of prerequisite knowledge; however, is inconsistent in activating students' prior knowledge.	connections between current content and their own background and experiences.	opportunities for students to discover the connections between current content and life experiences. Students see the purpose and the "big picture."
Teaching to individual learning abilities CEC Standard 1, Individual Learning Differences	In teaching groups of learners, is aware of the need for adaptations in assignments, time allowed, response modes, etc., and occasionally accommodates these needs for different learners with ELN.	Demonstrates awareness that lesson plans take into account the needs of various learners. Appropriate adaptations are a routine part of planning and delivery.	Articulates clearly individual student goals and expectations. Individualized instruction is designed with the goal of challenging all students to achieve their potential.
Selection of resources to meet range of individual needs: special education to gifted CEC Standard 5, Instructional Strategies	Has limited knowledge of additional resources and attempts to meet the individual needs of some students (i.e., low-achieving or gifted) by assessing resources.	Routinely utilizes supplemental materials and outside resources with students at both ends of the learning curve.	Actively seeks out resources from the community or professional organizations and utilizes these sources and materials for the benefit of varied learners.
Expectations for learning and achievement CEC Standards 2 & 5, Learning Environments & Instructional Planning and Strategies	Conveys consistent expectations for student achievement through instructional goals and activities, interactions, and the classroom environment. Instructions are appropriate for the grade level or course.	Appropriately challenges students to reach their potential; gives positive feedback to students but does not lower expectations for their achievement.	Consistently encourages and creates opportunities for students to achieve and exceed. Creates supportive and nurturing learning environments that promote student success and access.
Selecting resources for general	Displays limited awareness and/or use of resources	Routinely seeks out multiple resources for teaching, including	Seeks out and uses resources from professional

<p>instruction</p> <p>CEC Standard 5, Instructional Strategies</p>	<p>available or does not take initiative to obtain materials or learn about technology-based resources that could enhance student access to learning. Occasionally uses supplemental materials.</p>	<p>technology or adaptive technology, selecting those most appropriate for comprehensiveness and accuracy. Makes a deliberate attempt to allow for multiple ways of learning.</p>	<p>organizations, or community agencies and support services. These resources are not just "add on." May advocate for and obtain technology-based and adaptive resources for students.</p>
<p>Best practices: multiple teaching strategies, active learning, modeling</p> <p>CEC Standard 5, Instructional Strategies</p>	<p>Written plans and delivery of instruction may show evidence of more than one strategy within a lesson and a limited variety of approaches over time. Students do not generally demonstrate active engagement in lessons. Some evidence of modeling effective behaviors may be present, but is not always consistent or responsive to student needs.</p>	<p>Written instructional strategies are effectively incorporated in each lesson based on subject matter and needs of students. Students respond positively to lessons and learning activities provided.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a strong and varied repertoire of instructional strategies and modeling behaviors that are consistently appropriate to the student's learning or behavioral needs.</p>
<p>Candidate role in instructional process</p> <p>CEC Standard 5, Instructional Strategies</p>	<p>May not consistently play an effective instructional role in directing or motivating student learning.</p>	<p>Assists students to work independently, solve problems and assessment their own work, but is able to intervene or direct instruction appropriately. Encourages self-motivation and self-control.</p>	<p>Demonstrates multiple roles as needed. Consistently monitors student engagement in learning and behavior. Knows how to motivate individual students to achieve and succeed.</p>
<p>Oral and written language</p>	<p>Speech and written language are clear and correct. Vocabulary is correct, but limited</p>	<p>Speech and written language are clear and correct. Vocabulary is appropriate to students' ages,</p>	<p>Oral and written language is correct and expressive with well-chosen vocabulary that enriches the lesson.</p>

	or not appropriate to students' ages or backgrounds.	abilities, and interests.	
Quality of questions	Questions are a combination of low and high quality. Only some invite a thoughtful response. Wait time is inconsistent.	Appropriate variety of questions. Challenges students to justify responses, probing for learner understanding, and helping students articulate ideas. Consistently provides adequate wait times	Knows how to ask questions and stimulates discussion in different ways for particular purposes. Promotes risk-taking, divergent thinking, and simulations of curiosity. Students learn to question.
Positive climate for intrinsic motivation CEC Standard 2, Learning Environment	Students are complimented for appropriate behavior and study habits. Candidate encourages students to appreciate others. Minimal extrinsic rewards offered.	Classroom environment is positive; students are encouraged to support and respect each other. Candidate clearly shows a caring attitude toward all students.	Classroom environment is consistently supportive and nurturing for all students.
Establishing expectations for behavior CEC Standard 1, Social Interactions	Standards of conduct appear to have been established for situations and most students seem to understand them, if not consistently follow them.	Standards of conduct are clear to all students. Candidate reviews and prompts behaviors when appropriate.	Standards of conduct for various situations are clear to students and appear to have been developed or revised with student's participation.
Monitoring student behavior CEC Standard 1, Social Interactions	Generally aware of student behavior but may miss the activities of some students. May neglect to use positive reinforcement.	Is consistently alert to student behavior, uses positive reinforcement and behavior prompts.	Monitoring is subtle and preventive. Students are encouraged to monitor their own and their peers' behavior in appropriate ways.
Response to student behavior CEC Standard 5, Intervention	Attempts to respond to behavioral issues but with uneven results. May not intervene or intervene appropriately	Response to negative or socially inappropriate behavior is handled well, in ways that respects the student's dignity and mitigates impact on	Response to inappropriate behavior is highly effective and sensitive to student's individual needs. Assists students in making appropriate behavior choices.

	when student behavior is inappropriate or potentially harmful to self or others.	the learning environment for other students.	Consistently strives to maintain an environment in which all students feel safe and non-threatened.
Discussion techniques with student participation CEC Standard 1, Language	May not consistently demonstrate ability to communicate effectively with all students, including students with communication disorders.	In general, effective communication skills with individual students are demonstrated, as well as efforts to engage students in discussion. The candidate is effective in finding means for communication with students who are nonverbal or hearing or speech-impaired	Consistently effective in engaging in communication with all students; works hard and successfully at involving students in discussion and making contributions to class decision-making as well as discussion of learning topics.
Use of media and technology: felt/magnetic boards, charts, film/overhead projectors, computers (Internet, PowerPoint, Distance Learning, etc.) as available. CEC Standard 5, Instructional Strategies	Candidate may not consistently make use of or know how to use available instructional technology.	Lessons consistently use media and/or technology to add instructional impact and increase learning.	Takes initiative to integrate new technology formats and curriculum. Quality and depth are consistently strong.
Purposeful learning activities based on essential skills and district curriculum CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning	Activities may follow an organized progression but are not completely compatible with the required curriculum or individualized instructional plans.	Learning activities are highly relevant to students' needs and match instructional goals. Unit plans are keyed to state/district curriculum and/or individualized instructional plans.	Learning activities follow a well-organized progression and follow the school/district curriculum requirements and/or individualized instructional plans.
Short- and long-term planning CEC Standard 5, Instructional	Short-term planning is evident and lessons may be consistently prepared. . There	Long-term planning with connections to past/future teaching is clearly evident and prepared in advance	Responds to unanticipated sources of input, evaluates plans in relation to short and long term

planning	is minimal evidence of long-term planning or connections to past/future teaching. Inadequate attention may be paid to transitional planning (to a new school or postsecondary choices).	of teaching, Long-term and transitional plans are linked to students' needs and performance.	goals. Has a clear understanding of the "big picture" for planning.
Lesson plans: monitoring and adjustments CEC Standard 4, Monitoring Student Learning	Begins to check for understanding within a lesson. Attempts to adjust a lesson but with mixed results.	Routinely checks for understanding within the lesson. Makes minor adjustments to lessons or units and the adjustments occur smoothly.	Makes major adjustment to plans to meet student needs. Interest and motivation.
Variety of formal/informal assessments CEC Standard 4, Knowledge and Use of Assessments	Some instructional goals are assessed but not all. Gathering of assessment data is more frequent and begins to use performance-based measures. May not demonstrate knowledge of or ability to interpret results of common diagnostic tests and assessments.	Data on student progress is gathered in multiple ways such as observations, portfolios, teacher-made tests, performance tasks, student self-assessment and standardized tests, including the common types of standardized tests used to diagnose learning/cognitive and emotional/behavioral disorders.	Involves learner in self-assessment activities to foster awareness of their strengths/needs and to set personal goals for learning. Effectively uses diagnostic assessment results to plan and monitor student instruction.
Assessment data used in lesson planning/adjustment CEC Standard 4, Using Assessments to Adjust Lesson Planning	May not consistently or effectively apply assessment data to individual or group lesson adjustments.	Assessment results are used effectively to adjust plans for individuals and small groups.	A deliberate attempt is made to assess instructional goals for the sole purpose of determining the next steps in instruction for individuals and groups.
Evaluates criteria and feedback	Feedback to families and	Feedback includes qualitative comments	Learners/families are involved in setting

<p>CEC Standards 4 & 8, Provides Assessment Results to Family and Students</p>	<p>students is timely but may only be minimal (just a score).</p>	<p>to highlight strengths or needs, or implications for future educational planning.</p>	<p>criteria for evaluation. Feedback is individualized and includes personal goal setting. Descriptive rubrics are created and shared with students and families.</p>
<p>Recording and Monitoring Assessment Data</p> <p>CEC Standard 4, Maintaining student records</p>	<p>Scoring of papers and written records are adequate but require frequent monitoring to avoid errors.</p>	<p>System for scoring and recording data is fully effective and up-to-date.</p>	<p>System is highly effective and transparent. May demonstrate ability to see trends and instructional implications in aggregate data.</p>
<p>Reflection on teaching (written journal and conversations)</p> <p>CEC Standard 6, Reflective Practice</p>	<p>Generally accurate impression of a lesson's success. Offers vague, general suggestions for improvement or is dependent on supervisor's ideas. Open to suggestions.</p>	<p>Can accurately determine whether a lesson has met the stated goals and cites references about how it may be improved. Is committed to reflection, self-assessment and learning as an ongoing process. Welcomes constructive criticism.</p>	<p>Is able to critically analyze a lesson weighing the relative strength of the weak areas. Offers alternative actions complete with probable successes with different approaches. Actively seeks constructive criticism.</p>
<p>Relationships with colleagues</p> <p>CEC Standard 7, Collaboration with Colleagues</p>	<p>Maintains professional cordial relationships with colleagues, but may not initiate or fully understand the nature of collaborative relationships between general curriculum and special education teachers and/or school professionals and paraprofessionals.</p>	<p>Seeks opportunities to work with colleagues to learn and grow professionally. Is willing to give and receive help. Understands and effectively models collaborative relationships with the team of educators and paraprofessionals who play a role in the education of children with exceptional needs.</p>	<p>Routinely shares materials, resources, ideas with colleagues. May volunteer to organize tasks or take the lead with activities within a department/team or at the school level. Works exceptionally well and collaboratively with colleagues. Clearly understands the various roles of school team members in supporting the education of special needs students.</p>
<p>Professional growth (includes</p>	<p>Participates in professional</p>	<p>Consistently demonstrates</p>	<p>Demonstrates levels of leadership on a</p>

