

#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 (Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications) and at least one of the following: Principles of Learning and Teaching: Early Childhood #5621; Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K–6 #5622; Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5–9 #5623; Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7–12. The Principles of Learning exams are not a content measure and thus not reported. The Core Knowledge and Applications 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 a 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%)

The data are 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.

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

2. Alignment with Standards and Initial Special Education Individualized General and Independence Curriculum Combined Specialty Set.

Test Category	CEC Standard
Development and Characteristics of Learners	Standard 1
- Human development and behavior	ISCI 1 K1
- Theoretical approaches to student learning and motivation	ISCI 1 K3
- Basic characteristics and defining factors for each of the major disability categories	ISCI 1 K4
- Impact of disabilities on individuals, families and society	ISCI 1 K10
	ISCI 1 K11

Test Category	CEC Standard
<p>across the life span</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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>Planning and the Learning Environment</p> <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>Standards 5, 2</p> <p>ISCI 5 S5 ISCI 5 S8 ISCI 5 S15</p> <p>ISCI 2 K2 ISCI 2 K3 ISCI 2 K4 ISCI 2 K8</p>
<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 Preventive strategies and intervention strategies for at-risk learners 	<p>Standard 5</p> <p>ISCI 5 K2 ISCI 5 K3</p> <p>IGC5 K1 IIC5 K1</p> <p>IGC5 K3</p> <p>IGC5 K4 IIC5 K2</p> <p>IGC5 K5 IIC5 K3</p>
<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 	<p>Standard 4</p> <p>ISCI 4 K2 ISCI 4 K4</p> <p>IGC4 K1 IIC4 K1</p> <p>ISCI 4 S5 ISCI 4 S6</p>

Test Category	CEC Standard
	IGC4 S3 IIC4 S3
Foundations and Professional Responsibilities - 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 - Potential bias issues that may impact teaching and interactions with students and their families	Standards 6, 7 ISCI 6 K2 ISCI 6 K3 ISCI 6 K4 ISCI 6 K6 ISCI 6 K11 IGC6 K1 IIC6 K1 ISCI 7 K1 IGC7 K4

Analysis of the Data Findings

A total of four candidates reported scores for test #5354 (adopted by OSSE in September 2011) during the Fall 2014, Spring 2015, and Fall 2015 semesters. 100% earned qualifying scores. While the required score is 151, the average score for these graduates was 170. This is well above the required score.

Candidates generally fell within the average range or above the average range (of raw scores) in Planning and Learning Environments, Instruction, and Foundations and Professional Responsibilities, suggesting relative strengths in these areas. More candidates fell below the average raw score in Development and Characteristics, and Assessment. We have added a new assessment course (EDCC 606: Assessment and Development of Individualized Learning Prescriptions) to address weaknesses in assessment. Our methods courses (EDTE 634: Teaching Students with Significant Disabilities and EDTE 629: Teaching Students with High Incidence Disabilities) have been revised to place more emphasis on a range of disability categories.

Table 1
Average Overall Candidate Scores

Semester/Year	# Test Takers	Passing Scores		Average Score (minimum to pass is 151)
		#	%	
Fall 2014	1	1	100	179
Spring 2015	1	1	100	171
Fall 2015	2	2	100	159.5

Table 2
Candidate Raw Scores for Subsections Fall 2014*

Semester/Year	Subsections					Total Score
	Development and Characteristics of Learners (average performance range: 14-17)	Planning and the Learning Environment (average performance range:17-21)	Instruction (average performance range: 15-19)	Assessment (average performance range 13-16)	Foundations and Professional Responsibilities (average performance range: 15-16)	
Fall 2014	15 (19)	22(24)	20(23)	14(20)	17(22)	179

*Raw points available in parenthesis

Table 2
Average Candidate Raw Scores for Subsections Spring 2015*

Semester/Year	Subsections					Total Score
	Development and Characteristics of Learners (average performance range: 11-14)	Planning and the Learning Environment (average performance range: 18-22)	Instruction (average performance range: 15-18)	Assessment (average performance range 12-15)	Foundations and Professional Responsibilities (average performance range: 16-20)	
Spring 2015	13 (17)	19(26)	17 (23)	11(19)	17(23)	171

*Raw points available in parenthesis

Table 3
Candidate Raw Scores for Subsections Fall 2015*

	Subsections										Total Score
	Development and Characteristics of Learners		Planning and the Learning Environment		Instruction (Assessment		Foundations and Professional Responsibilities		
	RP & RPA	APR	RP & RPA	APR	RP & RPA	APR	RP & RPA	APR	RP & RPA	APR	
Candidate 1	7(16)	11-14	17(26)	19-22	13(24)	15-20	12(20)	13-17	11(20)	12-16	153
Candidate 2	16(17)	11-14	17(24)	16-20	18(25)	16-21	13(21)	14-17	14(23)	15-19	166

Note. RP = Raw Pointed Earned; RPA = Raw Points Available (in parentheses); APR = Average Performance Range

#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 included 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 (**Connection to Initial Special Education Individualized General and Independence Curriculum Combined can be found in the rubric and data tables below.**):

- 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 Standard7)

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 federal and local legislation and accompanying policies and regulations related to special education services for children with disabilities in the District of Columbia. Provide at least two specific examples of how laws are applied in "real-

life” situations in relation to at least two of the following: referral and identification, behavior, Individualized Education Programs, Due Process, and dispute resolution.

2. Characteristics and development of children with special needs. Include examples of qualifying criteria for individuals from at least five of the thirteen categories of disabilities. Discuss how culture, language, and socioeconomic play a role in evaluation of characteristics and development. Finally, discuss how characteristics and development should be considered in various stages: early childhood, elementary school, middle and high school (beginning transition), and movement from school employment or other post-secondary opportunities.
3. The educational assessment and placement procedures established under IDEIA and related local law. Be specific about how culture, language, race, and socioeconomic status may play a role in this process. Provide at least two “real-life” examples of how these procedures are applied in schools.
4. The impact of an exceptional condition on the child’s life. Pay specific attention to the intersection of race, culture, and language. In addition, discuss how a teacher may use such considerations to support student success.
5. The interaction of culture and language with evaluation, diagnosis, and treatment of exceptional conditions. A). Discuss how barriers and resources for working with families from different cultures and/or who speak different language. B). Specifically discuss barriers and resources regarded to working with English Language Learners. Describe how language differences may play a role in the identification of disabilities. Provide at least two specific examples of how you can apply your knowledge of this interaction when evaluating individuals, and developing Individualized Education Programs for students.
6. The importance of collaboration between school, families, and community support systems. Describe at least two specific procedures that could be used to ensure collaboration between the 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) ISCI 6 K1	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. Does not provide specific examples of "real-life application of the laws. 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. Provides at least two specific examples of application of the laws. The presentation may contain one or more minor errors or omissions.	The presentation thoroughly and knowledgeably summarizes D.C. and federal law related to special education services, clearly explaining the impact of those laws on children and families in particular. Explanations are clearly stated. Provides at least two specific "real-life" examples of application of the laws. No factual errors or critical omissions are noted.
Issue #2: Characteristics and Development (CEC Standard 1, Development and varying abilities and	The presentation may include noticeable errors or omissions that could lead to confusion or conveying misinformation to the audience. The	The presentation adequately summarizes information on the range of special education categories used in the D.C. school	The presentation clearly and knowledgeably summarizes information on the range of special education categories

Criteria	Approaches	Meets	Exceeds
<p>behavior)</p> <p>ISCI 1 K2</p>	<p>descriptions of special education categories may not reflect a clear understanding of characteristics or developmental aspects of a range of special needs. No discussion of the role of culture, race, language, and socioeconomic status and development through various stages of schooling. The tone may not be respectful in describing characteristics of students.</p>	<p>system, and describes characteristics of students at different age levels. Development of discussion of the role of culture, race, language, and socioeconomic status and development through various stages of schooling. One or two omissions or minor errors may be noted.</p>	<p>and characteristics of students who are placed in one or more category. Clear and excellent development of discussion of the role of culture, race, language, and socioeconomic status and development through various stages of schooling. The tone of this discussion is knowledge 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>
<p>Issue #3: Assessment and Placement Issues</p> <p>(CEC Standard 4, Multiple types of assessment)</p> <p>IGC1 S1 IIC3 S1</p> <p>ISCI 4 K2 IIGC4 K2 IIC4 K2</p>	<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. Does not provide specific examples of how culture, language, race, and socioeconomic status may play a role in this process; and at least two "real-life" examples of how these procedures are applied in schools.</p>	<p>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. Provides specific examples of how culture, language, race, and socioeconomic status may play a role in this process; and at least two "real-life" examples of how these procedures are applied in schools. One or two omissions or minor</p>	<p>The presentation clearly and knowledgeably summarizes laws and practices related to assessment and placements, with concise explanations of key terms, concepts, and assessments used. Provides specific examples of how culture, language, race, and socioeconomic status may play a role in this process; and at least two "real-life" examples of how these procedures are applied in schools. No factual errors or critical omissions are noted.</p>

Criteria	Approaches	Meets	Exceeds
<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> <p>ISCI 1 K4</p> <p>ISCI 6K7</p>	<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.</p>	<p>errors may be noted.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The presentation comprehensively deals with the topic of exceptionality and quality of life, and includes suggestions and resources related to family support systems and parent-school collaboration.</p>
<p>Issue #5a: Interaction of Culture and Language with Diagnosis and Treatment</p> <p>(CEC Standard 1, Cultural perspectives and interaction with families; CEC Standard 6: Professional and Ethical Practice)</p> <p>ISCI 1 K7</p> <p>ISCI 1K13</p> <p>ISCI 1 K5</p> <p>IGC6 K1</p> <p>IIC6 K1</p>	<p>The presentation may not adequately address this topic, or reflects a biased or stereotyped approach to cultural norms. The coverage of this topic may be overly abstract.</p>	<p>The presentation adequately addresses and includes examples of factors, related to 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).</p>	<p>The presentation addresses how cultural and family differences must be taken into consideration in diagnosis and treatment. The presentation includes suggestions or alternatives for school-family collaboration that deal respectfully and knowledgeably with a range of family and cultural differences.</p>
<p>Issue #5b: Interaction of Culture and <u>Language</u></p> <p>(CEC Standard 1, Educating ELN</p>	<p>The presentation may not adequately address this issue, or may not clearly articulate the problems faced by children with</p>	<p>The presentation adequately addresses complications as well as solutions for educating children with exceptional needs who</p>	<p>The presentation reflects strong knowledge of both the problems and resources available in educating children who</p>

Criteria	Approaches	Meets	Exceeds
students whose primary language is not English) ISCI 1 K13 ISCI 1 K15	exceptional needs who are also English language learners (ELLs), as well as the services provided by schools in this area.	are also ELLs, or whose parents speak limited English.	are ELLs, or whose parents speak limited English. The presentation addresses how language barriers can mask or be mistaken for learning disabilities.
Issue #6: Collaboration (CEC Standard 7, Collaborating with families and other service providers) ISCI 7 K2 ISCI 1 K3	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. Little to no description of at least two procedures that support collaboration between schools families and communities.	The presentation adequately addresses the important role of school, family, related service providers, and community collaboration in educating children with special needs. Description of at least two procedures that support collaboration between schools families and communities.	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. Excellent description of at least two procedures that support collaboration between schools families and communities.

