

Special Education BSE Program Assessment Report for AY 2016-17



April 11, 2018

Bruce Smith
Professor of Special Education
501.569.8940
bdsmith@ualr.edu

Table of Contents

Introduction to the Program	3
Vision.....	3
Mission.....	3
Program requirements.....	4
Course of Study.....	5
Program Goals and Alignment with Arkansas Department of Education and Council for Exceptional Children Standards	5
Key Assessments	9
Key Assessment Data, Analyses, and Interpretations	10
Assessment 1 Content Knowledge: Licensure and Professional Examinations.....	10
Assessment 2: Content Knowledge: Assessment of Content Knowledge in Special Education.....	12
Assignment 3: Lesson Plan.....	14
Assessment 4: AR-TESS and CEC Evaluation of Internship Experience.....	18
Assessment 5: Case Study.....	25
Assessment 6: IEP.....	30
Assessment 7: Reflection on Teaching.....	35
Assessment 8: Professional Development Plan.....	37
Assessment 9: Exit Portfolio.....	39
Assessment 10: Exit Portfolio Presentation.....	42
Continuous Improvement Process	44
Stakeholder Involvement/Communication Plan	45
Appendix 1: Program Data Review Form	46

Special Education BSE Program 2018 Assessment Report for AY 2016-17

The School of Education offers the Bachelor of Science in Education (BSE) Degree in Special Education, leading to licensure for teaching students with disabilities from Kindergarten through 12th grade. This new program started in the Fall 2015 semester and its first completers graduated in the Spring 2017 semester.

Vision

The Special Education Teacher Licensure Program envisions a world in which all individuals with disabilities are provided quality-of-life opportunities and experiences in natural environments, including the general education environment.

Mission

The mission of the Special Education Program is to promote and strengthen the professional development of individuals involved in the education of children and youth with disabilities in a variety of settings, including schools, early childhood settings, and community settings through the development of professionals who will use state of the art methodologies and technologies. The program mission aligns with the Specialized Professional Association, Council for Exceptional Children ([CEC](#)), College of Education and Health Professions, and [Arkansas Department of Education](#) standards and performance expectations.

- Graduates will demonstrate a commitment to the education of people with varying degrees of disabilities across the developmental span. Graduates will possess knowledge and skills in teaching and learning, assessment and identification and instructional planning, including attention to different racial and cultural backgrounds. It is the belief of the faculty that this commitment is achievable through the provision of supported educational opportunities in school, and community settings. Graduates will also demonstrate skills in the use of technology, working with families, collaboration, and evaluation.
- Graduates will continue to systematically advance their professional knowledge and skills in response to the changing needs of individuals with disabilities and the programs designed to serve them. Toward that end, the program seeks to foster skills and dispositions associated with reflection and continuous professional renewal.
- Graduates are expected to develop and maintain effective communication and technology skills including the use of these skills in communicating in accessible ways to individuals who require assistive technology.
- Graduates are expected to maintain sensitivity and awareness of cultural and ethnic differences among professionals, families, and individuals with disabilities.

The Special Education program is committed to diversity by the nature of the population targeted for service. Extending that commitment is accomplished in multiple fashions throughout the program.

1. Student recruitment activities include identification of diverse cultural and ethnic populations, including persons with disabilities.
2. Core courses reflect attention to serving diverse populations, giving specific attention to culturally diverse families and professionals.
3. Program faculty is committed to collaborating with colleagues regarding diversity issues as they relate to students with disabilities in the general education setting.
4. The program has a communication component that seeks to infuse communication with culturally and ethnically diverse populations.

Admission to the program will only be considered if the student has completely met the following requirements:

- Formal [admission to UALR](#).
- Cumulative 2.70 GPA
- Completion of the UALR and CEHP [General Education Core](#)* to include:
 - College Mathematics or College Algebra (MATH 1315/1302)**
 - Composition I and II (RHET 1311 & 1312)**
 - Speech Communication (SPCH 1300)**
 - Passing scores on [Praxis Core Exams](#) ***
 - Completion of all background checks (FBI, State Police and Child Maltreatment)

* Students seeking admission to the college with associate's degrees designed for transfer (Associate of Arts, Associate of Arts in Teaching, and some Associate of Science degrees) may be fully admitted with audit for equivalent Core Courses and Passing Praxis scores upon full admission to UALR.