<p>student teaching requirements and portfolio)</p> <p>CEC Standard 6, Professional Practice and Professional Activities</p>	<p>activities that are provided. Conducts him/herself in a professional manner most of the time. Some student teaching requirements are not completed.</p>	<p>professionalism in appearance/manners. Actively seeks out professional literature, colleagues, conferences, mentors, etc., to grow professionally. Student teaching requirements are completed with quality and depth.</p>	<p>team or with the faculty. May include: sharing new knowledge/skills, conducting/sharing action research in the classroom, making presentation to faculty. Fully coordinating events such as study trips, teaching after school enrichment classes.</p>
<p>Participation in school/district events and projects.</p> <p>CEC Standard 6, Participation in Professional Activities</p>	<p>Participates in school/district events when specifically asked.</p>	<p>Volunteers to participate in more than one activity and makes substantial contributions, Participates as much a possible as a full staff member.</p>	<p>Frequently seeks opportunities to volunteer for activities outside of own classroom or creates activities such as enrichment/remedial classes for students outside of regular school day. Values role in making the entire school a productive learning environment.</p>
<p>Sensitivity to student needs and awareness of community resources.</p> <p>CEC Standard 6, Ethical Practice</p>	<p>Identifies special needs of some students but does communicate concerns with classroom teacher. Respects the privacy of students and confidentiality of information.</p>	<p>Is concerned about all aspects of a child's well-being (cognitive, emotional, social, and physical) and is alert to signs of difficulty. Takes steps to stop discrimination or harassment among students.</p>	<p>Is persistent in seeking to end discriminatory activity or harassment among students. Also, teams with the classroom teacher to obtain support services</p>
<p>Respectful and productive communication with families.</p> <p>CEC Standard 7, Collaboration with Families</p>	<p>Adheres to the existing formats for communication with parents. Needs to be reminded to communicate with individual student's parents.</p>	<p>Teams with the general curriculum teacher to communicate with parents about their child's progress on a regular basis and openly welcomes parents to the classroom. Responses to parent concerns are handled with great sensitivity.</p>	<p>Demonstrates initiative in creating new avenues for connections/communications with families. This may include: family learning projects, a new or different type of class newsletter, utilizing parents in class projects, or making sure parents</p>

			are connected to social support networks and/or learning opportunities and special resources
--	--	--	--

Analysis of the Data

During the last three academic semesters (Spring 2013, Fall 2013, Spring 2014), all candidates met or exceeded the standards measured in the Student Teaching assessment. All candidates demonstrated their pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions during their student teaching experience.

Knowledge of Content (CEC standard 3): Sixty-six percent of candidates met expectations in this area, and 33 percent exceeded expectations. This is a relative weakness as more students met than exceeded expectations. This suggests that we may need to focus more on content areas such as reading, mathematics, social studies and science in our courses. We will be revising our program of study in order to incorporate a reading course, and revising some of our courses in order to include more instruction in specific content areas, and how to make curriculum in these content areas accessible to students with diverse learning needs.

Development and Characteristics (CEC Standard 1): Twenty-five percent of candidates met expectations in this area and 75 percent exceeded expectations. This shows a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program.

Individual Learning Abilities (CEC Standard 1): Nine percent of candidates met expectations in this area, while 91 percent exceeded expectations. Candidates were able to identify individual learning abilities of students in their classrooms.

Selection of Resources for Students with Disabilities (Gifted or Students with Special Educational Needs) (CEC Standard 5): Twenty-five percent of candidates met this standard and 75 percent exceeded this standard. Candidates were able to choose resources that were appropriate for students with diverse needs.

Expectations for Learning (CEC Standards 2 & 5): Thirty-three percent of candidates met these standards and 66 percent exceeded these standards. Candidates established clear and high learning expectations for all students.

Selecting Resources for General Instruction (CEC Standard 5): Thirty-three percent of candidates met this standard and 66 percent exceeded. Candidates were able to select resources for general instruction including textbooks and supplemental materials.

Best Practices (CEC Standard 5): Twenty-five percent of candidates met this expectation and 75 percent exceeded. Candidates were able to identify and apply best practices for teaching in a number of content areas.

Candidates Role in the Instructional Process (CEC Standard 5): Twenty-five percent of candidates met expectations in this area and 75 percent exceeded expectations. This appears to be a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program.

Positive Climate (CEC Standard 2): Thirty-three percent of candidates met these standards and 66 percent exceeded these standards. The data shows that this is a relative strength of candidates in the program.

Establishing expectations (CEC Standard 5), Monitoring and Responding to Behavior (CEC Standard 4): Thirty-three percent of candidates met these standards and 66 percent exceeded these standards. This appears to be a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program.

Discussion Techniques (CEC Standard 5): Twenty-five percent of candidates met expectations in this area and 75 percent exceeded expectations. This appears to be a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program.

Use of Media/Technology (CEC Standard 5): Fifty-eight percent of candidates exceeded expectations, while 42 percent met expectations. This appears to be an area where we could support our candidates more in order to achieve excellence. This may include requiring more use of technology in lessons throughout the course of student teaching placements.

Purposeful Learning Activities (CEC Standard 5): Twenty-five percent of candidates met expectations in this area and 75 percent exceeded expectations. This appears to be a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program.

Short and Long-Term Planning (CEC Standard 5): Twenty-five percent of candidates met expectations in this area and 75 percent exceeded expectations. This appears to be a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program.

Lesson Planning (CEC Standard 5): Fifty percent of candidates met expectations, while 50 percent exceeded expectations. This appears to be an area where we could support our candidates more in order to achieve excellence. In Fall 2014, we piloted a new lesson plan format based on current research in lesson plan development (Causton-Theoharis, Theoharis, & Trezek, 2008) and additional information gained from the this key assessment.

Using a Variety of Assessments (CEC Standard 4): Fifty-eight percent of candidates exceeded expectations, while 42 percent met expectations. This appears to be an area where we could support our candidates more in order to achieve excellence. This may include a review of the assessment course EDCC 605: Educational Assessment, and evaluation of if this course provides enough instruction on use of a variety of assessments.

Use of Assessment Data and Evaluates Criteria and Feedback (CEC Standard 4): Fifty percent of candidates met expectations, while 50 percent exceeded expectations. This appears to be an area where we could support our candidates more in order to achieve excellence. Similarly to above, this may include a review of the assessment course to ensure it is meeting the needs of students in this area.

Recording and Monitoring Progress (CEC Standard 4): Fifty-eight percent of candidates exceeded expectations, while 42 percent met expectations. This appears to be an area where we could support our candidates more in order to achieve excellence. This area, and the two above show a need to evaluate how we are covering assessment in the "Educational Assessment and Evaluation" course and throughout our core methods courses.

Reflection on Teaching (CEC Standard 6): Twenty-five percent of candidates met expectations in this area and 75 percent exceeded expectations. This appears to be a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program.

Relationships with Colleagues and Professional Growth (CEC Standard 7): Eighty-three percent exceeded expectations in these areas, while 17 percent met expectations. This appears to be a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program.

Participation (CEC Standard 6): Twenty-five percent of candidates met expectations in this area and 75 percent exceeded expectations. This appears to be a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program.

Sensitivity to Student Needs (CEC Standard 6): Eighty-three percent exceeded expectations in these areas, while 17 percent met expectations. This appears to be a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program.

Communication with Families (CEC Standard 7): Eighty-three percent exceeded expectations in these areas, while 17 percent met expectations. This appears to be a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program.

Candidates showed strengths in a number of areas, including: selecting resources; establishing expectations; use of best practices; and developing relationships with students and colleagues. Some areas where we could support candidates further in order to achieve excellence include: developing lesson plans; behavior management; and assessment. In order to address these areas, we plan to revise the lesson plan template used during the teaching internship to support better development of lesson plans. In addition, we will add a behavior change project to a course (EDTE 629: Teaching Students with Learning and Emotional Disabilities) in order for the candidate to become familiar with behavior management and intervention techniques. We will also focus more on assessment in a number of courses in order to provide candidates with more opportunities to become comfortable with the assessment cycle.

It should be noted that the candidates who "met" rather than exceeded the standards measured in this assessment demonstrated all of the competencies listed above and met graduation requirements. Their evaluations reflected both adequate knowledge of the standards and purposeful demonstration of techniques. The difference was in their degree of initiative, depth of awareness, strength of advocacy efforts, and variety of strategies used. In each case, the university supervisor met with the candidate following the semester and reviewed steps needed for the candidates to strengthen their skills.

Data Table

Criteria	Spring 2013						Fall 2013						Spring 2014					
	Approaches		Meets		Exceeds		Approaches		Meets		Exceeds		Approaches		Meets		Exceeds	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Knowledge of Content, CEC Standard 3	0	0	3	60	2	40	0	0	4	66	2	33	0	0	1	100	0	0
Interdisciplinary Approaches	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	1	16	5	84	0	0	1	100	0	0
Developmental Characteristics, CEC Standard 1	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	1	16	5	84	0	0	0	0	1	100
Prior Knowledge and Experiences	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	1	16	5	84	0	0	1	100	0	0
Individual Learning Abilities, CEC Standard 1	0	0	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	0	6	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
Selection of Resources, CEC Standard 5	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	6	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
Expectations for Learning, CEC Standards 2 & 5	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	1	16	5	84	0	0	1	100	0	0
Selecting Resources, CEC Standard 5	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	1	16	5	84	0	0	1	100	0	0
Best Practices, CEC Standard 5	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	2	33	4	66	0	0	1	100	0	0

Short and Long-term Planning, CEC Standard 5	0	0	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	1	16	5	84	0	0	1	100	0	0
Lesson Plans, CEC Standard 5	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	3	50	3	50	0	0	1	100	0	0
Variety of Assessments, CEC Standard 4	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	4	66	2	33	0	0	1	100	0	0
Assessment data, CEC Standard 4	0	0	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	4	66	2	33	0	0	1	100	0	0
Evaluates Criteria and Feedback, CEC Standards 4	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	3	50	3	50	0	0	1	100	0	0
Recording and Monitoring Assessment Data, CEC Standard 4	0	0	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	3	50	3	50	0	0	1	100	0	0
Reflection of Teaching, CEC Standard 6	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	1	16	5	84	0	0	0	0	1	100
Relationships with Colleagues, CEC Standard 7	0	0	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	1	16	5	84	0	0	0	0	1	100
Professional Growth, CEC Standard 6	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	0	2	33	4	66	0	0	0	0	1	100
Participation,	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	0	2	33	4	66	0	0	0	0	1	100

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning.

Assessment 5: Action Research Project

Description of the Assignment and its Use in the Program

The Action Research Project is used to document candidates' ability to work with a student within the context of a classroom. The assessment is part of the Advanced Seminar in Teaching (EDTE 689) and is completed during candidates' final semester.