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). Specifically, less candidates exceeded the standards (with more candidates meeting the standards) related to identifying specific legal principles associated with assessment, and discussing considerations related to particular disabilities. In addition, more candidates met than exceeded in describing specific theories and research methods that form the basis for special education practice. 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. Specifically, many candidates exceeded the standards in their ability to discuss the relationship between disability and the family, identify characteristics of culture and the environment that should be considered when working with students with disabilities, and in identifying the roles of

individuals with exceptionalities, their families and other stakeholders in the Individualized Education Program Development process.

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 2015 to focus more on law and policy, assessment, and characteristics and development in order to support continued growth of candidates in this area. Specifically, we focused on application of federal and local laws and policies that relate to IEP compliance, and choice of various forms of assessment.

All 11 candidates in the summer 2015 course met or exceeded expectations in each area. For each issue number, 7-8 candidates (64-73 percent respectively) exceeded the standard. For each issue number, between 3-4 candidates (27-36 percent respectively) met the standard. The results show more consistency across domains from the previous years. Candidates who met the standard included responses that lacked detail. We have revised the assignment to include more specific criteria, so that candidates clearly understand the need to develop the presentation in detail in order to show an in-depth understanding of each issue.

Data Table

Criteria	Summer 2013						Summer 2014						Summer 2015					
	Approach		Meets		Exceeds		Approach		Meets		Exceeds		Approach		Meets		Exceeds	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Overall Organization and Presentation	1	20	2	40	2	40	0	0	0	33	4	66	0	0	4	36	7	64
Issue #1 CEC Standard 6 (Law and Policy) ISCI 6 K1	1	20	3	60	1	20	0	0	2	33	4	66	0	0	4	36	7	64
Issue #2 CEC Standard 1 (Char. & Dev.) ISCI 1 K2	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	1	16	5	84	0	0	4	36	7	64
Issue #3 CEC Standard 4 (Assessment) IGC1 S1 IIC3 S1 ISCI 4 K2 IIG4 K2 IIC4 K2	1	20	2	40	2	40	0	0	1	16	5	84	0	0	3	37	8	73
Issue #4 CEC	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	0	0	6	100	0	0	3	27	8	73

#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 was part of EDTE 637, Preparation of Individualized Learning Prescriptions, and was completed in candidates' second academic year. In Fall 2015, program revisions were made to the entire special education MAT program of study. A new course, EDCC 606: Assessment and Development of Individualized Learning Prescriptions course was developed. Beginning in Spring 2016, this Key Assessment will be included in EDCC 606. 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 is included below. Alignment with the Specialty Set (Initial Special Education Individualized General and Independence Curriculum Combined) is included in the scoring rubric and data table.

A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for is included 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; CEC Standard 4)
- 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 2)
- Classroom Accommodations (CEC Standard 5)
- Assessment Accommodations (CEC Standard 4)
- Transition Plan (CEC Standard 5)
- Assessment Interpretation and Application (CEC Standard 4)

KEY ASSESSMENT

Individualized Education Program (IEP)

Description of the Assignment and its Use in the Program

The assessment is part of EDCC 606: Assessment and Preparation of Individualized Learning Prescriptions (formerly part of EDTE 637: Preparation of Individualized Learning Prescriptions). 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.

Through the completion of the following Individualized Education Program components, candidates are able to demonstrate their ability to meet the CEC standards described above and in the scoring rubric

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 16 year-old student in the 10th 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.

Individualized Education Program (IEP)

STUDENT INFORMATION

Student Name	Grade	Gender	DOB	Language
Maria James	9	F	02/06/XXXX	English

ELIGIBILITY / IEP INFORMATION

Last Eligibility Meeting Date	Last IEP Annual Review	Primary
Disability 01/31/XXXX	02/08/XXXX	Specific Learning Disability

1 Signatures of IEP Team Participants

IEP MEETING PARTICIPANTS

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.

Participant Role	Name	Attended Meeting?	Signature
Student			

2, 3 PRESENT LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE AND ANNUAL GOALS (by area of concern)

AREA OF CONCERN Academic – Mathematics		
Present Level of Educational Performance		
<p>Maria is able to add and subtract with regrouping. She can calculate single digit by single-digit multiplication problems and simple double digit by single digit division problems without the support of a calculator. She is able to solve double digit multiplication and division problems with the support of a calculator.</p> <p>Based on WJ III tests conducted on 12/8/XX, 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 9th 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.</p> <p>Based on STAR MATH diagnostic assessments conducted on 9/15/XX, 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.</p>		
Needs:	Impact on the student:	
Annual Goal 1:		
Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement	Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:

Annual Goal 2:		
Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement	Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:

AREA OF CONCERN Academic – Written Expression		
Present Level of Educational Performance		
<p>A recent DRA 2 assessment suggests Maria reads at a DRA 2 “50”, which is a 5th grade independent reading level. Her QRI score was a 5.2, which indicates a 5th grade reading level as well. Maria experiences some difficulty with decoding multi-syllable words and with comprehension.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Challenges: Maria struggles with consistently applying strategies related to the writing process and often needs support with each step. She needs assistance generating ideas, constructing an outline, writing a rough draft, editing, revising and publishing.</p>		
Needs:	Impact on the student:	
Annual Goal 1:		
Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement	Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:
	6/15/XX	
Annual Goal 2:		
Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement	Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:
	6/15/XX	

4 AREA OF CONCERN		
Communication – Speech and Language		
Present Level of Educational Performance		
<p>A speech-language evaluation had been recommended for Maria, as evidenced in previous IEPs dating back to 2014, 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.</p> <p>A WJ III was completed in December 2014. 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, 05/30/2014) 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.</p>		
Needs:	Impact on the student:	
Annual Goal 1:		
Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement	Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:
Annual Goal 2:		
Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement	Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:

5 AREA OF CONCERN
Emotional, Social, and Behavioral Development
Present Level of Educational Performance
<p>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.</p>

Maria seems overwhelmed this year by her classes and seems unable to grasp some of the academic content. She often has trouble completing assignments in a timely manner. She frequently seems able 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 improved over time. However, her organizational skills seem to decline 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 seems to need support in following through with the application process.

Needs:	Impact on the student:

Annual Goal 1:

Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement	Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:

Annual Goal 2:

Baseline:	Anticipated Date of Achievement	Evaluation Procedures and Schedule:

SPECIAL EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES

Special Education Services

Service	Setting	Begin Date	End Date	Time/Frequency
Resource Specialist Services	General Education Classroom and Small Group Setting Outside			10 hrs per wk

	General Education Classroom			
--	-----------------------------	--	--	--

Related Services

Service	Setting	Begin Date	End Date	Time/Frequency
Speech-Language Pathology				4 hours per month
Transition Support				4 hours per month

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	10 hours per week	
Speech-Language Pathology	4 hours per month	
Behavioral/Occupational Support Services	4 hours per month	

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
Presentation	Presentation

<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 indicates she enjoys her history and social studies courses because she says they are “interesting”. 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, but expresses interest in trying out for a school play or chorus.</p>
<p>Employment Interests: Maria indicates she 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		[school guidance counselor]
Assessment Tool(s): Informal meeting with student and observations		
<p>Interpretation of Results Summary for Post-Secondary Education and Training Maria expressed an 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. This may be a goal for which Maria should be encouraged to do further research.</p> <p>It appears that Maria’s would like to gain full-time employment at “any job,” while continuing to pursue other career interests in her spare time. To that end, her special education teacher has helped her write a resume, and complete job applications for</p>		

Giant Food, Whole Foods, Safeway, Burger King, CVS, and others. To date, one potential employer has called her in for an interview. However, she was not prepared for interview and did not receive an offer for employment. 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.

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.

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, 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

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:

TRANSITION SERVICES FOR EMPLOYMENT

Service	Setting	Time	Projected Begin Date	Projected End Date

AREA: Independent Living

Long Range Goal(s):

SHORT-TERM MEASURABLE GOALS

Short-Term Measurable Goal:	
Baseline:	Anticipated date of achievement:

TRANSITION SERVICES FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING

Service	Setting	Time	Projected Begin Date	Projected End Date

IEP DEVELOPMENT RUBRIC

Criteria	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
<p>1. Identification of IEP team participants</p> <p>(CEC Standard 7, Collaboration)</p> <p>ISCI 7 K2</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; CEC Standard 4 Assessment)</p> <p>ISCI 1 K3</p> <p>ISCI 4 S5</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</p>	<p>Statements of annual goals and baselines in math, reading, and writing are adequately designed to address student needs in each area.</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</p>

<p>ISCI 5 S1 ISCI 5 S5</p>	<p>data. Several goals statements are not clear or are not written in such a way that they are measurable. Many goals may be overly 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.</p>	<p>Statements reflect a generally accurate interpretation of and attention to test data and other information. Baseline statements are accurate and sufficiently concrete to 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.</p>	<p>that allow for them to be evaluated, but are sufficiently broad or deep to identify the areas of academic need and focus. Baseline statements in all cases are well suited to support the measurement of goals.</p>
<p>4. Communication Concerns (CEC Standard 1, Learner Development and Individual Differences) IGCI K10 IIC1 K10</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>

		relates to areas of concern in the area of speech, language, or other communicative functions.	
<p>5. Emotional, Social and Behavioral Development</p> <p>(CEC Standard 1, Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences)</p> <p>ISCI 1 K11 IGC1 K4 IIC1 K4</p>	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 supported by the student information provided.	Needs and impact statements adequately summarize the behavioral improvements that will encourage the student toward greater self-empowerment and more productive behaviors. Annual 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.	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 motivations, interests, and family background. Goals are also concise, thorough, and professionally written in measurable terms.
<p>6. Justification for Instructional Services apart from the General Education setting</p> <p>(CEC Standard 2, Learning Environments)</p> <p>IIC2 K5</p>	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.
<p>7. Classroom Accommodations</p>	Accommodations may be incomplete,	All accommodations reflect acceptable	All accommodations are appropriate and

<p>(CEC Standard 5, Instructional Strategies)</p> <p>ISCI 5 S1 ISCI 5 S13</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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>
--	---	---	--

<p>8. Assessment Accommodations</p> <p>(CEC Standard 4, Assessment)</p> <p>IGC4 S3 IIC4 S3</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</p> <p>(CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning)</p> <p>IIC5 K5 ISCI 5 S18</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</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</p>

	suited for the student's meeting her maximum potential and personal goals.		educational opportunities.
<p>10. Assessment Interpretation and Application</p> <p>(CEC Standard 4, Assessment)</p> <p>ISCI 4 S5</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. The last 3 administrations of this assessment are included in the report below (fall 2013; fall 2014; fall 2015). 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 team participants (CEC Standard 7)
- Academic Concerns – Needs and Impact Statements (CEC Standard 1; CEC Standard 4)
- 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 2)
- Classroom Accommodations (CEC Standard 5)
- Assessment Accommodations (CEC Standard 4)
- Transition Plan (CEC Standard 5)
- Assessment Interpretation and Application (CEC Standard 4)

Data from fall 2013 and fall 2014 indicated that most candidates exceeded the standards in all areas. Although we are pleased that our candidates excel, we were also concerned regarding grade inflation and critical evaluation of the assignment. Furthermore, we want to be sure the assignment is robust. Thus, in the faculty training for fall 2015, there was a larger focus on grade inflation and critical evaluation of all assignments. The program coordinator also reviewed grading expectations with the instructor for the course for fall 2015. This seems to have had some impact on overall scores.