** with grade C or above

*** Note that Praxis and/or GRE scores take approximately three (3) weeks for UALR to receive the scores.

Once admitted, students are required to:

- Maintain a 2.75 grade point average, with at least a C in all courses specific to the special education program.
- In addition, students' professional behaviors, content knowledge, and classroom performance will be evaluated throughout the program.
- Successful completion of the licensure program is not based solely on the number of course credits, but requires demonstration of specified professional knowledge, skills, and behaviors. While a student may require additional time to meet some performance expectations, the faculty may limit that time and reserves the right to remove a student from the program should appropriate progress not be demonstrated

Completion of the Program:

- A GPA of 2.75 and completion of all courses on the degree plan with required grades.
- Passing scores on the [Praxis II](#) exams
- Submission of all required artifacts into [Chalk & Wire Electronic Portfolio](#)

Course of Study ([BSE SPED Study](#))

The 122-hr program includes the 35-hr CEHP general education core; 27 hours of teacher education courses; 36 hours of special education professional core courses, including two 45-hr field experiences (one in special education settings with students with mild disabilities and one in special education settings with students with moderate/severe/profound disabilities); and 24-hrs of two semesters of internship with corresponding internship seminars (one in elementary special education setting and one in a secondary special education setting).

Program Goals Alignment with Arkansas Department of Education and Council for Exceptional Children Standards

The initial licensure program's assessment system aligns with both [The Arkansas Teaching Standards](#) and the [Council for Exceptional Children's Initial Preparation Standards](#). These two sets of professional standards represent the program's specific learning objectives for our candidates upon completion of the program.

The CEC Initial Preparation Standards represent the specialized knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the profession demands all beginning special education teachers must master to assure the public that they can provide safe and effective practices in teaching students with disabilities.

Specialized Professional Association Candidate Outcomes

Upon Completion of the Program, Candidates will meet the following CEC Initial Preparation Standards for beginning special educators:

- 1.0 Standard 1: Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences. Beginning special education professionals understand how exceptionalities may interact with development and learning and use this knowledge to provide meaningful and challenging learning experiences for individuals with exceptionalities.
 - 1.1 Beginning special education professionals understand how language, culture, and family background influence the learning of individuals with exceptionalities.
 - 1.2 Beginning special education professionals use understanding of development and individual differences to respond to the needs of individuals with exceptionalities.
- 2.0 Standard 2: Learning Environments. Beginning special education professionals create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments so that individuals with exceptionalities become active and effective learners and develop emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and self-determination.

- 2.1 Beginning special education professionals through collaboration with general educators and other colleagues create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments to engage individuals with exceptionalities in meaningful learning activities and social interactions.
- 2.2 Beginning special education professionals use motivational and instructional interventions to teach individuals with exceptionalities how to adapt to different environments.
- 2.3 Beginning special education professionals know how to intervene safely and appropriately with individuals with exceptionalities in crisis.
- 3.0 Standard 3: Curricular Content Knowledge. Beginning special education professionals use knowledge of general and specialized curricula to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities.
 - 3.1 Beginning special education professionals understand the central concepts, structures of the discipline, and tools of inquiry of the content areas they teach , and can organize this knowledge, integrate cross-disciplinary skills, and develop meaningful learning progressions for individuals with exceptionalities
 - 3.2 Beginning special education professionals understand and use general and specialized content knowledge for teaching across curricular content areas to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities
 - 3.3 Beginning special education professionals modify general and specialized curricula to make them accessible to individuals with exceptionalities.
- 4.0 Standard 4: Assessment. Beginning special education professionals use multiple methods of assessment and data-sources in making educational decisions.
 - 4.1 Beginning special education professionals select and use technically sound formal and informal assessments that minimize bias.
 - 4.2 Beginning special education professionals use knowledge of measurement principles and practices to interpret assessment results and guide educational decisions for individuals with exceptionalities.
 - 4.3 Beginning special education professionals in collaboration with colleagues and families use multiple types of assessment information in making decisions about individuals with exceptionalities.
 - 4.4 Beginning special education professionals engage individuals with exceptionalities to work toward quality learning and performance and provide feedback to guide them.
- 5.0 Standard 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies. Beginning special education professionals select, adapt, and use a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies 6 to advance learning of individuals with exceptionalities.
 - 5.1 Beginning special education professionals consider an individual’s abilities, interests, learning environments, and cultural and linguistic factors in the selection, development, and adaptation of learning experiences for individual with exceptionalities.
 - 5.2 Beginning special education professionals use technologies to support instructional assessment, planning, and delivery for individuals with exceptionalities.