The Action Research Project is divided into five (5) phases, and each phase is aligned with one or more of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards, as follows:

- Phase I: Determining Scope and Content; Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences (CEC Standard 1); Learning Environments (CEC Standard 2)
- Phase II: Learning Goals and Objectives (CEC Standard 5-Instructional Planning and Strategies); Research-Based Strategies for Instruction (CEC Standard 5-Instructional Planning and Strategies)
- Phase III: Lesson Overviews; Assessment Plan (CEC Standard 4-Assessment); Assessment Design (CEC Standard 4-Assessment)
- Phase IV: Presentation, Interpretation, and Analysis of Student Learning (CEC Standard 5-Assessment)
- Phase V: Reflection (CEC Standard 6-Professional Development)

Summary

Candidates are asked to identify an area of need for students in their classrooms. This may include behavior, reading skills, homework, or other academic and social/behavioral skills. They are asked to collect baseline data on the identified skill or behavior. This includes data such as summative assessment and information from IEP goals. Next, candidates are asked to establish clear learning goals and objectives. They are then asked to implement a research based strategy aimed at improving that behavioral or academic skill. The candidates implement a set of lessons (this is determined based on skill or behavioral need) and assess students throughout the implementation of the lessons. They adjust lessons throughout the implementation based on that assessment. Finally, they plan a presentation using technology to present their project and findings from the project, including assessment data. In addition, they are asked to submit a 1-2 page reflective essay to reflect on their planning and student learning.

This assignment allows the candidates to show understanding and skills in data collection, attention to environmental contexts, planning an intervention, using research based strategies, assessment, and reflection. Thus, we are able to assess these skills via this performance based assessment.

The Assignment

Phase I

A. Determination of Project Scope and Content

The candidate, in collaboration with the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor, will determine a focus for the curriculum content areas(s) for this project, as well as the group of students who will be included. Once choices have been made, the candidate will design an approximate five-day unit of study organized around a set of learning goals (per student, or per group, or both). Learning goals may be individualized or stipulated by an IEP, or may be based on the curriculum established for the grade level(s) of students in the group. The project should be based on an "authentic" situation; in other words, the unit should be driven by the learning needs of designated students in the candidate's student teaching placement. The unit may take place in a regular or resource classroom, or both.

In one or two concise paragraphs, summarize the general scope and content of the project. Include mention of the size of the group; curriculum areas, and range of grade levels addressed in the lesson; the length of time (days and hours) that require planning and preparation; and the location(s) in which you (the candidate) will teach.

Note: Phase I. A must be approved by your seminar course instructor before you proceed with this project.

B. Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences (Standard 1)

Once you (the candidate) have identified the students in your group and been given direction about the focus of the instruction for those students, you should collect and provide *general* background information about your students (take care to disguise identities, and only include personal characteristics and information that are relevant to the project). Depending on the range of individualized curriculum foci and size of the student group, you may describe characteristics per group (e.g. "six of the eight students read at or below a third grade level") or by individual student.

Your background information should include the following:

- gender, age and grade levels represented by the group of students
- range of exceptional characteristics represented by the group of students (learning, emotional, behavioral, physical)*
- range of language diversity represented by the group of students

This section should be a maximum of two pages in length.

** Provide information as best you can; in your narrative, be sure to distinguish between factual information that has been shared with you by the classroom teacher, and information that is based on observations.*

C. Contextual Factors (School Environment)-Standard 2

In two or three paragraphs, describe the **most relevant** factors of the school and classroom (or classrooms) in which you will conduct your project. You may wish to give the school a fictional name. Factors may include but are not limited to the list below.

- **School factors:** Type of school (public/private/charter/magnet); grades taught; enrollment size; average class size; number of students classified as ELN; accommodations, provisions and services for students with ELNs
- **School staffing:** Number of classroom teachers and special teachers (SPED, PE etc.); number and type of specialists or non-classroom based professionals; number and assignments of paraprofessionals.
- **School facilities:** Presence or absence of gym, cafeteria, playground, auditorium, computer lab; school-wide technology resources
- **Classroom factors:** Describe the classroom(s) in which your project will take place (size, floor plan, furniture, technology, ambiance, and other issues that may impact the success of your project). Be specific as to whether or when your instruction takes place in a mainstream classroom or a different setting.

Phase II

A. Establishment of Learning Goals and Learning Objectives (Standard 5-Instructional Planning Strategies)

Establish the **learning goals** for your project. Depending on the nature of the group of students you will be working with, your goals may be group-based, individual-based, or a combination of the two. If, for example, you are working with a group of students from one class who are struggling to come up to grade level in math, then you should establish learning goals for the group. If you are working with students across a range of grade levels or curriculum areas, then you will develop learning goals per student or per student groupings within the larger group. **As a "ballpark," plan to identify no more than 2-3 learning goals for a group of students, and no more than 1-2 learning goals for students you are working with on an individual basis.** Depending on the situation or the goal type, you may wish to establish fewer goals.

Each learning goal you establish must be supported by a brief (1-2 sentences) **rationale**. For example, your rationale for a math-related learning goal for a group of fifth-grade students might be to get those students up to grade level on

a 5th-grade math competency standard. Again, your learning goals will likely be predetermined or at least influenced by the school curriculum or student IEPs.

Develop at least one **learning objective** for each goal. Your objectives should be concrete, measurable statements of how you will know that a student has made progress toward achieving an established goal. Thus, a learning goal of "students will improve their ability to comprehend and solve written math problems at a fifth grade level" might be supported by a learning objective of "Students will be able to write accurate equations for a set of four, 5th grade level written math problems within a specified time limit." Your learning objectives should be a reasonable measure of the attainment of the learning goal that is specified.

You may wish to use a table format to display your learning goals, rationales, and objectives. You may also wish to consult with your seminar course instructor at this point to make sure you are on the right track, or ask your seminar course instructor to review a draft of your goals and objectives.

B. Development of Research-Based Strategies for Instruction (Standard 5-Instructional Planning Strategies)

For each of the learning goals you established above (per group and/or per individual), write an essay-based discussion of the "problem/s" (barriers to learning) and the "solution/s" (strategies) you will employ to help students learn.* Your discussion of strategies for each goal should be based on at least one substantive article or chapter that represents current research in pedagogy, child psychology or human development, methodology for teaching in the subject area, the specific learning disability of one or more students in your group, and/or brain research. Plan on 1-2 pages per learning goal; if it makes sense, you may discuss more than one learning goal in a single section of the essay.

Your discussion should begin with a description of the student or range of students for whom a particular learning goal is established. Using factual information as well as observation, describe the barriers to learning (e.g. cognitive, behavioral as well as other factors that may play a role, e.g. language, physical ability) that you must consider, in the context of the learning goal. Then go on to describe the range of strategies you plan to use to achieve the learning goal. Your strategies may be sequential: for example, if your goal is to help fifth graders solve word problems, you may first need to find out whether students are having difficulty with math, reading comprehension, or both. Or, you may need to first teach students some definitions or mental tricks for conceptualizing key words in math problems.

(Ideally, your research should take place after you identify the "problem," but before you formulate strategies.)

*Alternately, you can organize your essay by student or group, instead of by learning goal. However, if using this approach, be sure that each learning goal for the student or group is referenced in your discussion.

Phase III: Lesson and Assessment Plans (Standard 4-Assessment)

The next phase of your project is to design a set of lessons and an assessment plan for your unit of instruction. Although these are described separately as Parts A, B and C below, it is likely that you will develop these tangentially.

A. Lesson Plan Overview

Using a table or graphic format of your choice, create a day-by-day overview of the lesson plans for the duration of your Action Research Project. If you are designing separate instructional plans for individual students or groups, you may prefer to develop a separate overview for each group/student. (Do whatever makes best organizational sense to you.)

For each lesson, identify the learning objective(s), main activities, resources/materials used in those activities, and means by which you will formally or informally assess student learning during the lesson (pre-, ongoing, or summative). Most importantly, for each **learning activity** that is applied to more than one student, identify **adaptations** you will make for individual students. (For example, one student may respond best to technology-based assignments, or there may be a range of literacy or mathematical abilities.)

IMPORTANT: Although you should develop your plans before you begin your instructional unit, you should not be reluctant to change them as you progress through the unit, particularly as that is directed by your ongoing assessment of student learning. (If you can, keep track of the changes that you make.)

B. Assessment Plan(s) and Data Collection (Standard 4-Assessment)

Using a table format, create an assessment plan organized around your learning goals. For each learning goal that you established in Phase II, you should develop (1) a pre-assessment; (2) a plan for informal ongoing assessments or continuous monitoring of learning; and (3) a "summative" assessment by which you will determine learning gains.

As with lesson plans, you may need to develop separate assessment plans for individual students or groups.

Your assessment plan, particularly the summative assessment for any learning goal, should be guided by the learning objectives you established in Phase II.

As guided by your assessment plan, you must collect and record "pre- and post-" data in order to document student learning. This means that your "pre"-assessment of a learning goal must be designed in such a way that its results

can be compared to the summative assessment of the same learning goal. For example, a pre-assessment might ask a child to write a description of a friend, that is scored by a rubric that looks at a range of factors related to that child's composition skills. The summative assessment might be a descriptive essay with a different topic, but scored with the same rubric.

C. Assessments (Standard 4-Assessment)

Your final project should include submission of all pre-assessments and summative assessments that you used in your project, along with raw data (may be hand-written) representing student scores. Assessments should be accompanied by scoring guides and/or answer sheets. Assessments that are performance-based (i.e. require students to create a product or perform a skill) should include a scoring rubric. Your assessments or scoring guides should be designed in such a way that the results of the assessment will inform you of what aspects of the learning goals were achieved and not achieved.

Phase IV: Presentation, Interpretation, and Analysis of Student Learning (Standard 4-Assessment)

Phase IV of the project will be completed, or at least finalized, after you have taught your unit. It requires you to create a PowerPoint presentation format that:

- Includes graphic depictions of student learning based on pre- and post-assessment results (e.g. tables or bar graphs)
- Interpret the data (i.e. narratively summarize the data results), and
- Analyze the data (discuss what data reveal about student learning).

Your PowerPoint should also summarize key aspects of the Action Research Project from Phases I-II and Phase V. However, the focus should be on Phase IV.

Phase V: Reflection (Standard 6-Professional Learning)

In a 1-2 page essay, reflect on the results of student learning as summarized in Phase IV. Consider writing about one or more of the topics below. Reflect on your performance as a teacher and link your performance to student learning results. Evaluate your performance and identify future actions for improved practice and professional growth. Your essay should include but is not limited to the following topics:

- What changes did you make to your learning plans as a result of one or more of your pre-assessments or ongoing assessments?
- What learning goal had the greatest success? Provide two or more possible reasons for this success. Consider the roles played by learning goals and objective, application of research, instructional strategies, assessment choices, student characteristics or other contextual factors.

- Where were your students least successful? Provide two or more possible reasons for this lack of success. Again, consider your learning goals and objectives, instructional strategies, research, assessment choices and student characteristics or other contextual factors. Discuss what you would do differently or better in the future to improve student learning on this goal.