Summary of results:

During the fall 2013 and fall 2014 semesters, a majority of candidates exceeded expectations in all areas, with the fall 2013 scores indicating that only one student met expectations in one areas (identification of participants) and all candidates scoring “exceeds” in all additional areas. Fall 2015 results differed from previous administration of the Key Assessment. During this semester, two candidates scored “approaches” in a number of areas including identifying participants, articulating academic and social/behavioral concerns, and identifying communication concerns. One candidate received a grade in the course that will require him to retake the course. The other candidate with “approaches” in a number of areas was asked to amend the assignment and resubmit in order to show understanding of these concepts.

Overall, candidates exhibited relative strengths in writing about academic and behavioral needs and the impact on the student, and in transition planning and assessment interpretation with 70-80 percent of candidates scoring exceeds in these areas. For example, candidates showed strengths in ability to identify resources and techniques used to support transition from school to post-school environments. Some candidates seem to need more support in writing present levels of performance and 2 (20 percent) approached expectations, 4 (40 percent) met expectations, and 4 (40 percent) exceeded expectations. Candidates showed relative weaknesses in justification for removal from general education and classroom accommodations. Thus, the Least Restrictive Environment legislation and regulations were

reviewed and discussed. This suggests that although candidates are adept at interpreting formal and informal assessments, some require more support in selecting, adapting, and modifying assessments to accommodate the unique needs of learners in their classrooms.

The revised course, EDCC 606: Assessment and Preparation of Individualized Learning Prescriptions allows for re-evaluation of the assignment in order to address some of the relative weaknesses in the scores. Candidates will be asked to practice writing present levels of performance a number of times throughout the course. In addition, the course includes more rigorous instruction in selecting, adapting, and modifying assessments, in addition to more instruction in outlining meaningful accommodations.

Data Table

Criteria	Fall 2013						Fall 2014						Fall 2015					
	Appr.		Meets		Exceeds		Appr.		Meets		Exceed		Appr.		Meets		Exceeds	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Identification of IEP team participants	0	0	1	20	4	80	0	0	2	25	6	75	2	20	1	10	7	70
CEC Standard 7 ISCI 7 K2																		
Academic Concerns	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	2	25	6	75	2	20	4	40	4	40
CEC Standard 1; Standard 4 ISCI 1 K3 ISCI 4 S5																		
Academic Concerns	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	2	25	6	75	1	10	1	10	8	80
CEC Standard 5 ISCI 5 S1 ISCI 5 S5																		
Communication Concerns	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	2	25	6	75	2	20	1	10	7	70
CEC Standard 1 IGCI K10 IIC1 K10																		

CEC Standard 5 IIC5 K5 ISCI 5 S18	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	25	6	75	0	0	2	20	8	80
CEC Standard 4 ISCI 4 S5																							

#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, Curricular Content ISCI 3 K1 ISCI 3 K2 ISCI 3 K3	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. Lessons are based on College and Career Ready Standards	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. Lessons are based on College and Career Ready Standards.
CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning and Strategies Use of interdisciplinary approaches when teaching content ISCI 5 S76	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' CEC Standard 5	Does not always design or teach lessons in a way that reflects understanding of the cognitive and social/behavioral developmental	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.

<p>Instructional Planning Strategies</p> <p>ISCI 1 K12</p> <p>IGC1 S1 IIC3 S1</p>	<p>level of the student.</p>		
<p>Activates prior knowledge and experiences</p> <p>CEC Standard 5: Planning and Instruction</p> <p>IGC5 S11 IIC5 S5</p>	<p>Does demonstrate some awareness of the importance of prerequisite knowledge; however, is inconsistent in activating students' prior knowledge.</p>	<p>Consistently helps students make connections between current content and their own background and experiences.</p>	<p>Lessons include deliberate opportunities for students to discover the connections between current content and life experiences. Students see the purpose and the "big picture."</p>
<p>Teaching to individual learning abilities</p> <p>CEC Standard 1, Individual Learning Differences; CEC Standard 5</p> <p>IGC1 S1 IIC3 S1</p> <p>ISCI 5 S15</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Demonstrates awareness that lesson plans take into account the needs of various learners. Appropriate adaptations are a routine part of planning and delivery.</p>	<p>Articulates clearly individual student goals and expectations. Individualized instruction is designed with the goal of challenging all students to achieve their potential.</p>
<p>Selection of resources to meet range of individual needs: special education to gifted</p> <p>CEC Standard 5, Instructional Strategies</p> <p>ISCI 5 K2</p> <p>IGC5 K1 IIC5 K1</p> <p>ISCI 5 S76</p>	<p>Rarely or never selects evidence-based practices that are validated for specific characteristics of learners and settings.</p> <p>Has limited knowledge of additional resources and attempts to meet the individual needs of some students (i.e., low-achieving or</p>	<p>Sometimes selects evidence-based practices that are validated for specific characteristics of learners and settings.</p> <p>Routinely utilizes supplemental materials and outside resources with students at both ends of the learning curve.</p> <p>Sometimes selects resources that</p>	<p>Routinely selects evidence-based practices that are validated for specific characteristics of learners and settings.</p> <p>Actively seeks out resources from the community or professional organizations and utilizes these sources and materials for the benefit of varied learners.</p> <p>Routinely selects</p>

	<p>gifted) by assessing resources.</p> <p>Rarely or never selects resources that respond to cultural, linguistic and gender differences.</p>	<p>respond to cultural, linguistic, and gender differences.</p>	<p>resources that respond to cultural, linguistic and gender differences.</p>
<p>Expectations for learning and achievement</p> <p>CEC Standards 2 & 5, Learning Environments & Instructional Planning and Strategies</p> <p>ISCI 2 K4 ISCI 2 S4 ISCI 2 S7</p> <p>ISCI 5 S17</p>	<p>Conveys inconsistent expectations for student achievement through instructional goals and activities, interactions, and the classroom environment, Instructions are appropriate for the grade level or course.</p>	<p>Appropriately challenges students to reach their potential; gives positive feedback to students but does not lower expectations for their achievement.</p>	<p>Consistently encourages and creates opportunities for students to achieve and exceed. Creates supportive and nurturing learning environments that promote student success and access; exceptional at providing positive feedback for students</p>
<p>Selecting resources for general instruction</p> <p>CEC Standard 5, Instructional Strategies</p> <p>IGC5 K1 IIC5 K1</p> <p>ISCI 5 S7</p>	<p>Displays limited awareness and/or use of resources 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>Often seeks out multiple resources for teaching, including 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>Routinely seeks out multiple resources for teaching, including technology or adaptive technology, selecting those most appropriate for comprehensiveness and accuracy. Always makes a deliberate attempt to allow for multiple ways of learning. Seeks out and uses resources from professional 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</p>

			students.
<p>Best practices: multiple teaching strategies, active learning, modeling</p> <p>CEC Standard 5, Instructional Strategies</p> <p>ISCI 5 S8 ISCI 5 S15</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 plans and delivery of instruction show multiple 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>ISCI 5 S2 ISCI 5 S12 ISCI 5 S17</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 assess 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. Consistently encourages self-motivation and self-control.</p>
<p>Positive climate for intrinsic motivation</p> <p>CEC Standard 2, Learning Environment</p> <p>ISCI 2 K4 ISCI 2 S1</p>	<p>Candidate sometimes encourages positive behavior and study habits. Candidate encourages students to appreciate others.</p>	<p>Classroom environment is positive; students are encouraged to support and respect each other. Candidate clearly shows a caring attitude toward all students. Mostly, creates a safe environment in which diversity is valued.</p>	<p>Classroom environment is consistently supportive and nurturing for all students. Consistently creates a safe environment in which diversity is valued.</p>

<p>Establishing expectations for behavior</p> <p>CEC Standard 2, Learning Environments</p> <p>ISCI 2 S2</p> <p>ISCI 2 S 10</p>	<p>Standards of conduct appear to have been established for situations and most students seem to understand them, if not consistently follow them.</p>	<p>Standards of conduct are clear to all students. Candidate reviews and prompts behaviors when appropriate.</p>	<p>Standards of conduct for various situations are clear to students and appear to have been developed or revised with student participation.</p>
<p>Monitoring student behavior</p> <p>CEC Standard 2, Learning Environments</p> <p>ISCI 2 S11</p> <p>ISCI 2 S9</p>	<p>Generally aware of student behavior but may miss the activities of some students. May neglect to use positive reinforcement.</p>	<p>Is consistently alert to student behavior, uses positive reinforcement and behavior prompts.</p>	<p>Monitoring is subtle and preventive. Students are encouraged to monitor their own and their peers' behavior in appropriate ways. Consistent use of positive reinforcement.</p>
<p>Response to student behavior</p> <p>CEC Standard 2, Learning Environments; CEC Standard 5, Intervention</p> <p>ISCI 2 K3</p> <p>ISCI 2 K4</p> <p>IGC5 S9</p> <p>IGC5 S22</p>	<p>Attempts to respond to behavioral issues but with uneven results. May not intervene or intervene appropriately when student behavior is inappropriate or potentially harmful to self or others.</p>	<p>Response to negative or socially inappropriate behavior is handled well, in ways that respects the student's dignity and mitigates impact on the learning environment for other students.</p>	<p>Response to inappropriate behavior is highly effective and sensitive to student's individual needs. Assists students in making appropriate behavior choices. Consistently strives to maintain an environment in which all students feel safe and non-threatened.</p>
<p>Discussion techniques with student participation</p> <p>CEC Standard 5. Instructional Strategies</p> <p>ISCI 5 S2</p> <p>ISCI 5 S14</p>	<p>May not consistently demonstrate ability to communicate effectively with all students, including students with communication disorders.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Use of media and</p>	<p>Candidate may not</p>	<p>Lessons consistently</p>	<p>Takes initiative to</p>