- 5.3 Beginning special education professionals are familiar with augmentative and alternative communication systems and a variety of assistive technologies to support the communication and learning of individuals with exceptionalities.
 - 5.4 Beginning special education professionals use strategies to enhance language development and communication skills of individuals with exceptionalities
 - 5.5 Beginning special education professionals develop and implement a variety of education and transition plans for individuals with exceptionalities across a wide range of settings and different learning experiences in collaboration with individuals, families, and teams.
 - 5.6 Beginning special education professionals teach to mastery and promote generalization of learning.
 - 5.7 Beginning special education professionals teach cross-disciplinary knowledge and skills such as critical thinking and problem solving to individuals with exceptionalities.
- 6.0 Standard 6: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. Beginning special education professionals use foundational knowledge of the field and the their professional Ethical Principles and Practice Standards to inform special education practice, to engage in lifelong learning, and to advance the profession.
- 6.1 Beginning special education professionals use professional Ethical Principles and Professional Practice Standards to guide their practice.
 - 6.2 Beginning special education professionals understand how foundational knowledge and current issues influence professional practice.
 - 6.3 Beginning special education professionals understand that diversity is a part of families, cultures, and schools, and that complex human issues can interact with the delivery of special education services.
 - 6.4 Beginning special education professionals understand the significance of lifelong learning and participate in professional activities and learning communities.
 - 6.5 Beginning special education professionals advance the profession by engaging in activities such as advocacy and mentoring
 - 6.6 Beginning special education professionals provide guidance and direction to paraeducators, tutors, and volunteers.
- 7.0 Standard 7: Collaboration. Beginning special education professionals collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, individuals with exceptionalities, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways to address the needs of individuals with exceptionalities across a range of learning experiences.
- 7.1 Beginning special education professionals use the theory and elements of effective collaboration.
 - 7.2 Beginning special education professionals serve as a collaborative resource to colleagues.
 - 7.3 Beginning special education professionals use collaboration to promote the well-being of individuals with exceptionalities across a wide range of settings and collaborators.

Upon Completion of the Program, Candidates will meet the following ADE Initial Preparation Standards for all teachers:

The Arkansas Department of Education has adopted the 2011 Model Core Teaching Standards developed by Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC). InTASC is a program of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). The standards have been grouped into four general categories to help users organize their thinking about the standards (Model Core Teaching Standards: A Resource for State Dialog, InTASC, 2011):

The Learner and Learning

Standard #1: Learner Development. The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

Standard #2: Learning Differences. The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

Standard #3: Learning Environments. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Content

Standard #4: Content Knowledge. The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.

Standard #5: Application of Content. The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.

Instructional Practice

Standard #6: Assessment. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.

Standard #7: Planning for Instruction. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.

Standard #8: Instructional Strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

Professional Responsibility

Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.

Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration. The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

Key Assessments

Name of Assessment ¹		Type or Form of Assessment ²	When the Assessment Is Administered ³	Alignment with Standards	
				CEC	ADE
1	Content Knowledge: Licensure and Professional Examinations	Standardized State Licensure Test	Intermediate and Exit gate	1.1,1.2,3.1, 3.2,6.1,6.2, 6.3	1,2,4,5
2	Content Knowledge: Assessment of Content Knowledge in Special Education	Course and Field/internship Performance Assessment	Intermediate and Exit gate	1.1,1.2,2.3, 3.1,3.2,3.3, 4.2,5.3,5.7, 6.1,6.2,6.3, 7.1	1,2,4,5, 8

Name of Assessment ¹		Type or Form of Assessment ²	When the Assessment Is Administered ³	Alignment with Standards	
				CEC	ADE
3	Lesson Plan	Performance Assessment by Rubric	Field Experience/Internship Professional gate	1.1,1.2,2.1, 2.2,3.1,3.2, 3.3,4.1, 5.1 5.3,5.4,5.5 5.7,6.1,6.3, 6.6,7.1	1,2,4,5, 6,7,8
4	Field Experience Assessment	Performance assessment by Rubric	Field Experience/Capstone gate SPED 7141/7292	All (1-7)	All (1-10)
5	Case Study	Performance Assessment by Rubric	Field Experience/Capstone gate SPED 7305/7341/7352	1.1,1.2,2.1 2.2,3.1,3.2 3.3,4.1,4.2, 4.4,5.1,5.2, 5.6,5.7	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7,8,9
6	IEP	Course Performance Assessment	Field Experience / Capstone gate SPED 7341/SPED 7352	1.2,2.1,3.1, 3.2,3.3,4.2, 4.3,5.1,5.5, 6.5,7.3	1,2,3,4, 6,7,8,9, 10
7	Reflective Summary	Exit Portfolio Assessment	Exit/Professional gate SPED 7309	6.4	9
8	Professional Development Plan	Course performance Assessment	Professional gate SPED 7309	6.1,6.4	9
9	Exit Portfolio	Course performance Assessment	At Exit	All (1-7)	All (1-10)
10	Exit Portfolio Presentation	Presentation	At Exit	6.1,6.2,7.2	9,10

Key Assessment Data, Analyses, and Interpretations

Assessment 1 Content Knowledge: Licensure and Professional Examinations

Candidates seeking endorsement in special education must successfully pass specific Praxis and Praxis II standardized tests for entry into the program (Praxis Core), entry into internship II (Praxis II SPED Core Knowledge & Application) and for graduation (Praxis II: PLT).

Standardized Test	Unacceptable 1	Acceptable 2	Target 3
SPED: Core Knowledge & Application (5354)	Score 150 and below.	Score from 151 to 174.	Score of 175 and above
PLT: K-6 (5622)	Score 159 and below.	Score from 160 to 176	Score of 177 and above
Praxis Core: Reading (5712)	Score 156 and below.	Score from 157 to 188	Score of 189 and above
Praxis Core: Writing (5722)	Score 162 and below.	Score from 163 to 170	Score of 171 and above
Praxis Core: Math (5732)	Score 150 and below.	Score from 151 to 166	Score of 167 and above

Spring 2017

Test Name	Test #	Cut Score	N	Mean	# of Retakes
Praxis Core – Reading	5712	156	3	172.67	0
Praxis Core – Writing	5722	162	3	172.67	0
Praxis Core – Math	5732	150	3	163.33	0
SPED: Core Knowledge & Application	5354	151	3	169.67	0
I. Development and Characteristics of Learners			3	11.33	
II. Planning and the Learning Environment			3	20.00	
III. Instruction			3	16.67	
IV. Assessment			3	15.00	
V. Foundations and Professional Responsibilities			3	15.33	
PLT K-6	5622	160	3	173.67	0
I. Students as Learners			3	13.33	
II. Instructional Process			3	16.00	
III. Assessment			3	9.67	
IV. Professional Development Leadership and Community			3	11.33	
V. Analysis of Instructional Scenarios			3	11.67	

Standardized Test	N	Unacceptable 1	Acceptable 2	Target 3
SPED: Core Knowledge & Application (5354)	3		67%	33%
PLT: K-6 (5622)	3		67%	33%
Praxis Core: Reading (5712)	3		100%	
Praxis Core: Writing (5722)	3		67%	33%
Praxis Core: Math (5732)	3		67%	33%

All three completers successfully passed all state required standardized tests on their first attempts with no need for retakes. This suggests that the candidates entered the program with acceptable general education content and skills in math, reading, and writing. Further, scores on the Praxis Principles of Teaching and Learning and the Special Education Knowledge and Application tests suggest that the completers have acquired an acceptable pedagogical

knowledge for beginning educators and acceptable pedagogical knowledge and special education knowledge for beginning special educators.