Rubric

Criteria	Approaches	Meets	Exceeds
Phase I			
A. Determining Scope and Content	The candidate did not provide a clear, thorough or focused summary of the project. The candidate may not have sought, or followed through on, consultation and approval for the scope and content of the project.	The candidate provided an adequate summary of the scope of content of the project. Clarity or information may be lacking in one or two minor areas.	The candidate provided a thorough yet concise summary of the project. The description provided clear information and necessary detail for all required factors.
B. Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences CEC Standard 1:	The candidate's response may have been incomplete or unclear, indicating that the candidate did not collect available background information on students. The response may not indicate that the candidate has an informed understanding of the exceptional needs represented by students. The response may not be uniformly respectful in its descriptions of students, or may focus on student characteristics that do not appear relevant to the project.	The candidate's response demonstrates adequate knowledge and understanding of the exceptional learning needs of students, as well as the role and impact of other factors (e.g. age, grade levels) as that relates to group or individual learning. In one or two instances, the candidate may have drawn inferences that were not based on known or shared knowledge about one or more students' exceptional conditions.	The candidate's response was detailed and nuanced, giving thoughtful consideration to a range of relevant factors. The candidate was careful to distinguish between known and inferred characteristics of student exceptionalities. The candidate clearly did his or her homework in terms of collecting all available background information and presenting it accurately.
C. Learning	The candidate's response may have	The candidate adequately	The candidate selected and

<p>Environments CEC Standard 2</p>	<p>been overly brief or lacking in detail. The response may not reflect that the candidate chose the most relevant factors, and instead may have only presented information that was readily available, but not particularly of value in designing or planning the unit of study.</p>	<p>described factors that apply to the learning environment. Factors that are most critical to the design and delivery of the unit of study were included.</p>	<p>provided a detailed description of the most critical factors that will apply to the unit of study. It is clear the candidate took the initiative to find out details and information that are most important.</p>
<p>Phase II</p>			
<p>A. Learning Goals and Objectives</p> <p>CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning and Strategies</p>	<p>Learning goals and objectives were not clearly stated. The relevance of objectives to the learning goals may have been unclear. It may not be evident how the learning goals are consistent with the longer term instructional goals(s) established for students. Learning goals and objectives may be overly ambitious for the timeframe, or too narrowly developed.</p>	<p>Learning goals and objectives were adequately stated, with objectives written in measurable terms. Goals and objectives take into consideration the abilities and needs of students and groupings of students. The learning goals are well suited to the timeframe of the unit. Learning goals conform or align to the long-range instructional plan established for each student, and/or the class curriculum.</p>	<p>Goals and objectives were clearly written and well thought through. Learning objectives are especially reflective of the needs, abilities, and learning styles of individual students.</p>
<p>B. Research-Based Strategies for Instruction</p> <p>CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning and Strategies</p>	<p>The essay did not adequately and/or accurately convey the findings of research consulted. The relevance of the research to the focus of the candidate's unit of study (ELNs of students and/or focus of instruction) may not be clear or sufficiently discussed</p>	<p>The candidate's essay adequately made connections between relevant research and the learning goals for students, with attention to the relationship with learning goals and students' exceptional needs.</p>	<p>The essay reflected a solid understanding of research consulted and its potential application to instructional strategies. The candidate clearly did a thorough job of selecting and integrating the</p>

	in the essay.		research.
Phase III			
A. Lesson Overviews	Lesson plans may have been incomplete or not organized in such a way that activities and sequencing is evident. Lessons may not take into consideration all students and/or parallel learning activities that may be occurring at the same time for different students or groups.	Lesson plans were complete and reasonably detailed. Instructional adaptations used within group instruction were clear.	Lesson plans were very well presented and detailed. The candidate clearly gave careful thought to planning differentiated instruction across groups and individual students.
B. Assessment Plan CEC Standard 4, Assessment	The assessment plan may not clearly distinguish between pre-, ongoing, and post-instructional assessments. Assessments may not be described clearly enough, or may appear to be inappropriate in terms of the placement of the assessment, its relation to a learning goal, or appropriateness for a student or group of students.	The candidate's plan, overall, was complete, logical, and coherent. The candidate's assessment choices reflect an adequate understanding of the role, design and use of formative and summative assessments. Assessments are generally appropriate to the learning goals and objectives they are intended to meet. Adaptations to assessments are indicated as needed.	The assessment plan is thorough and coherent in all respects. The plan includes a variety of informal and formal assessment strategies. All assessments appear to be well matched to learning goals as well as to the unique needs and learning styles of individual students.
C. Assessment Design CEC Standard 4, Assessment	One or more of the assessments submitted were poorly designed, and included ambiguous directions or questions. Formatting may be poorly designed. Assessments may not have been screened for bias or	Assessments designed by the candidate were generally well written, with expectations clearly stated. Assessments focused on the most critical learning aspects of learning goals or objectives. Scoring is well	All assessments are well written (or explained, in the case of non-written assessments). Assessments are well designed to capture the most critical aspects of learning, and to provide feedback

	<p>inclusion of material that was not covered in instruction. Assessments may not be well differentiated to meet learning needs or styles of individual students, and/or may not be consistent measures of the learning goals identified.</p>	<p>designed and suited to the assessment format. Assessments are appropriate to the needs and learning styles of individual students.</p>	<p>to the instructor on student strengths and weaknesses. Adaptions to assessments are well thought out and planned.</p>
Phase IV			
<p>Presentation, Interpretation, and Analysis of Student Learning</p> <p>CEC Standard 4, Assessment</p>	<p>The candidate's PowerPoint representation does not include interpretable displays of student learning data. Data presented may have been incomplete, and/or not clearly explained in relationship to learning goals.</p>	<p>The candidate did an adequate job of presenting and analyzing student learning gains for most learning goals. Material is generally well formatted in the PowerPoint for ease of interpretation and analysis. The candidate's analysis satisfactorily draws connections between assessment data and what data reveal about students' meeting learning goals. Candidate interpretation of data is factually accurate and does not under- or over represent the role of data in drawing conclusions about student learning.</p>	<p>The candidate did an excellent job of presenting pre- and post-instructional data in well-designed graphic formats. Conclusions drawn by the candidate from resultant data are consistently focused on what data reveal about student learning in the course project. The candidate does a responsible job of applying data as possible or probable evidence of learning gains.</p>
Phase V Reflection			
<p>Reflection</p> <p>CEC Standard 6, Professional Learning and Practice</p>	<p>The essay may not be sufficiently developed for a reader to understand what the candidate learned from the</p>	<p>The candidate's essay adequately reflects on aspects of the unit (and resultant learning data) that were</p>	<p>The essay is a strong and well-developed exploration of the value and learning provided by the</p>

	<p>project or how the candidate applied data analysis to his or her own success in having an impact on student learning. The essay did not provide good or clear examples of student achievements or lack of achievement. The essay may not have provided evidence of how the candidate monitored student learning and made adjustments during the unit.</p>	<p>positive and affirming, as well as aspects that create opportunities for future growth and adjustment of teaching practices. The essay provides convincing evidence that the candidate monitored student learning via formal or informal assessments, and made adjustments as needed.</p>	<p>project and draws insightful inferences across lessons, learning activities, assessments, and student learning. The essay reflects that the candidate consistently monitored the learning and motivation of all students, making adjustments as needed. The essay includes powerful insights on lessons learned by the candidate about his or her strengths as well as areas for growth.</p>
--	--	--	---

Analysis of the Data Findings

During the last three semesters (Spring 2013, Fall 2013, Spring 2014), 10 out of 11 (90 percent) of candidates met or exceeded the standards measured in the Action Research Project on all sections. All candidates demonstrated their ability to identify a need and, through research and planning, to have a positive impact on students. If they did not have a positive impact, they were able to reflect deeply on why they did not have an impact and changes they may make in the future to increase their impact. In this time period; six candidates (54 percent) "exceeded" expectations; and an average of four out of eleven candidates (36 percent) "met" all standards measured; and one candidate approached (approximately 9 percent). This candidate was provided additional support and additional opportunities to implement instruction with a mentor at a different placement.

More candidates scored "exceeds" (60-90 percent) than "meets" (50-60 percent) in the areas of Learner Development (Standard 1), Environment (Standard 2), and Instructional Planning and Strategies (Standard 5). Two candidates who scored "exceeds" in these areas scored "meets" in the areas related to assessment and use of technology to present assessment data (Standard 4, Assessment). Overall, approximately 40-50 percent of candidates scored in the meets and exceeds categories respectively. Thus, it seems that candidates are strong in identifying areas

of need, gathering pertinent background information (Standard 1), paying particular attention to environment and context (Standard 2), and choosing and implementing appropriate research-based strategies (Standard 3). Candidates could improve in the area of assessment and use of technology to present assessment data. In this particular area, some candidates were not as strong in presenting the data from their projects using graphs or charts. In addition, some candidates could have strengthened the design of their assessment to be more effective (e.g. by aligning with Bloom's taxonomy or by differentiating for students).

Placing more focus on this type of assessment and graphically representing the data could be included in EDCC 605: Assessment and Measurement. This is a course candidates take earlier in the program. Although it does currently include a similar assignment, it could certainly be revised to focus more clearly in order to develop stronger assessment, differentiating assessments, and creating graphs and charts that display data accurately and clearly.

Data Table

Criteria	Spring 2013						Fall 2013						Spring 2014					
	Approaches		Meets		Exceeds		Approaches		Meets		Exceeds		Approaches		Meets		Exceeds	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Determining Scope and Content	0	0	2	40	3	60	1	17	3	50	2	33	0	0	1	100	0	0
Characteristics of Students CEC Standard 1, Learner Development	0	0	1	20	4	80	1	17	1	17	4	66	0	0	1	100	0	0
Contextual Factors	0	0	1	20	4	80	1	17	1	17	4	66	0	0	1	100	0	0
CEC Standard 2 Learner Environment	0	0	1	20	4	80	1	17	1	17	4	66	0	0	1	100	0	0
Learning Goals and Objectives	0	0	1	20	4	80	1	17	1	17	4	66	0	0	1	100	0	0
CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning and Strategies	0	0	2	40	3	60	1	17	1	17	4	66	0	0	1	100	0	0
Research-Based Strategies	0	0	2	40	3	60	1	17	1	17	4	66	0	0	1	100	0	0
CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning and Strategies	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	6	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
Lesson Overviews	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	6	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

Assessment Plan	0	0	2	40	3	60	1	17	2	33	3	50	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
CEC Standard 4-Assessment																			
Assessment Design	0	0	2	40	3	60	1	17	2	33	3	50	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
CEC Standard 4, Assessment																			
Presentation, Implementation, and Analysis	0	0	2	40	3	60	1	17	2	33	3	50	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
CEC Standard 4, Assessment																			
Reflection	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	1	17	5	83	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
CEC Standard 6, Professional Learning																			

References

Causton-Theoharis, J., Theoharis, G., & Trezek, B. (2008). Teaching pre-service teachers to design inclusive instruction: A lesson planning template. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 12*(4), 381-399,

#6 (Required): Additional assessment that addresses CEC initial teacher preparation standards.

This assignment was developed by the Special Education program at Northeastern State University, Oklahoma. They have given permission to Trinity for its use.