<p>technology: felt/magnetic boards, charts, film/overhead projectors, computers (Internet, PowerPoint, Distance Learning, etc.) as available.</p> <p>CEC Standard 5, Instructional Strategies</p> <p>ISCI 5 S7</p>	<p>consistently make use of or know how to use available instructional technology.</p>	<p>use media and/or technology to add instructional impact and increase learning.</p>	<p>integrate new technology formats and curriculum. Quality and depth are consistently strong.</p>
<p>Purposeful learning activities based on essential skills and district curriculum</p> <p>CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning</p> <p>ISCI 5 S15 IGC5 S12 IGC5 S24</p>	<p>Activities may follow an organized progression but are not completely compatible with the required curriculum or individualized instructional plans.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Learning activities follow a well-organized progression and follow the school/district curriculum requirements and/or individualized instructional plans.</p>
<p>Short- and long-term planning</p> <p>CEC Standard 5, Instructional planning</p> <p>ISCI 5 S1 ISCI 5 S8</p>	<p>Short-term planning is evident and lessons may be consistently prepared. There 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). Rarely plans in collaboration with</p>	<p>Long-term planning with connections to past/future teaching is clearly evident and prepared in advance of teaching, Long-term and transitional plans are linked to students' needs and performance. Plans in collaboration with team members when possible. Attention to transitional planning when appropriate.</p>	<p>Responds to unanticipated sources of input, evaluates plans in relation to short and long term goals. Plans in collaboration with team members when possible. Has a clear understanding of the "big picture" for planning. Attention to transitional planning when appropriate.</p>

	team members.		
Lesson plans: monitoring and adjustments CEC Standard 4, Monitoring Student Learning ISCI 5 S11	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.	Routinely checks for understanding within the lesson. Makes major adjustment to plans to meet student needs, interests and motivation.
Variety of formal/informal assessments CEC Standard 4, Assessment ISCI 4 S8 IGC4 S3	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. Assessments are rarely or never adapted based on the unique abilities and needs of students.	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. Assessments are mostly adapted based on the unique abilities and needs of students.	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. Assessments are routinely adapted based on unique abilities and needs of students.
Assessment data used in lesson planning/ adjustment CEC Standard 4, Using Assessments to Adjust Lesson Planning ISCI 4 S8	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 CEC Standards 4	Feedback to families and students is timely but may only be	Feedback includes qualitative comments to highlight strengths or needs, or	Learners/families are involved in setting criteria for evaluation. Feedback is

& 7, Provides Assessment Results to Family and Students ISCI 4 S7 ISCI 7 S2	minimal (just a score).	implications for future educational planning.	individualized and includes personal goal setting. Descriptive rubrics are created and shared with students and families.
Recording and Monitoring Assessment Data CEC Standard 4, Assessment ISCI 4 S9	Scoring of papers and written records are adequate but require frequent monitoring to avoid errors.	System for scoring and recording data is fully effective and up-to-date.	System is highly effective and transparent. May demonstrate ability to see trends and instructional implications in aggregate data.
Reflection on teaching (written journal and conversations) CEC Standard 6, Professional Learning and Ethical Practice ISCI 6 S11	Generally accurate impression of a lesson's success. Offers vague, general suggestions for improvement or is dependent on supervisor's ideas. Open to suggestions.	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.	Is able to critically analyze a lesson weighing the relative strengths and weakness. Offers alternative actions complete with probable successes with different approaches. Actively seeks constructive criticism.
Relationships with colleagues CEC Standard 7, Collaboration with Colleagues ISCI 7 S6	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.	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.	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.
Professional	Participates in	Consistently	Demonstrates levels

<p>growth (includes student teaching requirements and portfolio)</p> <p>CEC Standard 6, Professional Learning and Ethical Practice</p> <p>ISCI 6 S12</p>	<p>professional activities that are provided. Conducts him/herself in a professional manner most of the time. Some student teaching requirements are not completed.</p>	<p>demonstrates 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>of leadership on a 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, Professional Learning and Ethical Practice</p> <p>ISCI 6 S12</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>ISCI 6 S14</p> <p>IIC6 S3</p>	<p>Identifies special needs of some students but does communicate concerns with other teachers or staff.</p> <p>Rarely or never seeks information regarding community resources for children with exceptionalities.</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. Often seeks information regarding community resources for children with exceptionalities.</p>	<p>Routinely demonstrates sensitivity for the culture, language, religion, gender, disability, socioeconomic status, and sexual orientation. Demonstrates concern for all aspects of a child's well-being. Takes steps to stop discrimination or harassment among students. Respects the privacy and confidentiality of student information.</p> <p>Always seeks information regarding community resources for children with</p>

			exceptionalities.
<p>Respectful and productive communication with families.</p> <p>CEC Standard 7, Collaboration</p> <p>ISCI 7 S1</p> <p>ISCI 7 S3</p> <p>ISCI 7 S4</p>	<p>Adheres to the existing formats for communication with parents. Needs to be reminded to communicate with individual student's parents.</p> <p>Respects the privacy of students and confidentiality of information.</p>	<p>Teams with other teachers and staff 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>Respects the privacy and confidentiality of student information.</p>	<p>Teams with other teachers and staff 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 are connected to social support networks and/or learning opportunities and special resources</p> <p>Respects the privacy and confidentiality of student information.</p>

Lesson Plan Template

Lesson Overview	Name:	Date:
	Grade/Subject/Class:	Unit/Theme/Topic:
Standards	Common Core or State Standard(s): What content standard(s) are you specifically addressing in this lesson? (<i>Hint: These need to be focused. Be sure to select only standards that clearly relate to your lesson.</i>)	
Lesson Objectives	Specifically, in measurable language, what do you want students to know and be able to do by the end of the lesson? Be sure to include all components of a measurable objective (Conditions, Performance/Behavior, and Criteria) and Blooms Taxonomy. (<i>Hint: Be sure that these are focused and that they relate directly to the standards selected.</i>)	
Rationale	Provide an explanation of the reasons you are teaching this lesson including the importance for children of this age to learn this material. Discuss developmentally appropriate practices. Describe the instructional approaches and methods you will follow in presenting the material.	
Materials	<p>Materials/Equipment/Preparation: List all materials including texts and assistive technology that are needed to teach this lesson. List items to help you organize yourself before the lesson. Make sure you write or draw an agenda and review it with the students. If you are using technology, set up and practice before the lesson.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials • Assistive Technology • Agenda • Texts/books 	
Planning for Learning Differences*	<p>Accommodations: Explain how you will use accommodations to meet student needs. This includes students with a variety of exceptionalities. (<i>Note: Accommodations will vary depending on the specific issue and the nature of the lesson presented. "Learning differences" is broadly inclusive and not limited to students with identified special needs.</i>)</p>	
	<p>Differentiation: Explain how you will reach students with a variety of learning preferences. For example, use of Universal Design for Learning (multiple methods of presentation, multiple methods of engagement, and multiple options for assessment). (Example: English Language Learners, Enrichment, etc.)</p>	
Assessment	Explain how you will check for understanding <i>during</i> the lesson. Explain how you will determine whether students have met the lesson objective(s) <i>at the end</i> of the lesson.	

*Learning differences include (but are not limited to): English Language Learner needs, enrichment needs, and cultural differences.

Lesson Sequence and Steps (Including Introduction, Demonstration, Guided Practice, Independent Practice, Assessment and Closure)

Time/Duration (e.g., 9:00-9:30, or 10-15 minutes)	Sequence of Steps: Detail each step you will use to acquire the desired outcome from your introduction through closure. (Hint: You will likely include more than six steps. When typing into this document, just add on to the steps).	Materials and Differentiation (Describe specific materials and how you will differentiate instruction in this section).
Introduction:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purpose and Objective: State purpose and/or objective of the lesson to the students in student friendly language. (“Students will be able to…”). <i>Be sure that you are communicating to the students specifically what you expect them to learn/be able to do by the end of the lesson.</i> 2. Value: Indicate to the students WHY this is worthwhile for the students. 3. Engagement: Show how you will scaffold or bridge from past lessons, grab student attention, and/or create interest in the lesson. 	
Core Instruction/Activities	<p>Core activities may include demonstration or modeling, guided practice, independent practice/extension, and assessment/evaluation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. 5. 6. <p>Continue numbering as needed...</p>	
Closure/Wrap-up:	<p>Closure/Wrap-up: This is the “wrap-up” portion of the lesson, where the teacher helps students recall what they have learned in the lesson. Teacher reinforces lesson objective(s).</p>	

School and Family Partnership

Homework or Home Family Connection	Create a homework assignment to go along with the lesson. Demonstrate home/school connections.
---	--

Reflective Practice

	<p>Student learning: How do you know the students did/did not meet the lesson objectives? What evidence from your assessment supports your answer?</p> <p>Your teaching: What did you learn about teaching from this lesson? What was successful? What would you do differently? What were your proud of?</p>
--	---

Analysis of the Data

During the last three academic semesters (fall 2014, spring 2015, fall 2015), 11 out of 12 candidates met or exceeded the standards measured in the Student Teaching assessment. In the fall of 2015, one candidate approached the standards in all areas. Thus, ninety-two percent of candidates demonstrated their pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions during their student teaching experience. The one candidate experienced significant difficulty meeting the requirements for the assessment and the course. **All “approaches” discussed below are represented by this one candidate.** This candidate did not pass the course and a remediation plan has been put in place for this candidate that requires the candidate to retake the course along with additional courses in reading instruction, behavior management, and differentiating instruction.

Knowledge of Content (CEC Standard 3): Sixty-six percent of candidates exceeded expectations in this area, and 25 percent met expectations. One candidate approached expectations in this area. This was a relative strength of the candidates. This may be due to the fact that a number of candidates teach and support students for at least a part of the day in general education classrooms. Overall, candidates showed understanding of local College and Career Ready standards, and understanding of the curriculum used in each school location or classroom. In addition, we revised some of our courses to include more emphasis on content area knowledge and more instruction on how to make content accessible to students with diverse learning needs. This may be a reflection of these adjustments to the course content.

Use of Interdisciplinary approaches (CEC Standard 5): Sixty-six percent of candidates exceeded expectations and 25 percent met expectations. One candidate approached expectations in this area. This shows that overall, candidates were able to select and implement a variety of strategies with learners with exceptionalities.

Development and Characteristics (CEC Standard 1): Sixty-six percent of candidates exceeded expectations and 25 percent met expectations. One candidate approached expectations in this area. Candidates showed understanding of different ways of learning of individuals with exceptionalities. This was a relative strength of the candidates.

Activates Prior Knowledge (CEC Standard 5): Eighty-three percent of candidates exceeded expectations in this area and eight percent met expectations in this area. One candidate approached expectations here. Candidates showed understanding of the importance of activating prior knowledge. Specifically, they met or exceeded the initial specialty set standards by showing they were able to use instructional methods that may compensate for deficits in memory, comprehension, and retrieval.

Individual Learning Abilities (CEC Standard 1; CEC Standard 5): Eighty-three percent of candidates exceeded expectations in this area and eight percent met expectations in this area. One candidate approached expectations here. 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): Eighty-three percent of candidates exceeded expectations in this area and eight percent met expectations in this area. One candidate approached expectations. Candidates were able to choose resources that were appropriate for students with diverse needs.

Expectations for Learning (CEC Standards 2 & 5): Eighty-three percent of candidates exceeded expectations in this area, with 8 percent meeting expectations. One candidate approached expectations in this area. Candidates established clear and high learning expectations for all students.