Assessment 2: Content Knowledge: Assessment of Content Knowledge in Special Education

Assessment 2 is a performance assessment, focusing on candidate development in learning, understanding and using the content knowledge of special education. The table below, "SPED Content Areas" is a snapshot of the various special education content areas of the Praxis II Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications test. Completers' scores in this test are presented above. For Assessment 2, candidates must provide course performance evidence that they know and understand such special education content areas as the needs of learners with disabilities and the legal requirements for service delivery. According to CEC, examples of evidence for this assessment could "include comprehensive examinations; written interpersonal/presentational tasks; capstone projects or research reports addressing cross-disciplinary content; philosophy of teaching statement that addresses the role of culture, literature, and cross-disciplinary content; and other portfolio tasks" (<http://aims.caepnet.org/PRS/Agreements/Form442.pdf>). For the exit portfolio, candidates must upload course assignments and/or products developed for field experiences and internships as evidence that you have acquired the necessary content knowledge of special education.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
Development and characteristics of learners with disabilities	Candidate does not demonstrate a grasp of the basic and rudimentary knowledge of the development and characteristics of learners with disabilities	Candidate demonstrates a grasp of the basic knowledge of the development and characteristics of learners with disabilities	Candidate demonstrates considerable basic knowledge and some advanced knowledge of the development and characteristics of learners with disabilities	Candidate demonstrates extensive basic and advanced knowledge of the development and characteristics of learners with disabilities
Planning for instruction and management of students with disabilities and in structuring the special education learning environment	Candidate does not demonstrate a grasp of the basic and rudimentary knowledge of planning for instruction and management of students with disabilities and in structuring the special education	Candidate demonstrates a grasp of the basic knowledge of planning for instruction and management of students with disabilities and in structuring the special education learning environment	Candidate demonstrates considerable basic knowledge and some advanced knowledge of planning for instruction and management of students with disabilities and in structuring the special education	Candidate demonstrates extensive basic and advanced knowledge of planning for instruction and management of students with disabilities and in structuring the special education

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
	learning environment		learning environment	learning environment
Instruction	Candidate does not demonstrate a grasp of the basic and rudimentary knowledge of the instruction of students with disabilities	Candidate demonstrates a grasp of the basic knowledge of the instruction of students with disabilities	Candidate demonstrates considerable basic knowledge and some advanced knowledge of the instruction of students with disabilities	Candidate demonstrates extensive basic and advanced knowledge of the instruction of students with disabilities
Assessment	Candidate does not demonstrate a grasp of the basic and rudimentary knowledge of the assessment of students with disabilities	Candidate demonstrates a grasp of the basic knowledge of the assessment of students with disabilities	Candidate demonstrates considerable basic knowledge and some advanced knowledge of the assessment of students with disabilities	Candidate demonstrates extensive basic and advanced knowledge of the assessment of students with disabilities
Foundations of special education and professional responsibilities of special educators	Candidate does not demonstrate a grasp of the basic and rudimentary knowledge of the foundations of special education and professional responsibilities of special educators	Candidate demonstrates a grasp of the basic knowledge of the foundations of special education and professional responsibilities of special educators	Candidate demonstrates considerable basic knowledge and some advanced knowledge of the foundations of special education and professional responsibilities of special educators	Candidate demonstrates extensive basic and advanced knowledge of the foundations of special education and professional responsibilities of special educators

Spring 2017

Criteria	N	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4	MEAN	Standard Deviation
Development and characteristics of learners with disabilities	3			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Planning for instruction and management of students with disabilities and in structuring the special education learning environment	3			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Instruction	3			100%		3.00	0.00
Assessment	3		33%	67%		2.67	0.58
Foundations of special education and professional responsibilities of special educators	3			33%	67%	3.67	0.58

The data for the first-year completers, along with the standardized data in assessment 1, provides further evidence that our completers have acquired considerable basic knowledge and some advanced knowledge of essential special education content areas required for a beginning special educator.