Assessment 6: Communication Case Study

Description of the Assignment and its Use in the Program

The Communication Case Study presentation project was added as an assessment in Spring 2012. The assessment is part of EDTE 629, Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities/Teaching Students with Emotional Disabilities. The culmination of this case study-based assessment is an 8–13 page paper, containing the following sections:

- Instructional Planning for Children with Special Communicative Needs, CEC Standards 1 and 5
- The Role of Assistive and Augmentative Technology, CEC Standard 5
- Cultural and Language Considerations, CEC Standards 1 and 2

Purpose

The purpose of this assignment is to assess each candidate's knowledge and skills in the area of communication and language. Specifically, the assignment asks the candidates to apply their knowledge of instructional planning for individuals with special communication needs, assistive and augmentative technology to aid communication, and designing instruction and supports for students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III

After reviewing three case studies, candidates write an essay-based response that addresses the following CEC standards:

- Instructional Planning for Children with Communicative Disorders
 - Ways in which exceptional conditions interact with language (CEC Standard 1)
 - Atypical and typical language development (CEC standard 1)
 - Individualized strategies to enhance language development (CEC Standard 5)
 - Working collaboratively to address needs of individuals with ELN (CEC Standard 7)
- Assistive, Alternative, and Augmentative Technology
 - Choice and application of Assistive Technology (CEC Standard 1 and 5)

- Cultural and Language Considerations
 - Facilitating Understanding of Subject Matter for Individuals with ELN whose Primary Language is not English (CEC Standards 3 and 5)
 - Understanding Interaction of Primary Language, Culture, and Family Background with a Student's ELN (CEC Standard 1)

Description of the Assignment

Methods and Case Studies in Special Education Speech, Language and Communication

For this assignment, you will read case studies for three young children (Julia, Kami, and Tim) who each have learning disabilities or needs that relate in one or more ways to speech, language, and/or communication. Your task is to determine the best learning strategies and solutions for each child. For the sake of this assignment, you should assume that you are the special education co-teacher assigned to a first grade classroom, and all three children are in your class. You should also assume that one paraprofessional is also assigned to the class.

After you read the case studies, write an essay-based response that addresses the topics, and follows the structure outlined in Sections I-II below. Use the scoring rubric to help guide the content of your paper.

Your paper should be at least eight (but no more than 13) pages in length (12 pt serif font, 1" margins, double-spaced). It should follow APA format for footnotes, references, and bibliography. The paper should be organized according to the sections described below, with consideration given to the page length guidelines for each section. It should begin with a brief one-paragraph introduction that sets the stage for your essay, as that is described in the first paragraph of these instructions. (You may choose to write in the 3rd person – e.g. "Ms. Brown is a special education teacher at" or in the first person – e.g. "I am a special education co-teacher in a first grade classroom, and would like to introduce you to three of my students: Kami, Julia and Tim.")

Case Study 1 – Julia

Julia is a six-year-old girl who came to live in Oklahoma from China when adopted by American parents six months ago. When she arrived in America it was evident that she had a limited vocabulary of Chinese words that she was able to understand. She does not have any expressive language. She is primarily nonverbal. She is mildly intellectually disabled due to additional unknown complications at birth. She has no experience with communication aids. Her vision and hearing are not an issue. Julia attends full day Kindergarten class at Skelly Elementary. She does not interact with other children, but is attentive to her surroundings and copies the behavior of other children as a means of following directions (sitting, standing, moving from one room to another). Her least restrictive environment was determined as a co-taught education classroom with individual speech therapy three times per week.

Case Study 2 – Kami

Kami is a seven-year-old girl whose verbal and motor abilities are severely impacted by physical disabilities due to cerebral palsy. Her sight and hearing are normal. She has mild mental

retardation. She uses a wheelchair and has limited ability to use her hands for writing or grasping objects. She has a full-time aide with her at all times to assist her with all physical tasks. Her least restrictive environment was determined to be the first grade classroom for most of the day. She participates in math, reading, art, music and physical education. She attends lunch with her peers. Kami is in a separate classroom for life skills, physical therapy, occupational therapy and speech therapy. An assistive technology device is needed so that Kami can communicate during her school activities, lunch and recess as well as at home and in the community.

Case Study 3 - Tim

Tim is a six-year-old boy who has Autism and is primarily nonverbal. He has a limited vocabulary and is having extreme difficulty being unable to communicate his needs. He is also experiencing learning challenges. In Kindergarten, he progressed well and most learning difficulties were the result of not being able to communicate. At this time, it is important that methods of communication are addressed in order to increase the ability to learn. Tim's least restrictive environment was determined to be in the general education classroom for the entire day with a full-time paraprofessional. At times, he will leave to work one on one with the paraprofessional on instructional goals provided by the teacher. Tim also has speech therapy 4 times a week.

Paper Outline

Section I

Instructional Planning for Children with Special Communicative Needs

(a) For each child, summarize the relationship between his/her communication needs or disorders and his/her other exceptional learning needs. Based on the evidence provided, to what extent does each child's circumstances reflect typical or atypical language development? (Include reasons to support your determinations.) In your discussion, be sure to identify the range and type of communication needs that must be addressed for each child in order to maximize their learning potential and emotional well being. (This section of your paper will be 1-2 pages.)

(b) Each case study summarizes the therapy and special education services that Julia, Kami and Tim receive outside of the general classroom. Assume, however, that in the general classroom, children are learning how to use singular and plural nouns with appropriate verbs. Describe in general terms how you would adapt instruction for these three children on that unit of study (approximately two weeks in length), in ways that will enhance their language development. Be sure to take into consideration the resources that are currently used by each child (e.g., communication aids, specialists, other therapies) in your discussion. In particular, consider how you will collaborate with other school-based professionals or paraprofessionals in order to help each child achieve the learning goals described above? In order to make this part of your paper as authentic as possible, you may need to research the characteristics described for each child and add details that would better anchor your instructional plans. (This section of your paper will be 2-4 pages in length.)

Section II – The Role of Assistive and Augmentative Technology

In this part of the paper, you are asked to research, describe, and recommend choices for assistive/augmentative technology that would benefit each child. Your discussion should focus on each child in turn, and describe one or two types of technology that might benefit that particular child. (Since you know that Kami uses a communication device, you may either focus on a discussion of voice enhancement technology, or choose a different form of assistive technology to explore that might augment Kami's other communicative needs.) Plan to briefly describe **four** different types of technology-based devices.

Your paper should also include fairly detailed footnotes for each form of technology you describe. Footnotes should include information such as manufacturer(s), cost factors including pricing options and insurance coverage, range of options and availability. (This section of your paper will be 2-5 pages in length, including footnotes.)

Section III – Cultural and Language Considerations

In this part of the paper, you will focus only on Case Study 1 (Julia). Unlike the other two children, Julia's learning needs are impacted by the fact that her native language is not English. Assuming that the school does have an ESL teacher but does not have any personnel who can speak the child's native language, describe the steps you would recommend to reach and educate Julia. What would you consider and who would you include in your collaborative efforts? Do you think Julia might benefit from further testing, or other services? Finally, consider whether there may be any cultural considerations that may be impacting your communication with Julia and or may have impacted results of her current diagnosis. (There is no "right or wrong" approach here; this part of your essay will be evaluated on the thoroughness and thoughtfulness of your approach to range of complicated factors that must be considered in order to educate Julia to her full potential.) (This section of your paper will be 1-2 pages in length.)

Rubric

Candidates will be required to re-submit the paper if performance in any one criterion is rated as unacceptable.

Criteria	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Section I Instructional Planning for Children with Communicative Disorders			
Ways in which exceptional conditions interact with language. CEC Standard 1	The response may not fully address the range of ELNs for each child, or may not reflect an accurate understanding or summation of those needs as they are described in the case study.	The response summarizes how each child's exceptional conditions interact with their unique language or communication-based disorders. The discussion is sufficient to establish the main concerns that need to be addressed for each child.	The response provides a succinct summary of the range of ELNs for each child, with an emphasis on how each child's ELNs are impacted and interrelate with communication or language based disorders.
Atypical and typical language development CEC Standard 1	The response may not fully or directly provide the candidate's determination of whether and how each child's language-based disability reflects atypical or typical language development. Or the candidate's response may make assumptions that are not supported by case study information.	The candidate's discussion of atypical and language development, as that is shown by each child, reflects an accurate understanding of the concepts and provides plausible reasons for the determination made in that respect for each child.	The response demonstrates an advanced level of knowledge of typical and atypical language development. The candidate may cite research to support determinations made. The candidate may propose some reasonable hypotheses related to one or more child's language development (that are supportable based on information that is provided).
Individualized strategies to enhance language development CEC Standard 5	Adapted teaching strategies may not be fully or clearly described for each child, in such a way that clearly addresses the unit of ELA instruction as outlined in Section I.B of the instructions. It is not apparent that strategies proposed take into	The strategies to adapt instruction for each child appear appropriate and realistic. They take into consideration all resources currently in place to support each child. Strategies are sufficiently detailed and include some information about how strategies would be applied and monitored over the two-	The candidate has proposed strategies for each child that are thorough and that challenge the child at his/her level of ability. Strategies chosen by the candidate allow students to participate in whole class activities to the greatest extent possible. Strategies also include means of monitoring students'

	consideration and are adapted for each child's special needs as that applies to speaking, listening, reading and/or writing.	week unit. Strategies take into consideration language development as it applies to speaking, listening, reading and writing.	learning during and at the end of the ELA unit. The candidate may have used to research to develop or inform this section of the paper.
Working collaboratively to address needs of individuals with ELN CEC Standard 7	The candidate may not have fully addressed the range of resources and collaboration that may be used to assist each of the three students. The candidate may not adequately describe or distinguish between the roles of the two classroom co-teachers, the paraprofessionals and others who provide educational services to the three children.	The strategies proposed in the paper include the use of collaborative efforts to support the learning needs of each child. Efforts appear to be realistic and inclusive. It is clear how each member of the child's "learning team" will participate.	Collaborative strategies are very well delineated and thought out, with effort given as well to communication and integration of collaborative efforts. The candidate may "think outside the box" in terms of the best ways to serve each child. The candidate plays a central and consultative role in the problem-solving needed for each child.

Section II Assistive, Alternative and Augmentative Technology

Choice and application of assistive technology CEC Standard 5	The technology choices described by the candidate is not sufficiently distinct (e.g., a description of two different brands of a communicative device that both have the same basic purpose and function counts as one example of technology, not two). It may not be clear how the devices are appropriate to or will enhance learning for the child they are suggested for. The candidate may not have supported his technology choices	The candidate has provided information on four types of technology (hardware and/or software) that are either recommended for use, or might be worth further investigation. Choices are appropriate to the needs of the children for whom they are suggested. The candidate has supplied useful references for each form of technology.	Devices are succinctly described and their application to the needs of each child is specific and explicit. The candidate may have done research into a range of devices before settling on four to include and reference in the paper.
--	---	---	---

	with references.		
Section III Cultural and Language Considerations			
Facilitating understanding of subject matter for individuals with ELN whose primary language is not English CEC Standards 3 and 5	Strategies presented for Julia are limited or do not take into consideration the full range of her interacting learning needs. Strategies proposed may not reflect an accurate understanding of the roles of teachers and specialists who would be involved in Julia's educational solutions.	The strategies for Julia described in the paper give adequate and reasonable considerations to Julia's needs for ESL services, as well as the coordination of those services with Julia's other ELNs.	Strategies are well thought out. The candidate clearly takes the role of advocate and leader in terms of strategizing solutions and coordination of efforts.
Understanding interaction of primary language, culture, and family backgrounds with a student's ELN CEC Standard 1	The response may not fully describe or take into consideration the range of interacting circumstances that keep Julia from reaching her potential. The candidate may not adequately consider or reflect upon any cultural barriers that Julia or her teacher's experience.	The response considers the full range and complexity of Julia's unique set of circumstances, and considers the range of resources and collaboration that may be brought into play. The response includes consideration of Julia's cultural and family background, and how those factors may contribute to both Julia's current diagnosis and goals established for her.	The response is exceptionally thoughtful. It may reflect research on the part of the candidate on one or more topics that impact or might impact Julia's well being. The candidate gives especially sensitive consideration of the role culture and family may play as both causes and solutions.
Overall structure and format	The paper may not meet length and formatting requirements, or sufficiently address all topics. The paper may not be fully coherent or logical in construction.	The paper is at least eight pages in length, and is formatted according to instructions. The paper has few typos or grammatical errors. The candidate has addressed all topics in a coherent and logical fashion.	The paper is well written, thoughtful, and engaging. All topics are thoroughly and thoughtfully addressed. The paper reflects a fairly sophisticated understanding and approach to best practices in special education.