Selecting Resources for General Instruction (CEC Standard 5): Seventy-five percent of candidates exceeded expectations in this area, and sixteen percent met expectations in this area. Candidates were able to select resources for general instruction including textbooks and supplemental materials.

Best Practices (CEC Standard 5): Eighty-three percent of candidates exceeded expectations in this area, with eight percent meeting expectations. One candidate approached expectations. For the most part, 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): Eighty-three percent of candidates exceeded expectations in this area, with eight percent meeting expectations. One candidate approached expectations. This appears to be a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program. Specifically, candidates excelled supporting increased self-awareness, self-management, and self-control.

Positive Climate (CEC Standard 2): Ninety-two percent of candidates exceeded expectations in this area, while one candidate approached expectations in this area. As mentioned in the introduction to this section, this candidate will be required to take a behavior management course and part of requirement for graduation and licensure approval. The data shows that this is a relative strength of candidates in the program.

Establishing expectations (CEC Standard 2), Monitoring and Responding to Behavior (CEC Standards 2 & 5): Sixty-six percent of candidates exceeded the standard, while twenty-five percent met the standard, with one student approaching expectations. Although many candidates exceeded, this appears to be a relative weakness when compared to other standards. Specifically, candidates seem to need more preparation on positive behavior management strategies and monitoring of student behavior. The revised program of study that began in fall 2015 includes a behavior management course that will address this issue.

Discussion Techniques (CEC Standard 5): Sixty-six percent of candidates exceeded the standard, while twenty-five percent met the standard, with one student approaching expectations. Although many candidates exceeded, this appears to be a relative weakness when compared to other standards. The revised program of study that began in fall 2015 includes a behavior management course that will address this issue. .

Use of Media/Technology (CEC Standard 5): Fifty percent of candidates exceeded expectations, while 42 percent met expectations, and one candidate approached expectations. This appears to be an area where we could support our candidates more in order to achieve excellence. In addition, some of the teachers are limited in showing their knowledge of how to incorporate assistive and instructional technology due to the limited availability of technology at their school sites. Future program support may include requiring more use of technology in lessons throughout the course of student teaching placements; and collaboration with school sites to ensure some technology is available for candidate use during the student teaching internship.

Purposeful Learning Activities (CEC Standard 5): Sixteen percent of candidates met expectations in this area and 75 percent exceeded expectations. One candidate approached 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 66 percent exceeded expectations. One candidate approached expectations in this area. This appears to be a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program.

Lesson Planning (CEC Standard 5): Twenty-five percent of candidates met expectations in this area and 66 percent exceeded expectations. One candidate approached expectations in this area. 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 (see lesson plan template included in this document).

Using a Variety of Assessments (CEC Standard 4): Fifty-eight percent of candidates exceeded expectations, while 42 percent met expectations, with one candidate approaching expectations. Candidates required further development in skills in evaluation of instruction, and monitoring the progress of individuals with exceptionalities. This appears to be an area where we could support our candidates more in order to achieve excellence. We have developed a new assessment course (EDCC 606: Assessment and Preparation of Individualized Learning Prescriptions) in order to address use of assessment.

Use of Assessment Data and Evaluates Criteria and Feedback (CEC Standards 4 & 7): Fifty-eight percent of candidates exceeded expectations, while 42 percent met expectations, with one candidate approaching expectations. This appears to be an area where we could support our candidates more in order to achieve excellence. We have developed a new assessment course (EDCC 606: Assessment and Preparation of Individualized Learning Prescriptions) in order to address use of assessment.

Recording and Monitoring Progress (CEC Standard 4): Fifty-eight percent of candidates exceeded expectations, while 42 percent met expectations, with one candidate approaching expectations. This appears to be an area where we could support our candidates more in order to achieve excellence. We have developed a new assessment course (EDCC 606: Assessment and Preparation of Individualized Learning Prescriptions) in order to address use of assessment.

Reflection on Teaching (CEC Standard 6): Eight percent of candidates met expectations in this area and 75 percent exceeded expectations, and one (eight percent) candidate approaching expectations. Candidates were able to reflect on their own teaching practice to improve instruction. 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): Seventy five percent exceeded expectations in these areas, while sixteen percent met expectations, and 8 percent (one student) approached expectations in this

area. This appears to be a relative strength of the candidates and, thus, a relative strength of the program.

Participation (CEC Standard 6): Eighty three percent of candidates exceeded expectations in this area, while 8 percent met expectations, and 8 percent approached 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 of candidates exceeded expectations in this area, while 8 percent met expectations, and 8 percent approached 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 of candidates exceeded expectations in this area, while 8 percent met expectations, and 8 percent approached 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: behavior management; and assessment. In order to address these areas, we have added a classroom management and positive behavior supports course to the program of study beginning in fall 2015. We will also focus more on assessment in a number of courses, and have developed a new course on assessment (EDCC 606 Assessment and Preparation of Individualized Learning Prescriptions), also available to candidates enrolling after summer 2015.

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.

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, one candidate approached expectations in all area. This candidate has been placed on an extensive remediation plan that requires retaking the student teaching internship course, along with enrolling in, and completing a number of courses related to behavior management and instructional strategies.

Data Table

Criteria	Fall 2014				Spring 2015				Fall 2015									
	Approaches		Meets		Exceeds		Approaches		Meets		Exceeds		Approaches		Meets		Exceeds	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Knowledge of Content, CEC Standard 3 ISCI 3 K1 ISCI 3 K2 ISCI 3 K3	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	1	12	6	75
Interdisciplinary Approaches CEC Standard 5 ISCI 5 S1	0	0	1	33	1	66	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	12	1	12	6	75
Developmental Characteristics, CEC Standard 1 ISCI 1 K12	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	1	12	6	75
IGC1 S1 IIC3 S1	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	7	88
Prior Knowledge and Experiences Standard 5 IGC5 S11 IIC5 S5	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	7	88
Individual Learning Abilities, CEC Standard 1; CEC Standard 5 IGC1 S1 IIC3 S1 ISCI 5 S15	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	7	88

Selection of Resources, CEC Standard 5 IGC5 K1 IIC5 K1	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	7	88
ISCI 5 S7	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	12	0	6	75
Expectations for Learning, CEC Standards 2 & 5	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	1	12	0	75
ISCI 2 K4	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
ISCI 2 S4	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
ISCI 2 S7	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
ISCI 5 S17	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
Selecting Resources, CEC Standard 5	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
IGC5 K1	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
IIC5 K1	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
ISCI 5 S7	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
Best Practices, CEC Standard 5	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
ISCI 5 S8	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
ISCI 5 S15	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
Candidate Role in Instructional Process, CEC Standard 5	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
ISCI 5 S2	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
ISCI 5 S12	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
ISCI 5 S17	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	0	0	6	75
Oral and Written Language	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	1	12	6	75

Quality of Questions	0	0	2	66	3	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	2	24	5	63
Positive Climate, CEC Standard 2 ISCI 2 K4	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	7	88
ISCI 2 S1	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	7	88
Establishing Expectations, CEC Standard 2 ISCI 2 S2	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	12	2	24	5	63
ISCI 2 S10	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	12	2	24	5	63
Monitoring Behavior, CEC Standard 2 ISCI 2 S11	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	12	2	24	5	63
ISCI 2 S9	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	12	2	24	5	63
Response to Behavior, CEC Standards 2 & 5 ISCI 2 K3	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	12	2	24	5	63
ISCI 2 K4	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	12	2	24	5	63
IGC5 S9	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	12	2	24	5	63
IGC5 S22	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	12	2	24	5	63
DISCUSSION TECHNIQUES, CEC STANDARD 5 ISCI 5 S2	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	12	2	24	5	63
ISCI 5 S14	0	0	2	66	1	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	3	38	4	50
Use of Media and Technology, CEC Standard 5 ISCI 5 S7	0	0	2	66	1	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	3	38	4	50

Purposeful Learning Activities, CEC Standard 5 ISCI 5 S15 IGC5 S12 IGC5 S24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	12	1	12	24	5	6	75
Short and Long-term Planning, CEC Standard 5 ISCI 5 S1 ISCI 5 S8	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	100	1	12	2	12	24	5	63		
Lesson Plans, CEC Standard 5 ISCI 5 S11	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	100	1	12	2	12	24	5	63		
Variety of Assessments, CEC Standard 4 ISCI 4 S8	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	100	1	12	2	12	24	5	63		
IGC4 S3																									
Assessment data, CEC Standard 4 ISCI 4 S8	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	100	1	12	2	12	24	5	63		
Evaluates Criteria and Feedback, CEC Standards 4 & 7 ISCI 4 S7	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	100	1	12	2	12	24	5	63		
ISCI 7 S2																									
Recording and Monitoring Assessment Data, CEC Standard 4 ISCI 4 S9	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	100	1	12	2	12	24	5	63		

Reflection of Teaching, CEC Standard 6 ISCI 6 S11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	1	12	6	75	
Relationships with Colleagues, CEC Standard 7 ISCI 7 S6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	2	24	5	63	
Professional Growth, CEC Standard 6 ISCI 6 S12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	1	12	6	75	
Participation, CEC Standard 6 ISCI 6 S12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	1	12	6	75	
Sensitivity to Student Needs, CEC Standard 6 ISCI 6 S14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	1	12	6	75	
IIC6 S3																												
Communication with Families, CEC Standard 7 ISCI 7 S1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	2	24	5	63	
ISCI 7 S3 ISCI 7 S4																												

#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 (**Alignment with the Specialty Set: Initial Special Education Individualized General and Independence Curriculum Combined is included in the scoring rubric and data table.**):

- 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 Learning and Ethical Practice)

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

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 or interventions (this is determined based on skill or behavioral need) and assess students throughout the implementation of the lessons or interventions. 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 5-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, your 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 general education, resource classroom, or self-contained setting.

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 and 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 and 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 you may adapt based on 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 and Ethical Practice)

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 ISCI 1 K3 ISCI 1 K7 ISCI 1 K11 ISCI 1 K12	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. Candidate includes consideration of	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. Candidate

	Candidate shows no or little consideration of cultural, language, or other socioeconomic factors that may impact the student.	cultural, language, or socioeconomic factors that may impact the student.	includes an exceptional explanation of consideration of cultural, language, or other socioeconomic factors that may impact the student.
C. Learning Environments CEC Standard 2 ISCI 2 K1 IGC2 K2 IIC2 K3	The candidate's response may have 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.	The candidate adequately 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.	The candidate selected and 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.
Phase II			
A. Learning Goals and Objectives CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning and Strategies ISCI 5 S5	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.	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.	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>B. Research-Based Strategies for Instruction</p> <p>CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning and Strategies</p> <p>ISCI 5 K2 IGC5 S1 IIC5 S1</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 in the essay.</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 research.</p>
<p>Phase III</p>			
<p>A. Lesson Overviews (CEC Standard 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies)</p> <p>ISCI 5 S8</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Lesson plans were complete and reasonably detailed. Instructional adaptations used within group instruction were clear.</p>	<p>Lesson plans were very well presented and detailed. The candidate clearly gave careful thought to planning differentiated instruction across groups and individual students.</p>
<p>B. Assessment Plan</p> <p>CEC Standard 4, Assessment</p> <p>ISCI 4 S4</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>C. Assessment Design</p> <p>CEC Standard 4, Assessment</p> <p>ISCI 4 S4</p>	<p>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 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>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 designed and suited to the assessment format. Assessments are appropriate to the needs and learning styles of individual students.</p>	<p>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 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>ISCI 4 S7</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</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>

		the role of data in drawing conclusions about student learning.	
Phase V Reflection			
Reflection CEC Standard 6, Professional Learning and Practice ISCI 6 S11	The essay may not be sufficiently developed for a reader to understand what the candidate learned from the 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.	The candidate's essay adequately reflects on aspects of the unit (and resultant learning data) that were 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.	The essay is a strong and well-developed exploration of the value and learning provided by the 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.