Assignment 3: Lesson Plan

All candidates must demonstrate competency in designing and implementing instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of students with a variety of disabilities. The plan must show that the candidate knows and can plan lessons according to the **characteristics** of the **learner(s)**, and **individual learning differences, cultural and ethnic diversity, language needs** and **social validity**. The plan also must provide evidence that the candidate can develop plans that are individualized to the learner and promote the development of an independent learner. Additionally, this assessment will demonstrate that the candidate can adapt instruction and the learning environment to most effectively teach the student. Assessment is an important aspect of the lesson plan. Candidates complete performance activities involving developing plans and teaching the plans, both in methods courses and in field/practicum experiences to meet this goal. Candidates may submit one or more lesson plans from courses and field experiences and internships as evidence for this assignment. Candidates may also submit University Supervisor and CT TESS and CEC Observations as evidence of planning skills as well.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
Knowledge of Content & Pedagogy (Component 1a in AR-TESS)	The teacher's plans display little knowledge of the content of the lesson, prerequisite relationships between different aspects of the content, or the specific instructional best practices that could be used to teach that content for student learning	The teacher's plans reflect some awareness of the important concepts in the discipline, prerequisite relationships between them, and the instructional best practices that could be used to teach that content for student learning	The teacher's plans reflect solid knowledge of the content, prerequisite relationships between important concepts, and the instructional best practices specific to that discipline.	The teacher's plans reflect extensive knowledge of the content and the structure of the discipline. The teacher actively builds on knowledge of prerequisites and misconceptions identified previously when describing instruction or seeking causes for student misunderstanding.
Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (Component 1b in AR-TESS)	The teacher's plans demonstrate little or no knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language	The teacher's plans indicate the importance of understanding students' backgrounds, cultures, skills,	The teacher's plans indicate the teacher identified knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills,	The teacher's plans indicate the teacher actively identified knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills,

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
	proficiency, interests, and special needs, and does not plan to seek such understanding	language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for the class as a whole.	language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for different groups of students.	language proficiency, interests, and special needs from a variety of sources, and attained this knowledge for individual students.
Setting Instructional Outcomes (Goals and Objectives) (Component 1c in AR-TESS)	Instructional outcomes are unsuitable for students, represent trivial or low-level learning, or are stated only as activities. There are no objectives or the objectives are not component skills of the goal. Goals and objectives do not permit viable methods of assessment.	Instructional outcomes are of moderate rigor and are suitable for some students, but consist of a combination of activities and goals, with some objectives, some of which permit viable methods of assessment. They reflect more than one type of learning, but the teacher makes no attempt at coordination or integration.	Instructional outcomes are stated as goals and objectives reflecting high-level learning and curriculum standards. Objectives are component skills of the long-term goal. They are suitable for most students in the class, represent different types of learning, and can be assessed. The outcomes reflect opportunities for coordination, and take the needs and IEP's of some individual students into account.	Instructional outcomes are stated as goals and component skill objectives that can be assessed, reflecting rigorous learning and curriculum standards. They represent different types of content, offer opportunities for both coordination and integration, and take the needs and IEP's of individual students into account.
Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources (Component 1d in AR-TESS)	The teacher's plans demonstrate little or no familiarity with resources to enhance own knowledge and skills, to use in teaching, or for students with disabilities who need them. The teacher does not plan to seek such knowledge.	The teacher's plans demonstrate some familiarity with resources available through the school or district to enhance own knowledge, to use in teaching, or for students with disabilities who need them. The teacher does not plan to seek to extend such knowledge.	The teacher is fully aware of the resources available through the school, district, or online resources, to enhance own knowledge, to use in teaching, or for students with disabilities who need them.	The teacher seeks out resources in and beyond the school or district, department of education/special education, in professional organizations, on the Internet, and in the community to enhance own knowledge, to use in teaching, and for students who need them.
Designing Coherent Instruction	The series of learning experiences is	The series of learning experiences	The teacher coordinates knowledge of	The teacher coordinates knowledge of