Analysis of the Data Findings

The Communication Case Study was added in Spring 2012. The results for each administration are described below.

Spring 2012

Ninety-one (91) percent of candidates met or exceeded the standards overall, with most (82 percent) exceeding the standards. The one candidate (9 percent) who "met" the standard, rather than exceeding it, demonstrated adequate knowledge of the standard and the requirement of the presentation. However, the responses lacked detail to meet the "exceeded" range. Faculty met with this candidate to address this concern, particularly as it will impact the candidate's ability to pass the comprehensive exam (assessment 7) prior to student teaching.

The one candidate (9 percent) who simply "approached" the standard showed a lack of understanding regarding instructional planning, appropriate technology choices, and cultural/language considerations. The candidate has met with his academic advisor, and they have created a remediation plan. The candidate will be required to repeat the class (and, therefore, the assessment) when it is next offered in Spring 2013.

Spring 2013

All candidates met or exceeded the standards for this assignment. One candidate met the standards for the entire assignment, while another candidate met the standard for individualized strategies to enhance language development and choosing assistive technology, and exceeded the standards in all other areas. The one candidate that met the standards was new to the profession and seemed to need more time to acquire the skills and knowledge to exceed the standards. Opportunities during the candidate's internship will allow the candidate to further develop these skills. In addition, future courses will focus more on specific strategies for language development and introduce the candidates to more assistive technology options.

Spring 2014

All candidates met or exceeded the standards for this assignment. Similar to the results from Spring 2013, candidates seemed to struggle the most with choosing assistive technology and individualized strategies for language development. Students who scored "meets" on these strategies were able to choose an AT device and identify some strategies, but not with enough specificity to score "exceeds." Thus, it seems they have a good understanding of the concepts and may need more "hands-on" practice in using and implementing AT and strategies to develop language. Thus, we will spend more time introducing a variety of AT and modeling its use for students. Candidates will also be required to use an AT device in at least one lesson in EDTE 634: Teaching Students with Intellectual Disabilities.

Candidates were relatively stronger in identifying typical and atypical language development, collaboration, and developing and implementing strategies for students identified as English Language Learners.

Criteria	Spring 2012			Spring 2013			Spring 2014						
	App	Meets	Exceeds	App	Meets	Exceeds	App	Meets	Exceeds				
Choice and application of assistive technology	1	9	1	9	9	82	0	0	0	2	33	4	67
CEC Standard 5													
Facilitating understanding of subject matter for individuals with ELN whose primary language is not English	1	9	1	9	9	82	0	0	0	1	16	5	84
CEC Standards 3 and 5													
Understanding interaction of primary language, culture, and family backgrounds with a student's ELN	1	9	1	9	9	82	0	0	0	1	16	5	84
CEC Standard 1													
Overall structure and	1	9	1	9	9	82	0	0	0	1	14	6	100

#7 (Optional): Additional assessment that addresses CEC standards.

Assessment 7: Comprehensive Examination

Description of the Assignment and its Use in the Program

The Comprehensive Examination is used to document candidates' content knowledge and serves as a transition point for candidates entering student teaching; the examination is taken during the last semester prior to student teaching.

The Comprehensive Examination in Special Education, which is in essay format, calls for a thorough understanding of the Council for Exceptional Children's (CEC) Professional Standards; the basis and implications of these standards; and the ability to apply associated competencies to scenarios and situations involving learners, families, and school and community stakeholders and resources. The examination is timed, with candidates having four hours in which to complete the three sections.

From Academic Policies:

(<http://www.trinitydc.edu/catalog-12-13/policies-edu/#comps>)

Comprehensive Examination for Candidates in Teacher Education

Prior to enrolling in the Internship (Student Teaching), candidates for the Master's of Arts in Teaching (MAT) and Undergraduate Majors in Education must achieve qualifying scores on the Comprehensive Examination administered by the School of Education.

The Comprehensive Examination provides an opportunity for faculty to review candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions to ensure their readiness for student teaching. The Comprehensive Examination also provides an opportunity for teacher candidates to integrate the knowledge gained from coursework and field experiences and to apply that knowledge to hypothetical situations similar to those that might be encountered when teaching.

All students in the Master's of Arts in Teaching should see their academic advisor well in advance regarding preparation and registration for the examination.

When a candidate is unsuccessful in achieving a qualifying score after three opportunities, the faculty reserves the right, on approval of the Dean, to not recommend the student for graduation, for endorsement for certification/licensure, or both. The student must file appeals with the Dean within four weeks of being notified of the third failure.

Description of the Assignment

Introduction

Teaching in the twenty-first century is a challenging task. Typical classrooms include a diverse student population not only in terms of background, but also in language and exposure to the pre-requisite skills that students must have in order to respond adequately to standardized curriculum and assessments. Additionally, schools are experiencing a larger number of students who are having academic difficulty, due to disabilities and "social circumstances beyond their control."

Directions

Read the case study below from the perspective that you are the special education teacher with responsibility for facilitating and coordinating the learning and educational services for the child in question. Use the information in the case study to guide your responses to exam topics 1 and 2. Finally, as described in exam topic 3, you will develop a behavioral intervention plan for the child. Note that, because the case study will likely be different for each administration of this exam, the "prompts" given under essay topics may be more or less relevant, depending on the case study. Also recall that this exam is a measure of your own ability to make professional decisions based on information presented; and, thus, there are no "right" or "wrong" answers – other than the expectation that you can support your answers by professional knowledge and evidence from the case study.

Use the rubric at the end to guide your responses to each essay topic.

Case Study: Peter

Peter is an 11-year old boy who attends 5th grade in an urban public school. He has attended the same school since pre-Kindergarten. Peter is an only child and lives with his mother who works as a cook in a restaurant and his father who works in construction. Both parents are immigrants to the United States (legal status unknown) and Peter is the first one in the family to be US born. Both parents attended school through the 6th grade, and do speak some English but with very limited proficiency. Peter is bilingual and he speaks his native language at home and English at school.

Through the 4th grade, Peter had no problems with school and attended school on a regular basis. However, Peter's grandmother died in the summer after Peter completed 4th grade. She had lived nearby and previously cared for him frequently while his parents worked, and he had loved her very much.

Since entering the 5th grade, Peter has been experiencing symptoms of depression, such as loss of appetite and sleep, and he also experiences separation anxiety from his mother. Since school started in September, Peter refuses to leave his mother and stay in school. By mid-November, this behavior

has not changed or improved. Every morning there is a battle at home to get him off to school. He kicks, screams, and cries, refusing to let his mother go. If they manage to make him stay in school, he experiences symptoms of high anxiety, tearfulness, fear, and refuses to participate in any of the school activities.

Peter is a student with average to below average intelligence and performs on a 4th grade level in mathematics and science and on a 3rd grade level in language arts and social studies. Peter received English as a Second Language (ESL) services until he graduated from 4th grade. At that time, it was determined that his English proficiency was native-like and a decision was made for the ESL services to end. Peter used to enjoy his art class a lot, and he does not like to go to the music and physical education classes.

Peter has never had many friends and has always been somewhat socially withdrawn. After the death of his grandmother and since the symptoms of school phobia started, it is very difficult for him to stay around other children, especially when his mother is not present.

Exam Topic One

Briefly summarize the **characteristics** of the student that should be considered as factors in the development of an intervention plan. Factors to be considered should include any and all of the following that are relevant to the case study presented. Your discussion of characteristics may combine or overlap the categories below, as long as all important characteristics are identified for each category: **(CEC Standard 1)**

- ❖ **Developmental factors**, including consideration of and distinction between the child's **typical and atypical developmental characteristics** as they pertain to his or her psychosocial, intellectual, and physical development.
- ❖ **Family and biographical factors**, including pertinent characteristics of the child's family structure and history, as well as the child's own personality, likes, and dislikes.
- ❖ **Cultural and environmental factors**, including cultural and language background of the child, school and classroom environment, community and/or extracurricular activities in which the child participates, and other salient characteristics.
- ❖ **Physical ability and medical factors, if any** that may have an impact on the child's current behavior and/or development of a successful intervention plan (as known about the child, or observations that may suggest a physician be consulted).

Exam Topic Two

Using your best judgment as a special educator, summarize:

- (a) **2-3 critical factors, and/or interactions of factors**, among those mentioned above that may have caused or exacerbated the child's negative behavior and should be a focus or priority of steps taken to help the child. Dependent on the details of the case study and your own professional judgment, the steps you

prescribe may be a need for further assessment or information in one or more areas, or steps to be taken as part of the Behavior Intervention Plan **(CEC Standard 1)**

(b) **2-3 positive characteristics** of the family and/or student that can be applied to the development of a BIP (e.g. family values and supports; the student's interests, motivators, gifts or talents, career goals; other), as well as how one might take advantage of those characteristics in developing a plan for the child. **(CEC Standard 1)**

(c) Discuss the relationship between the child's behavioral/emotional problems and his or her learning abilities, needs, and progress. What is the impact or potential impact? How should the BIP you develop consider, include, or integrate the child's learning needs? **(CEC Standard 1)**

(d) Briefly list and describe the **collaborators** and **the role of collaboration** in development of an intervention plan for the student. Your list should be based on realistic expectations and knowledge of school staffing and availability of specialists in the D.C. public school system, as well as a realistic understanding and knowledge of resources available from outside agencies (e.g. family and child counseling services, other). Also include a discussion of any situations that might need to be considered in terms of family collaboration (e.g. guardianship issues, parental work schedules if known, language or other potential barriers). **(CEC Standard 7)**

Exam Topic Three

Based on the information you have summarized above, develop the basic structure for a **Behavior Intervention Plan** for the student. Using a matrix or a narrative format, your plan should be organized around a set of 3-5 **outcome statements** that express measurable goals you want to achieve in the improvement of the child's behavior and well-being. Each outcome statement should be supported by:

(a) multiple strategies or measures to be taken toward achievement of the outcome, including the timeframe and individuals involved in each strategy or measure; **(CEC Standard 5)**

(b) means by which you or others will evaluate/assess the child's progress in meeting each established outcome. **(CEC Standard 4)**