Analysis of the Data Findings

During the last three semesters (Fall 2014, Spring 2015, Fall 2015), 11 out of 12 (92 percent) candidates met or exceeded the standards measured in the Action Research Project on all sections. One candidate in Fall 2015 did not complete the project and therefore scored "approaches" in all areas. This candidate was asked to retake the course. In addition, a team in the School of Education offered a number of supports, including extra courses that will support the candidate in meeting expectations in the future course. All other 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 articulate changes they may make in the future to increase their impact.

More candidates scored “exceeds” (66 percent) than “meets” (25 percent) in the areas of Learner Development, Learner Goals and Objectives, Lesson Overviews, Presentation of Data, and Reflection. Seventy-five percent of candidates scored “exceeds” in relation to analysis of learning environments, while sixteen percent “met” expectations. In the area of assessment planning and design, 58 percent scored “exceeds” in this area, and thirty-three percent “met” expectations. 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). Thus we have developed a new assessment course described in the paragraph below to support candidates in this area.

Placing more focus on this type of assessment and graphically representing the data could be included in EDCC 606: Assessment and Development of Individualized Learning Prescriptions 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	Fall 2014						Spring 2015						Fall 2015					
	Approaches		Meets		Exceeds		Approaches		Meets		Exceeds		Approaches		Meets		Exceeds	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Determining Scope and Content	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	12	2	25	5	62
Characteristics of Students CEC Standard 1, Learner Development ISCI 1 K3 ISCI 1 K7 ISCI 1 K11 ISCI 1 K12	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	2	25	5	62
Contextual Factors	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	1	12	6	75
CEC Standard 2 Learner Environment ISCI 2 K1 IGC2 K2 IIC2 K3	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	12	2	25	5	62
Learning Goals and Objectives	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	12	2	25	5	62
CEC Standard 5, Instructional Planning and Strategies ISCI 5 S5	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	1	12	6	75
Research-	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	12	1	12	6	75

Reflection	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	1	12	2	25	5	62	
CEC Standard 6, Professional Learning ISCI 6 S11																						

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 634, Teaching Students with Significant Disabilities. Previously, it was part of EDTE 629: Teaching Students with Learning and Emotional Disabilities. This course was revised to cover students with high incidence disabilities. The communication case study seemed a better fit for EDTE 634. Thus, all recent data included, represent the Key Assessment that was completed as a requirement for EDTE 634: Teaching Students with Significant 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 (CEC Standard 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies)
- The Role of Assistive and Augmentative Technology, CEC Standard 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies
- Cultural and Language Considerations, CEC Standard 1: Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences & Standard 5: Instructional Planning

Note: Alignment with the *Initial Special Education Individualized General and Independence Curriculum Combined Specialty Set* is indicated in the rubric and data table.

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

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 labeled with a mild intellectual disability 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. Her parents indicate she enjoys playing at the park and attending library hour on the weekends. 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 enjoys playing with her siblings. 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 enjoys watching Disney movies and mathematics. 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

Criteria	Approaches	Meets	Exceeds
Section I Instructional Planning for Children with Communicative Disorders			
<p>Ways in which exceptional conditions interact with language.</p> <p>CEC Standard 1</p> <p>IGCI K10 IIC1 K9</p> <p>IGCI K12</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Atypical and typical language development</p> <p>CEC Standard 1</p> <p>ISCI 1 K1 IGC1 K10 IIC1 K9</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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).</p>
<p>Individualized strategies to enhance language development</p> <p>CEC Standard 5</p> <p>ISCI 5 S19</p> <p>ISCI 5 S20</p>	<p>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 consideration and are adapted for each child's special needs as that</p>	<p>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-week unit. Strategies take</p>	<p>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'</p>

	applies to speaking, listening, reading and/or writing.	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.
<p>Working collaboratively to address needs of individuals with ELN</p> <p>CEC Standard 7</p> <p>ISCI 7 K1</p> <p>IGC7 K4</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>

Section II Assistive, Alternative and Augmentative Technology

<p>Choice and application of assistive technology</p> <p>CEC Standard 5</p> <p>ISCI 5 K3</p> <p>ISCI 5 S7</p> <p>ISCI 5 S19</p>	<p>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 with references.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
--	---	--	--

Section III Cultural and Language Considerations

<p>Facilitating understanding of subject</p>	<p>Strategies presented for Julia are limited or do not take into</p>	<p>The strategies for Julia described in the paper give adequate and</p>	<p>Strategies are well thought out. The candidate clearly takes</p>
---	---	--	---

<p>matter for individuals with ELN whose primary language is not English</p> <p>CEC Standards 3 and 5</p> <p>ISCI 3 S1</p> <p>ISCI 5 S76</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>reasonable considerations to Julia's needs for ESL services, as well as the coordination of those services with Julia's other ELNs.</p>	<p>the role of advocate and leader in terms of strategizing solutions and coordination of efforts.</p>
<p>Understanding interaction of primary language, culture, and family backgrounds with a student's ELN</p> <p>CEC Standard 1</p> <p>ISCI 1 K5</p> <p>ISCI 1 K7</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Overall structure and format</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>

Analysis of the Data Findings

The Communication Case Study was added in Spring 2012. The results for the last three administrations are described below.

Spring 2014

All candidates met or exceeded the standards for this assignment. Candidates seemed to struggle the most with choosing assistive technology and individualized strategies for language development. Candidates 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. Therefore, 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. Specifically, candidates showed ability to understand the impact language development may have on academic and non-academic learning, and the ability to develop implement strategies for culturally and linguistically diverse students with exceptionalities.

Spring 2015

In spring 2015, five candidates completed the Key Assessment. While two candidates met expectations for understanding how language interacts with exceptional conditions and atypical and typical language development, three candidates exceeded expectations. In terms of selection of strategies, one candidate approached expectations, one candidate met expectations, and three candidates exceeded expectations. The same scores were reflected in selecting strategies in order for students to access the general education curriculum. The candidate who scored “approached” in the two previous areas discussed, did not pass the course and repeated the course in fall 2015.

Candidates showed a relative strength in working collaboratively, with four candidates exceeding expectations and one candidate meeting expectations. Candidates demonstrated understanding of models and strategies for consultation and collaboration. The same scores were achieved for the areas of choosing assistive technology and AAC devices, and understanding family culture. These scores suggest relative strengths in these areas. A few candidates required more depth in their explanations of how culture may influence the relationships with families, schools, and communities in relation to instruction. Overall, this assessment appears to effectively prepare candidates to work with students with exceptional language needs, who speak a variety of languages, and reflect the diverse cultural and ethnic background

represented in many of our schools. The course will continue to emphasize the influence of culture to support strong candidate understanding of this topic.

Fall 2015

All candidates met or exceed expectations in each area. Candidates showed relative strengths in understanding atypical and typical language development, working collaboratively, choosing assistive technology devices, and facilitating instruction of students with disabilities who are English Language Learners with between 75-88 percent of candidates exceeding expectations, and 12-25 percent meeting expectations. In the areas of strategies for facilitating language development, and understanding interaction of language and primary culture, 38 percent of candidates met expectations, and 62 percent of candidates exceeded expectations.

Criteria	Spring 2014			Spring 2015			Fall 2015		
	App	Meets	Exceeds	App	Meets	Exceeds	App	Meets	Exceeds
and 5									
ISCI 3 S1									
ISCI 5 S76									
Understanding interaction of primary language, culture, and family backgrounds with a student's ELN	0	1	5	0	1	4	0	3	5
CEC Standard 1 ISCI 1 K5 ISCI 1 K7									
Overall structure and format	0	0	6	0	1	4	0	2	6
			100			80			75

#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 and short answer 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 all ten questions. **Alignment with CEC initial teacher preparation standards and the Alignment with the Specialty Set (Initial Special Education Individualized General and Independence Curriculum Combined) is included in the scoring rubric and data table.**

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

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) in Special Education must achieve qualifying scores on the Comprehensive Examination administered by the School of Education (qualifying scores described below).

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 in Special Education 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.

Comprehensive Exam Fall 2015

Introduction:

Teaching in the twenty-first century is a challenging task. Many of our classrooms include diverse student populations that differ in terms of socioeconomic status, language, race/ethnicity, and ability/disability. This exam covers areas associated with the Council for Exceptional Children Initial Teacher Preparation Standards.

Scoring: Students must score “meets” on 8 or more questions in order to obtain a passing score. “Meets,” demonstrates that you have answered the question completely and that the response shows clear understanding of the concept and standard; all information included in the response is accurate. “Exceeds,” demonstrates an exceptional response that shows in-depth understanding of the concept/standard. “Approaches” indicates the response is incomplete, includes inaccuracies, or shows only partial or no understanding of the concept and standard. Quality of writing is included in the score (please refer to the School of Education Writing Rubric for expectations).

Development and Learning Characteristics (CEC Standard 1)

1. The field of special education includes students who display a variety of learning differences. Describe the basic characteristics and defining factors for 3 of the following disabilities: specific learning disability, autism, intellectual disability, speech or language impairment, emotional/behavioral disability.
2. Describe the impact of language, cultural, and gender differences on the identification process. Provide specific examples. Illustrate one way in which the cultural/environmental context of a student’s life may affect the implementation of an IEP.

Learning Environment (CEC Standard 2)

3. The learning environments of a classroom as well as social interactions developed within each special education environment can be very important.
 - a. List and explain at least three (3) things that a special educator should do to promote a positive learning environment.
 - b. List and explain at least three (3) things that a special educator can do to support positive social interaction within the classroom.

Curricular Content Knowledge (CEC Standard 3)

4. Describe a grade-level standard(s) based lesson developed for students who perform significantly below and significantly above grade level. Explain how you will make grade level content accessible for these students.

Assessment (CEC Standard 4)

5. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching in special education. Explain clearly and in detail at least four (4) different ways an assessment can be adapted to support the unique learning needs of a student with a disability receiving special education services.

Instructional Planning and Strategies (CEC Standard 5)

6. Special Educators understand typical and atypical language development. Special educators address the language needs of the special needs student through appropriate instructional strategies. Identify two (2) techniques or methods that support a student with atypical language development. Describe the technique, how it is implemented, what the objective(s) would be in using the strategy, and how the effectiveness of the strategy would be assessed.
7. The instructional planning required by a special educator in order to meet the IEP goals of the student is extensive. Provide one example of an IEP goal appropriate for a student with an academic goal in reading comprehension and one example of a transition goal for a student who hopes to attend a local community college after graduating from high school. Explain in detail how you would implement each IEP goal.
8. In the field of special education there are many instructional strategies that support good instruction. Discuss in-depth how teachers should select evidence-based practices for students, including how teachers ensure the practice is evidence-based. Provide an example of an evidence-based practice.

Professional Learning and Collaboration (CEC Standards 6 and 7)

9. Professional and ethical practice is an important part of being a special education teacher. Provide a detailed example of a way in which special educators demonstrate professional and ethical practice in the following areas: behavior management planning and implementation; professional development and continuing education; legal aspects of identification and placement of students with disabilities; and collaboration with families.

10. Special educators work in collaboration with school colleagues, families, service providers and community agencies. What are the rights and responsibilities of each? What should be the role of each of these in supporting a student with special needs? How should these groups interact to serve a student receiving special education services? Give specific examples of how you can apply best practices in collaboration. Include specific examples of how language and culture may be considered in regard to collaboration.

Rubric (including alignment with Special Set: Initial Special Education Individualized General and Independence Curriculum Combined).

**Special Education Comprehensive Exam Rubric
Revised Fall 2015**

CEC Standards	Approaches	Meets	Exceeds
<p>Question 1 CEC Standard 1: Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences</p> <p>1.2 Candidate shows understanding of development and individual differences to respond to the needs of individuals with exceptionalities.</p> <p>ISCI 1 K2 ISCI 1 K3 ISCI 1 K8</p>	<p>Response includes little or no information regarding development and individual differences.</p>	<p>Response illustrates understanding of use of development and individual differences to response to the needs of individuals with exceptionalities.</p>	<p>Response illustrates a clear and in-depth understanding of use of development and individual differences to response to the needs of individuals with exceptionalities.</p>
<p>Question 2 CEC Standard 1: Learner</p>	<p>Response includes little or no information on how</p>	<p>Response illustrates adequate understanding of</p>	<p>Response illustrates and clear and in-depth understanding</p>

<p>Development and Individual Learning Differences</p> <p>1.1 Candidate shows understanding how language, culture, and family background influence the learning of individuals with exceptionalities.</p> <p>1.2 Candidate shows understanding of development and individual differences to respond to the needs of individuals with exceptionalities.</p> <p>ISCI 1 K3 ISCI 1 K5</p>	<p>language, culture, and family background influence learning.</p> <p>Response includes little or no information regarding development and individual differences.</p>	<p>how language, culture and background influence learning of individuals with exceptionalities.</p> <p>Response illustrates understanding of use of development and individual differences to response to the needs of individuals with exceptionalities.</p>	<p>of how language, culture and background influence learning of individuals with exceptionalities.</p> <p>Response illustrates a clear and in-depth understanding of use of development and individual differences to response to the needs of individuals with exceptionalities.</p>
<p>Question 3 CEC Standard 2: Learner Environments</p> <p>2.1 Beginning special education professionals through collaboration with general educators and other colleagues create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments to engage individuals</p>	<p>Shows little to no understanding of how through collaboration with general educators and other colleagues he/she can create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments to engage individuals with exceptionalities in meaningful learning activities and social interactions.</p>	<p>Shows understanding of how through collaboration with general educators and other colleagues he/she can create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments to engage individuals with exceptionalities in meaningful learning activities and social interactions.</p>	<p>Shows exceptional understanding of how through collaboration with general educators and other colleagues he/she can create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments to engage individuals with exceptionalities in meaningful learning activities and social interactions.</p>

<p>with exceptionalities in meaningful learning activities and social interactions.</p> <p>ISCI 2 K3 ISCI 2 K5</p>			
<p>Question 4 CEC Standard 3: Curricular Content Knowledge</p> <p>3.3 Beginning special education professionals modify general and specialized curricula to make them accessible to individuals with exceptionalities.</p> <p>ISCI 3 K2 ISCI 3 K3</p> <p>ISCI 3 S1</p>	<p>Shows little understanding of modification of general and specialized curricula to make them accessible to individuals with disabilities.</p>	<p>Shows adequate understanding of modification of general and specialized curricula to make them accessible to individuals with disabilities.</p>	<p>Shows little in-depth understanding of modification of general and specialized curricula to make them accessible to individuals with disabilities.</p>
<p>Question 5 CEC Standard 4: Assessment</p> <p>4.0 Beginning special education professionals use multiple methods of assessment and data-sources in making educational decisions.</p> <p>4.3 Beginning special education professionals in</p>	<p>Displays little to no understanding of use of multiple methods of assessment and engaging individuals with disabilities in meaningful assessment.</p>	<p>Displays some understanding of use of multiple methods of assessment and engaging individuals with disabilities in meaningful assessment.</p>	<p>Displays in-depth understanding of use of multiple methods of assessment and engaging individuals with disabilities in meaningful assessment.</p>

<p>collaboration with colleagues and families use multiple types of assessment information in making decisions about individuals with exceptionalities.</p> <p>4.4 Beginning special education professionals engage individuals with exceptionalities to work toward quality learning and performance and provide feedback to guide them.</p> <p>ISCI 4 S4 ISCI 4 S8</p> <p>IIC4 S6</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>Question 6 CEC Standard 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies</p> <p>5.3 Use of augmentative and alternative communication</p> <p>5.4 Enhancing language development and communication skills.</p> <p>ISCI 5 K3 ISCI 5 S19</p>	<p>Displays little to no understanding of typical and atypical language development. Displays little to no understanding of strategies for working with students with atypical language development.</p>	<p>Displays sufficient understanding of typical and atypical language development. Displays little to no understanding of strategies for working with students with atypical language development.</p>	<p>Displays in-depth understanding of typical and atypical language development. Displays little to no understanding of strategies for working with students with atypical language development.</p>
<p>Question 7 CEC Standard 5 Instructional Planning</p> <p>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.</p> <p>ISCI 5 S1 IGC5 S27</p>	<p>Displays little to no understanding of development and implementation of education and transition plans.</p>	<p>Shows a general understanding of development and implementation of education and transition plans</p>	<p>Displays exceptional understanding of development and implementation of education and transition plans.</p>

<p>Question 8 CEC Standard 5: Instructional Planning</p> <p>5.0 Beginning special education professionals select, adapt, and use a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to advance learning of individuals with exceptionalities.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>ISCI 5 K2 IGC5 S1</p>	<p>Shows little to no understanding of how to select evidenced-based instructional strategies for learners with exceptionalities.</p> <p>Shows little to no understanding of how to 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.</p>	<p>Shows adequate understanding of how to select evidenced-based instructional strategies for learners with exceptionalities.</p> <p>Shows adequate understanding of how to 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.</p>	<p>Shows exceptional understanding of how to select evidenced-based instructional strategies for learners with exceptionalities.</p> <p>Shows exceptional understanding of how to 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.</p>
<p>Question 9 CEC Standard 6: Professional and Ethical Practice</p> <p>6.1 Beginning special education</p>	<p>Shows little to no understanding of use of ethical principles and professional practice standards.</p> <p>Shows little to no understanding that diversity is a part of</p>	<p>Shows adequate understanding of use of ethical principles and professional practice standards. Shows adequate understanding that</p>	<p>Shows exceptional understanding of use of ethical principles and professional practice standards. Shows exceptional understanding that</p>

<p>professionals use professional Ethical Principles and Professional Practice Standards to guide their practice.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>ISCI 6 K2 ISCI 6 K13 ISCI 6 K14 IGC6 K3 ISCI 6 K7</p>	<p>families, cultures, and schools, and that complex human issues can interact with the delivery of special education services.</p>	<p>diversity is a part of families, cultures, and schools, and that complex human issues can interact with the delivery of special education services.</p>	<p>diversity is a part of families, cultures, and schools, and that complex human issues can interact with the delivery of special education services.</p>
<p>Question 10 CEC Standard 6: Professional and Ethical Practice</p> <p>6.1 Beginning special education professionals use professional Ethical Principles and Professional Practice Standards to guide their practice.</p> <p>6.3 Beginning special education professionals understand that</p>	<p>Uses little or no the theory and elements of effective collaboration</p> <p>Does not serve as a collaborative resource to colleagues.</p> <p>Shows little to no understanding of how to use collaboration to promote the well-being of individuals with exceptionalities across a wide range of settings and collaborators.</p>	<p>Uses the theory and elements of effective collaboration</p> <p>Serves as a collaborative resource to colleagues.</p> <p>Shows understanding of how to use collaboration to promote the well-being of individuals with exceptionalities across a wide range of settings and collaborators.</p>	<p>Uses the theory and elements of effective collaboration</p> <p>Serves as a collaborative resource to colleagues.</p> <p>Shows exceptional understanding of how to use collaboration to promote the well-being of individuals with exceptionalities across a wide range of settings and</p>

<p>diversity is a part of families, cultures, and schools, and that complex human issues can interact with the delivery of special education services.</p> <p>ISCI 6 K4 ISCI 6 K7 ISCI 6 K10</p> <p>CEC Standard 7: Collaboration</p> <p>7.1 Uses the theory and elements of effective collaboration</p> <p>7.2 Serves as a collaborative resource to colleagues.</p> <p>7.3 Shows understanding of how to use collaboration to promote the well-being of individuals with exceptionalities across a wide range of settings and collaborators.</p> <p>ISCI 7 K2 ISCI 7 K4 IGC7 K3</p>			<p>collaborators.</p>
--	--	--	-----------------------

Results:

Overall candidates met or exceeded expectations in all areas of the comprehensive exam. Five of the six students who took the revised exam in Fall 2015 passed the exam, scoring “meets” or “exceeds” on at least 8 out of 10 exam questions. For all areas where the candidate scored “approaches,” the program director debriefed with the candidate to clear up any misunderstandings and to provide the candidate with resources for information in a particular area. For example, one candidate scored approaches on question 1 because she described inaccurate qualifying criteria for a disability category. Thus, the program director reviewed qualifying criteria to be sure the candidate was clear.

One candidate did not pass the exam, scoring 3 approaches overall. This candidate was given opportunity to participate in review sessions with the program coordinator and provided additional review material. The candidate was provided an opportunity to retake the exam in January 2016, and successfully passed the exam.

Question 1 (CEC Standard 1: Learner Development and Differences): For this question, one (16 percent) candidate approached expectations, while one (16 percent met expectations), and four (sixty-six percent) exceeded expectations. The remediation for the candidate who scored “approaches” is described in the previous paragraph. Overall, the candidates understood qualifying criteria. Some were able to articulate the criteria in more detail than others.