Special Education Comprehensive Examination Rubric

Criteria	Approaches	Meets	Exceeds
Exam Topic One			
<p>Characteristics of student – developmental factors</p> <p>CEC Standard 1</p>	<p>Not all developmental characteristics of the student are discussed, or discussion includes inaccuracies or presumptions not supported by the case study. Insufficient or inaccurate attention may be given to the child's atypical and typical development, based on the age of the child and other relevant factors.</p>	<p>Characteristics of the case study student's development are adequately summarized and draw reasonable inferences about the child's atypical vs typical development based on the child's age and other relevant factors.</p>	<p>Characteristics are very well described, with careful distinctions made between perceived or potential, and known factors. Response indicates a strong knowledge of child development and psychology, integrated with other factors.</p>
<p>Characteristics of student – family, cultural and environmental factors</p> <p>CEC Standard 1</p>	<p>The essay may include an overly brief or inadequate discussion of the full range of circumstances and characteristics impacting the child's life. The essay may not include or include adequate attention to the impact or interaction of family, cultural and environmental factors on the child's learning.</p>	<p>The essay references most important characteristics that impact the student's life, including cultural and environmental factors. The essay includes a focus on the impact or interaction of family, cultural and environmental factors on the child's learning or learning potential.</p>	<p>The essay discusses all characteristics that impact the student's life, and may include some appropriate inferences that are not included in the case study but that may be useful for further exploration or consultation. The essay includes a strong discussion of how cultural, family and environmental factors impact the student's learning.</p>
<p>Characteristics of student – physical ability or medical factors</p> <p>CEC Standard 1</p>	<p>The essay does not draw any connections between medical and/or physical factors that may interact or potentially interact</p>	<p>The essay makes appropriate reference to the role, or potential role, of physical or medical factors in the child's behavioral and/or</p>	<p>The essay makes perceptive and knowledgeable connections between physical or medical factors that do, or may, interact with the child's</p>

	with the child's behavioral and/or learning problems. Or the essay may draw conclusions that are not supported by information in the self-study.	learning problems.	behavioral and/or learning problems.
<i>Exam Topic Two</i>			
Impact of factors on child's behavior and learning CEC Standard 1	The essay may not clearly summarize the key factors that are impacting the child's behavior. Or factors included may not be clearly supported by the case study, or may overlook one or more critical considerations.	The essay does an adequate job of summarizing the factors that have led to a need for intervention. The essay includes a focus on the impact and interaction of the child's behavior on his or her learning potential.	The essay does a thorough job of prioritizing and integrating factors that may lead to the child's behavioral problems. The essay may include perceptive and well supported arguments for further assessments of the child.
Positive characteristics to draw upon in developing BIP CEC Standard 1	The essay may not identify at least two characteristics, or characteristics are not clearly described, or are not clearly supported by information presented in the case study. It may not be clear how the characteristics identified will be used toward building a useful BIP.	The essay identifies 2-3 characteristics of the child, family or circumstances that can be drawn on in developing the BIP. Characteristics are supported by (or can be inferred from) information in the case study.	The characteristics identified are well defined and supported by information in the case study, and supported by knowledge-based applications of those characteristics to the development of a realistic and potentially successful plan.
Impact on child's learning needs and abilities CEC Standard 1	The essay does not clearly or fully address the topic. Or the essay does not make logical connections or conclusions that relate to the impact of the child's behavior and	The essay adequately addresses the relationship and impact of the child's behavioral and emotional problems on his or her learning.	The discussion of the relationship between the child's behavioral problems and his or her learning needs, abilities, and potential is thorough and includes useful insights that are

	circumstances to his or her learning needs.		grounded in pedagogical research.
Collaboration and role of collaborators CEC Standard 7	The list of collaborators is incomplete, unclear, or unrealistic. The discussion of family collaboration issues is missing, unclear, or does not clearly or sensitively consider the issues that may be included in the case study. Overall, the response does not reflect a knowledge of the organization and structure of DCPS staffing and/or relationships between families, teachers, school specialists and/or community agencies in collaborative efforts for children with exceptional needs.	The essay includes an adequate list of all individuals (by role) who should be included in collaborative efforts to support the child. The essay includes an adequate discussion of any issues to be considered, if any, in establishing good rapport and communication with the child's parent(s) or guardian.	The list of collaborators is well documented in terms of roles and responsibilities of professional participants, and is based on realistic and knowledgeable understanding of DCPS school and specialist resources. The list may include outside agencies (if appropriate) that are again realistically chosen. The discussion of family collaboration issues (if applicable based on the case study) is practical (solution-based) as well as thoughtful.
Exam Topic Three			
Development of BIP CEC Standard 5	The BIP may be missing one or more aspects of critical information related to how, when, and by whom interventions would be carried out. One or more interventions may appear to be unsuitable, punitive, impractical, or not designed to ensure the emotional well being of the child.	Overall, the BIP is adequately designed and identifies a clear intervention plan that is appropriate to address the needs of the student as articulated in the case study. All needed components are included, i.e. timeframe, individuals involved, strategies, materials and resources (as applicable).	The BIP is very well designed and takes into consideration the complexity of issues suggested by the case study, including expectations for parental participation and suggestions for additional consultation, as appropriate. The BIP is also practical and suited to its specified timeframe and the typical factors and

			resources that would be available in an urban school and community.
Assessment of BIP CEC Standard 4	The candidate may not have included a minimum of three outcomes, or outcomes are not well stated or not clearly linked to the interventions described in the BIP. Assessments for outcomes may be missing, unclear, or inappropriate.	Overall, 3-5 outcomes are adequately identified and include measurable goals. Each outcome is supported by two or more strategies to be used to achieve outcomes. Appropriate assessment methods for outcomes are identified.	Outcome statements are thoughtful and clearly linked to the focus of the BIP. Assessments that will be used to measure outcomes are appropriate and clearly identified. Outcomes are included for all aspects of the child's behavioral, emotional, and learning issues.
Characteristics of written essay	The exam has multiple errors in: 1. Grammar 2. Punctuation 3. Spelling 4. Syntax	The exam has minimal errors in: 1. Grammar 2. Punctuation 3. Spelling 4. Syntax	With the possible exception of one or two minor typos, the exam is free of errors in: 1. Grammar 2. Punctuation 3. Spelling 4. Syntax

Analysis of the Data Findings

During the last admission of the comprehensive exam (spring 2013, fall 2013, spring 2014) all but one candidate met or exceeded the standards measured in the Comprehensive Examination assessment. One out of 13 approached the standard (7 percent), 2 out of 13 (15 percent) met the standard, and the rest exceeded the standards (78 percent). Most candidates demonstrated their content knowledge and their ability to develop and implement a Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP). Specifically, candidates demonstrated their knowledge of child development and psychology; cultural, family, and environmental factors that may impact student's learning; and physical or medical factors that may interact with a child's behavioral and/or learning difficulties (CEC Standards 1 and 7)

Two candidates (15 percent) "met" the standards. Although these candidates showed competence in the standards measured, their responses did not contain the depth of understanding needed at the "exceed" level. Faculty reviews the exam with them to discuss how the candidates could elaborate and show detail.

One candidate (1, 3 percent) approached the standards in fall 2013 and did not meet the requirements to begin student teaching. However, faculty worked with the candidate during the spring 2014 semester to prepare her for the exam. She met or exceeded expectations on all parts of the exam in spring 2014 and now qualifies to begin her student teaching.

Data Table

Criteria	Spring 2013						Fall 2013						Spring 2014											
	Approaches		Meets		Exceeds		Approaches		Meets		Exceeds		Approaches		Meets		Exceeds							
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%						
Characteristics of Student Developmental Factors CEC Standard 2	0	0	0	0	7	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100
Characteristics of student, family, cultural, and environmental factors CEC Standard 2	0	0	0	0	7	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100
Characteristics of student, physical ability or medical factors CEC Standard 2	0	0	0	0	7	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	67
Impact of factors on child's behavior and learning CEC Standard 2	0	0	0	0	7	100	1	33	0	0	0	0	1	33	1	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	67

#8 (Optional): Additional assessment that addresses CEC standards.

Assessment 8: Portfolio Position Papers

Description of the Assignment and its Use in the Program

The Portfolio Position Papers assessment reflects a revision of a previous Portfolio assessment, which included assessments completed throughout the candidate's program of study. This assessment was first implemented during the 2011-2012 academic year. The revised assessment requires candidates to demonstrate their overall knowledge in a series of position papers, each of which is specifically related to a CEC standard. Candidates complete this assessment during their student teaching semester, as part of their Advanced Seminar in Teaching (EDTE 689).

A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III

Candidates prepare six (6) position papers, as follows:

- #1 Philosophy (CEC Standard 6)
- #2 Accommodating Individual Learning Needs (CEC Standards 1 & 3)
- #3 Instructional Strategies (CEC Standard 5)
- #4 Learning Environment (CEC Standard 2)
- #5 Advocacy and Collaboration (CEC Standard 7)
- #6 Professional Development (CEC Standard 6)

This assignment is intended to provide a broad snapshot of the candidate's understanding and application of core standards as they are engaged in their teaching internship.

Description of the Assignment

Candidates prepare six position papers which must be submitted as part of their final portfolio; each paper addresses how candidates view the topic of the paper in light of their program coursework, field, and internship experiences/teaching. Requirements for each position paper focus on elements of specific CEC standards.

Papers are written on the following topics:

- #1 Philosophy (CEC Standard 6)
- #2 Accommodating Individual Learning Needs (CEC Standards 1 & 3)
- #3 Instructional Strategies (CEC Standard 5)
- #4 Learning Environment (CEC Standard 2)
- #5 Advocacy and Collaboration (CEC Standard 7)
- #6 Professional Development (CEC Standard 6)

All papers should include at least two documented references, but – since these are not research papers – should avoid lengthy quotations from source materials. Candidates write each paper to address the following:

Position Paper #1: Personal Philosophy of Special Education (CEC Standard 6)

This paper should define the candidate's philosophy of special education, as informed by principles and theories studied. The paper should include a focus on current controversies or differences of opinion in the field of special education, as well as capture the candidate's opinions and beliefs on those topics.

Position Paper #2: Accommodating Individual Learning Needs (CEC Standards 1 & 3)

This paper should focus on the relationship between a child's exceptional learning needs and other aspects of the child's life, including cultural or language background, family support systems, quality of life issues, and career options. As a way of examining this topic, candidates write about a child they have worked with enough to have a basic understanding of his/her diagnosed exceptional condition, personality and interests, and at least a glimpse into his/ her family background.

Questions answered may include:

- If you were the child's special education teacher, what strategies would you use to help the child achieve to his/her full potential?
- What strategies might you use to build a relationship with the child's family?
- What family or other support systems are in place, or may be needed, to help the child achieve learning goals?
- What interests does the child have that you might tap into in order to motivate him/her, or in order to moderate or improve behavior?
- What short-term learning goals (i.e. goals for a current school year) make sense in order to prepare the child for the next stage in his/her education or postsecondary options?
- Be sure to be as specific as possible about the child's age and exceptional needs, but be sure to disguise identities.

Position Paper #3: Instructional Strategies (CEC Standard 5)

In this paper, candidates write briefly about the instructional strategies they might employ toward their *choice* of one of the following goals:

- (1) preparation for taking a high-stakes multiple choice test;
- (2) learning new vocabulary words;

- (3) learning a specific mathematical operation (as appropriate to the grade level);
- (4) encouraging students' participation in class discussion of central concepts in a specific reading assignment;

Strategies should be designed for two different (hypothetical) elementary school-aged students who are performing at the same grade level, but have different exceptional characteristics or diagnoses. In the paper, be sure to specify (a) the goal and grade level chosen; (b) the specific exceptional condition(s) for each child, and (c) the strategy or strategies chosen for each child, and why that strategy was chosen. Be sure to cite at least one theory or research source that supports the choices for each child.

Alternately, candidates may base this position paper on an authentic situation and goal (which may differ from those above); in that case be sure to disguise identities of your students.)

Position Paper #4: Learning Environment (CEC Standard 2)

This paper should be based on the following scenario:

You have been hired as a Grade 2 special education teacher at a school that—even by D.C. standards—represents a great range of diversity. Approximately 60 percent of the students are African American, 15 percent are Latino or Hispanic American, and 25 percent are white, Asian, mixed race, or other nationalities. Fifteen percent of students are designated as limited English speakers, with approximately 12 different first languages represented across those students.

For three of your five class periods, you will work with students on an individual or small group basis in a resource room. The room is a former small classroom (approximately 20' x 18') that has newly been designated as your classroom. It is wired for Internet, but currently is not equipped with any technology. You have been asked to set up and furnish the room from existing school furnishings and supplies, but also told that you can tap into an additional funding source if needed for supplies and equipment. You have been told to expect no more than 10 students in each period, and that you will have a paraprofessional assigned to you for each class. You also have been told that one of the second grade students who receives special education services uses a wheelchair.

Based on the above scenario, describe how you will go about this task.

- How will you furnish and organize the room? What special resources (including technology) will you request?
- What additional purchases will you request or recommend?
- How might you make the room attractive?
- What kinds of posters, art, etc., might you consider putting up on walls or bulletin boards?

- As you write, think about how you will create a classroom that provides an emotionally (and physically) safe environment for all students. (Your decisions should reflect the characteristics of students and the student body described above.)

Accompany your essay with a simple sketch of the furniture placement in your room.

Position Paper #5: Advocacy and Collaboration (CEC Standard 7)

CEC Standard 10 (Collaboration) includes the following language: "Moreover, special educators embrace their special role as advocates for individuals with Exceptional Learning Needs. Special educators promote and advocate for the learning and well being of individuals with ELN across a wide range of settings and a range of different learning experiences."

Describe (based on your classroom observations or experience) an example of a teacher acting as an advocate for a student.

- What was the situation that caused the teacher to reach out to other teachers or staff, school professionals, or outside agencies to help the child or obtain additional resources for the child?
- What steps did the teacher take?
- How did the teacher use collaboration or make collaborative efforts on behalf of the student?
- What steps did the teacher take, if known, to ensure actions taken followed school protocol or protected the student or family's confidentiality?
- Do you believe the teacher acted appropriately?
- Would you have done something different, or in addition, if you were in that teacher's place?
- Be as specific as possible in your description, while taking care to disguise the identity of the teacher(s) and student. (Note: if you do not know what steps the teacher took on behalf of the child, describe the steps you would take on behalf of the child if you were in the teacher's place, including the collaborative efforts you might initiate or look into.)

Position Paper #6: Professional Development (CEC Standard 6)

For this paper, candidates choose one of two options:

(1) Attend a professional event for special educators. This might be a state or national conference or conference session, an in-service training workshop offered in your host school, or a lecture or presentation at another local college or university. Write a review of the event you attended, being sure to include the name of the sponsoring organization and speakers, date and location, and a

thorough description of the focus of the presentation. Be sure to include your own opinion on the value of the event you attended.

- Was it well organized?
- Was the presentation effective?
- Did you agree with the presenter(s)' perspective?
- Most importantly, did you learn something of value?

(2) Write about your own plans for keeping abreast of current research and best practice and special education, as well as your plans for professional growth as a special educator during the first five years of your teaching practice.

- Do you plan to join or are you already a member of a professional organization?
- Do you see yourself going back to school to get another degree and/or an added license?
- Do you see yourself pursuing a different career in professional education?
- Be specific about why you are interested in the options or plans that you mention.

Rubric

Criteria	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
<p>Position Paper 1 – Philosophy</p> <p>CEC Standard 6 INTASC Standard 9</p>	<p>The candidate's philosophy of special education is not clearly enough articulated or too generalized. The paper may not be well supported, or only vaguely supported, by research and theory. The paper may not clearly or effectively convey the candidate's position on a current controversy, or may not adequately or accurately convey the topic and context of the issue under discussion.</p>	<p>The candidate's philosophy of special education is adequately articulated and supported by at least two appropriate references to research or theorists. The candidate applies his or her own beliefs about the role and function of special education to support a position on a major current controversy within the field. Sources and references are appropriately cited.</p>	<p>The paper reflects a breadth and depth of knowledge of a range of learning theories, as well as current research and best practices in the field. The candidate's opinion on a current controversy or emerging issue in the field is balanced and well supported by research and by the candidate's own stated beliefs.</p>
<p>Position Paper 2 – Accommodating Individual Learning Needs</p> <p>CEC Standards 1 & 3</p> <p>INTASC Standards 1 and 8</p>	<p>The paper does not clearly describe the child in enough detail to understand the relationship between his or her ELN and other aspects of family or cultural background. The paper may reflect bias or unsupported conclusions about the child's learning potential or background. Short-term goals and strategies for achieving them may not appear relevant or supported by the description of the child.</p>	<p>The paper adequately describes the child and contextualizes the relationship between the child's diagnosed ELN and his or her family background, relevant cultural factors, support systems, and perceived learning potential. Short-term goals suggested for the child are supported by factors that relate to and integrate the child's ELN, interests or motivators, and family support system.</p>	<p>The paper provides a thoughtful and nuanced description of the child within the context of his or her family background, ELN, personality, interests and other factors that contribute to the child's wellbeing and enjoyment. The paper recommends several short-term learning goals, and strategies for reaching those goals, that are sound, practical, and supported by best practices, which are referenced and</p>

Criteria	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
			documented by the paper.
<p>Position Paper 3 – Instructional Strategies</p> <p>CEC Standard 5</p> <p>INTASC Standard 8</p>	<p>The paper may not follow or may misinterpret instructions for choosing a learning goal and describing two students. The ELNs may not be clearly or professionally described; or there may not be enough contrast to understand why instructional strategies would be differentiated for each hypothetical student. Instructional strategies may not be presented with sufficient clarity or detail, or it may not be clear why the strategies are appropriate to the specific ELN described. Strategies may not adequately or accurately be supported by research.</p>	<p>The paper adequately delineates instructional strategies, related to the chosen goal, that would be appropriate for two hypothetical students. Strategies are described in enough detail, and reflect that the candidate understands how to design instructional strategies appropriate to the learning goal and ELN characteristics. Strategies are supported by research.</p>	<p>The candidate's choice and description of two hypothetical students are clearly described and may present unusual challenges or contrast in terms of learning strategies appropriate for each one. Strategies chosen are well grounded in research and current best practice as documented by the paper. The candidate may present a range of strategies or alternate strategies for each goal.</p>
<p>Position Paper 4 – Learning Environment</p> <p>CEC Standard 2</p> <p>INTASC Standard 3</p>	<p>The paper and accompanying sketch may be unclear, impractical, or lacking in sufficient detail. Or the classroom design may not be sufficiently specialized to reflect appropriate choices for the number of</p>	<p>The paper and accompanying sketch adequately describe and illustrate the classroom that the candidate would create, and includes attention to student groupings, technology, and creating a safe and</p>	<p>The candidate's design and creation of a second grade special education classroom is thoughtful and creative, yet realistic, in terms of the likely resources available in a typical urban public school. The layout,</p>

Criteria	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
	students, developmental level of students, or range of special needs to be accommodated by the classroom.	nurturing environment appropriate to the grade and development level of students. The candidate's choices and decisions are supported by research as well as by most of the contextual factors presented in the scenario.	furnishings, décor and other considerations are designed to create an inviting, safe and stimulating environment. The environment is clearly designed to celebrate and support the diversity of the school population and individual students. Choices made in terms of technology hardware are both practical yet reflect current best practice in using technology to support education of young children and/or adaptive technology.
<p>Position Paper 5 – Advocacy and Collaboration</p> <p>CEC Standard 7</p> <p>INTASC Standard 10</p>	The paper may not clearly describe an example that illustrates a teacher acting as an advocate for a child, or not provide enough detail to understand why action was taken, what action was taken, or why the action taken was appropriate. The paper may not pay adequate or clear attention to the collaborative efforts initiated by the teacher, or what efforts the candidate believes would be appropriate. The candidate's	The paper adequately describes an example of a teacher's role as an advocate for additional support or services for a specific child. The description is sufficient to demonstrate that the candidate understands the role of advocacy as a routine responsibility of a special educator. The paper also describes how the candidate did or would take steps to collaborate with the family, as well as	The paper provides a detailed description of practices that represent a teacher's responsibilities and obligations to advocate for a student in need of additional support or services. The paper conveys a realistic appreciation of the obligation a special educator has in terms of advocating for students within the context or his or her own workload and other limitations. The paper reflects a detailed awareness

Criteria	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
	<p>approval (or reservations) about the actions taken by the teacher may not reflect a realistic understanding of the role of advocacy as a unique yet routine function of a special education teacher's responsibilities. The essay may not give adequate attention to the role of collaboration with both family and other educators, or may not convey an accurate understanding of the role and function or other professionals and agencies and protocols for initiating actions on behalf of the child.</p>	<p>services provided within and outside of the school system (if appropriate). The description indicates that the candidate generally understands the collaborative relationships, roles and protocols to be followed as that relates to initiating actions on behalf of the child.</p>	<p>of the protocols to be followed in terms of advocating for a child, and may suggest some creative alternate strategies or resources that may be available from outside agencies, as well as strategies for exploring those options.</p>
<p>Position Paper 6 – Professional Development</p> <p>CEC Standard 6</p> <p>INTASC Standard 9</p>	<p>The paper may not clearly describe the context and content of the professional development event attended, or if the second option was chosen, may not clearly or accurately describe the candidate's career plans. Overall, the paper does not convey that the candidate understands the role, value, and responsibility of the special educator to expand his/her</p>	<p>The paper adequately conveys that the candidate understands the role and value of continuous professional development and lifelong learning in order to broaden his/her understanding and keep abreast of current research and best practice. The paper indicates the candidate has a basic understanding of the profession of special education as</p>	<p>The paper provides a very detailed and knowledgeable discussion of the role and value of professional development and lifelong learning. The paper strongly conveys the candidate's commitment to his/her chosen field.</p>

Criteria	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
	professional knowledge and skills, or to keep abreast of research or developments in the field.	one that is represented by professional associations, advanced degree options, and the candidate's appreciation and use of these structures for further professional growth.	

Analysis of the Data Findings

The Portfolio Position Papers assessment was added in the 2011- 2012 academic year. Data for this program review are included for the last three semesters: spring 2013, Fall 2013, and Spring 2014. During this period, 100 percent of candidates met or exceeded the standards noted, with most exceeding each standard. Candidates demonstrated their ability to:

- express their philosophy of education;
- show an understanding of how to accommodate instruction for students in order for them to access the curriculum;
- establish effective learning environments for learners with diverse academic and social needs;
- assess students' needs academically and socially; and
- communicate and collaborate with peers and parents/community members.

There was some variability among students meeting or exceeding the standards in each area for each semester. For example, during Spring 2012, candidates showed relative strengths in accommodating individual learning needs. However, in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 the candidates showed less strength in this area, but more relative strength and understanding of the learning environment. Similarly, candidates in the Spring 2012 and Spring 2014 semesters showed relative strengths in advocacy. However, this did not appear as an overall relative strength for candidates in the Fall 2013 semester. Thus, it is difficult to make generalizations about, or identify patterns in terms of specific areas that may be stronger than others.