Question 2 (CEC Standard 1: Learner Development and Differences): Candidates scored very strongly on this question, indicating an area of strength in the program. One candidate (sixteen percent) met expectations in this area, while five candidates (eighty-three percent) exceeded expectations. Candidates showed a thorough understanding of cultural and language considerations. This may be to the diversity of the candidates themselves and the program focus on social justice.

Question 3 (CEC Standard 2: Learner Environments): Two candidates (33 percent) met expectations in this area, while four candidates (sixty-six percent) exceeded expectations. Overall, candidates were able to describe strategies for developing a positive learning environment and supporting social skills and social interaction.

Question 4 (CEC Standard 3: Curricular Content Knowledge): One candidate (sixteen percent) approached expectations in this area, while two candidates (33 percent) met expectations, and three candidates (fifty percent) exceeded expectations. The one candidate who approached expectations did not answer the question at all, indicating that she ran out of time. She was afforded the opportunity of a study session with the program coordinator and provided with additional study materials to retake the exam. Generally, candidates were able to

explain how a standards-based lesson could be adapted for students with diverse learning needs. Some provided more detail and additional examples that allowed for a score of “exceeds.”

Question 5 (CEC Standard 4: Assessment): Two candidates (33 percent) met expectations in this area, while four candidates (sixty-six percent) exceeded expectations. Candidates were able to explain a variety of ways to support access to assessment for students with diverse learning needs.

Question 6 (CEC Standard 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies): Candidates showed relative strength in understanding typical and atypical language development, and supporting communication of students with disabilities. This may be due to the inclusion of the Communication Case Study (Key Assessment 6) included in EDTE 634: Teaching Students with Significant Disabilities. One (16 percent) student met expectations in this area, while five students (eighty-three percent) exceeded expectations.

Question 7 (CEC Standard 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies): Two candidates (33 percent) met expectations in this area, while four candidates (sixty-six percent) exceeded expectations. Overall, candidates were able to articulate meaningful measurable goals and describe how they would support students in meeting these goals.

Question 8 (CEC Standard 5: Instructional planning and strategies): Three candidates (50 percent) met expectations in this area, while three candidates (50 percent) exceeded expectations. While all candidates showed some understanding of evidence-based practice (EBP) and where to get information related to EBP, some described EBP in more detail and provided more examples how where to find EBP.

Question 9 (CEC Standard 6: Professional and Ethical Practice): Two candidates (33 percent) met expectations in this area, while four candidates (sixty-six percent) exceeded expectations. Candidates seemed to understand expectations of professional and ethical practice in the field.

Question 10 (CEC Standards 6 and 7: Professional and Ethical Practice and Collaboration): This was a strength of the candidates. One candidate met expectations, while five candidates (eighty-three percent) exceeded expectations. Candidates were able to articulate the roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders in the field, and describe how special educators should collaborate with them.

Data Table

Criteria	Fall 2015					
	Approaches		Meets		Exceeds	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Question 1 CEC Standard 1: Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences ISCI 1 K2 ISCI 1 K3 ISCI 1 K8	1	16	1	16	4	66
Question 2 CEC Standard 1: Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences ISCI 1 K3 ISCI 1 K5	0	0	1	16	5	83
Question 3 CEC Standard 2: Learner	0	0	2	33	4	66

Environments								
ISCI 2 K3								
ISCI 2 K5								
Question 4	1	16	2	33	3	50		
CEC								
Standard 3:								
Curricular								
Content								
Knowledge								
ISCI 3 K2								
ISCI 3 K3								
ISCI 3 S1								
Question 5	0	0	2	33	4	66		
CEC								
Standard 4:								
Assessment								
ISCI 4 S4								
ISCI 4 S8								
IIC4 S6								
Question 6	0	0	1	16	5	83		
CEC								
Standard 1								
Learner								
Development								
and								
Differences								
ISCI 5 K3								
ISCI 5 S19								
Question 7	1	16	2	33	3	50		
CEC								
Standard 5								
Instructional								
Planning								

ISCI 5 S1 IGC5 S27	0	0	3	50	3	50
Question 8 CEC Standard 5: Instructional Planning ISCI 5 K2 IGC5 S1	0	0	2	33	4	66
Question 9 CEC Standard 6: Professional and Ethical Practice ISCI 6 K2 ISCI 6 K13 ISCI 6 K14 IGC6 K3 ISCI 6 K7	0	0	1	16	5	83
Question 10 CEC Standard 6: Professional and Ethical Practice CEC Standard 7: Collaboration ISCI 7 K2 ISCI 7 K4 IGC7 K3	0	0	0	0	0	0

#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)

Note: Alignment with the Specialty Set (Initial Special Education Individualized General and Independence Curriculum Combined) is included in the scoring rubric and data table.

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

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. For some of the papers, (e.g., position paper #3 and position paper #4) candidates are asked to write about how they have actively applied the standards. In addition, they are asked to include "artifacts" that support their

answers. 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 reference to current models, theories, and philosophies that form the basis for special education practice. 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. Be sure to cite relevant research to support your statement.

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 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 have employed toward actively engaging students in a standards-based lesson, using a College and Career Ready standard (or standards when applicable) of their choice. They also must discuss instructional strategies they will use to prepare students to take a test on the subject matter.

Strategies should be designed for two different (hypothetical, if necessary) students who are performing at different grade level, and have different exceptional characteristics or diagnoses. In the paper, be sure to specify (a) the standard, learning objective, 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 describe the theory and research-base that support each strategy, *and the process you used* in choosing the strategy.

Candidates may base this position paper on actual students in the classroom in that case, be sure to disguise identities of your students.

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

In this paper, candidates are asked to describe ways that they have structured the learning environments that respect and celebrate language and cultural differences. In addition, they are asked to explain how they adapt the physical environment for students with various exceptionalities. Candidates are asked to provide sketches or artifacts for support.

Candidates write a brief response to each statement and include at least one supporting sketch or "artifact" for each statement.

#1. Describe the process you have used to create a learning environment that respects the language and culture of all students. Please provide one piece of evidence (e.g. a photograph of your classroom; handout; and sketch of the classroom) to support your response.

#2. Describe how you have adapted the physical environment to provide optimal learning experiences for specific students with exceptionalities. Please provide one piece of evidence (e.g. a photograph of your classroom; handout; and sketch of the classroom) to support your response.

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

CEC Standard 7 (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 ISCI 6 K1</p>	<p>The candidate's philosophy of special education is not clearly enough articulated or too generalized. Does not include models, theories or philosophies that form the basis for special education practice. 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. Includes information on the models, theories and philosophies that form the basis for special education practice. 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. Exceptional description related to the models, theories and philosophies that form the basis for special education practice. 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>ISCI 7 K7</p> <p>ISCI 3 S1</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</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</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</p>

Criteria	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
	achieving them may not appear relevant or supported by the description of the child. No mention of specific accommodations put in place to access general education curriculum.	to and integrate the child's ELN, interests or motivators, and family support system. Identifies specific accommodations to access the general curriculum.	goals, that are sound, practical, and supported by best practices, which are referenced and documented by the paper. Excellent description of accommodations put in place to access general curriculum.
<p>Position Paper 3 – Instructional Strategies</p> <p>CEC Standard 5</p> <p>ISCI 5 K2</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>

Criteria	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
<p>Position Paper 4 – Learning Environment</p> <p>CEC Standard 2</p> <p>IGC2 K8 IIC2 K2</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 students, developmental level of students, or range of special needs to be accommodated by the classroom.</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 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.</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, 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>
<p>Position Paper 5 – Advocacy and Collaboration</p> <p>CEC Standard 7</p> <p>ISCI 7 K1</p> <p>IGC7 K2 IIC7 K2</p>	<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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>

Criteria	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
	<p>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 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>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 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>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 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 CEC Standard 6 ISCI 6 K13 ISCI 6 S11</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</p>	<p>The paper adequately conveys that the candidate understands the role and value of continuous professional development and</p>	<p>The paper provides a very detailed and knowledgeable discussion of the role and value of professional development and lifelong learning.</p>

Criteria	Approaches Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
ISCI 6 S12	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 professional knowledge and skills, or to keep abreast of research or developments in the field.	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 one that is represented by professional associations, advanced degree options, and the candidate's appreciation and use of these structures for further professional growth.	The paper strongly conveys the candidate's commitment to his/her chosen field.

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: fall 2014; spring 2015; fall 2015. 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 candidates meeting or exceeding the standards in each area. For example, 66 percent of candidates exceeded expectations in relation to an established philosophy of special education and teaching students with disabilities that were rooted in current models, theories, philosophies, and research; whereas, 34 percent met expectations in this area.

Similarly, 66 percent of candidates exceeded expectations on position paper 2, with 34 percent meeting expectations. This suggests that overall, candidates can clearly describe how students with disabilities can be supported in accessing the curriculum via appropriate accommodations.

Position paper 3 dealt with instructional strategies, and 50 percent of candidates scored exceeds in this area, with 50 percent meeting expectations. Although candidates were able to describe best practices in this area, some did not describe the research base behind the practice(s) in detail; thus, scoring a "meets" instead of "exceeds."

In relation to learning environment (position paper 4), 58 percent of candidates exceeded expectations, while 42 percent met expectations. Candidates were able to describe how they have structured learning environments in ways that celebrate culture and language differences. Furthermore, they provided clear descriptions of how they adapt the physical environment for students with disabilities.

In relation to advocacy and collaboration (position paper 5), 80 percent of candidates exceeded expectations, while 20 percent met expectations, suggesting a relative strength in this area. Lastly, 66 percent of candidates scored exceeds in relation to professional development (position paper 6), with 34 percent meeting expectations.

Overall, candidates showed relative strengths in the areas of philosophy, accommodations, advocacy and collaboration, and professional development. They showed relative weaknesses in instructional strategies and learning environments. It seems we need to provide more background and review related to the evidence-base of the methods introduced throughout the program. We have developed a new course, EDCC 606: Assessment and Development of Individualized Learning Prescriptions, which focuses on the criteria for Evidence-Based Practices, and how to locate and identify Evidence-Based practices for instruction. In relation to learning environment, the newly developed course, EDCC 542: Classroom Management and Positive Behavior Supports, provides candidates with information on developing culturally responsive classroom environments, and highlights strategies for adapting environments for students with exceptionalities (such as Autism) in ways that promote student learning.

Data Table

Criteria	Fall 2014						Spring 2015						Fall 2015					
	Approaches		Meets		Exceeds		App		Meets		Exceeds		App		Meets		Exceeds	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Position Paper 1, Philosophy CEC Standard 6 ISCI 6 K1	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	3	38	5	62
Position Paper 2, Accommodating Individual Learning Needs CEC Standards 1 &3	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	3	38	5	72
ISCI 7 K7																		
ISCI 3 S1																		
Position Paper 3, Instructional Strategies CEC Standard 5	0	0	2	66	1	33	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	4	50	4	50
ISCI 5 K2																		
Position Paper 4, Learning Environment CEC Standard 2	0	0	2	66	1	33	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	2	24	6	75
IGC2 K1 IIC2 K2																		
Position Paper 5, Advocacy and Collaboration	0	0	1	33	2	66	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	12	7	78