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
(Component 1e in AR-TESS)	poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes and does not represent a coherent structure. The experiences are suitable for only some students.	demonstrates partial alignment with instructional outcomes, and some of the experiences are likely to engage students in significant learning. The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure and reflects partial knowledge of students and resources.	content, of students, and of resources to design a series of learning experiences aligned to instructional outcomes and suitable for groups of students. The lesson or unit has a clear structure and is likely to engage students in significant learning.	content, of students, and of resources, to design a series of learning experiences aligned to instructional outcomes, differentiated where appropriate to make them suitable to all students and likely to engage them in significant learning. The lesson or unit structure is clear and allows for different pathways according to student needs.
Designing Student Assessments (Component 1f in AR-TESS)	The teacher's plan for assessing student learning contains no clear criteria or standards, is poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes, or is inappropriate for many students. The results of assessment have minimal impact on the design of future instruction.	The teacher's plan for student assessment is partially aligned with the instructional outcomes, without clear criteria, and inappropriate for at least some students. The teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for the class as a whole.	The teacher's plan for student assessment is aligned with the instructional outcomes, uses clear criteria, and is appropriate to the needs of students. The teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for groups of students.	The teacher's plan for student assessment is fully aligned with the instructional outcomes, with clear criteria and standards that show evidence of student contribution to their development. Assessment methodologies may have been adapted for individuals, and the teacher intends to use assessment results to plan future instruction for individual students.
Lesson Design: Appropriateness (from SPED Program CEC SPA assessment)	The lesson design is not appropriate for the skill being taught and does not reflect the characteristics of the student.	For the most part, the lesson design is appropriate for the skill and the target population; however, it contains one element that is inappropriate	The lesson design is appropriate for the skill and the target population.	The lesson design is appropriate for the skill and the target population. The lesson design is logical for the skill being addressed. The lesson design reflects

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
				consideration of the students age, communication skills and needs, strengths and weaknesses, and current level of performance.
Lesson Design: Adaptations (from SPED Program CEC SPA assessment)	The lesson has no statements for adapting the delivery for student with differing abilities; or, such statements are present, but two or more of the adaptations are inappropriate (or one is inappropriate, if only one adaptation is given).	The lesson has written statements of ways to adapt or modify delivery for students with differing abilities, but statements are not specifically connected to instructional sequences OR at least one logical adaptation is not included OR only one of several methods is inappropriate.	The lesson has written statements of appropriate ways to adapt or modify delivery for students with differing abilities.	The lesson has written statements of appropriate ways to adapt, accommodate, modify differentiated delivery for the range of students with differing abilities in the class.
Lesson Design: Extensions of Learning (from SPED Program CEC SPA assessment)	The lesson contains no statements or examples of how higher order thinking skills will be addressed; OR the lesson contains no examples of ways to generalize the knowledge or skill.	The lesson contains a statement and examples of how higher order thinking skills will be addressed, but either it is inappropriate for the lesson taught or for the learner; OR the lesson contains examples of ways to generalize the knowledge or skill, but examples are inappropriate for the lesson taught or for the learner.	The lesson contains a statement and explicit examples of how higher order thinking skills will be addressed; OR the lesson contains explicit examples of ways to generalize the knowledge or skill.	The lesson has statements addressing higher order thinking skills, when appropriate, AND the lesson has statements addressing generalization of learning.
Lesson Design: Student Products (from SPED Program CEC SPA assessment)	The lesson plan has no descriptions of the process or product resulting from the instruction	The lesson plan has descriptions of the process or product resulting from the instruction, however, the student outcomes are not appropriate	The lesson plan has specific descriptions of the process or product resulting from the instruction.	The lesson plan has specific descriptions of the process and product resulting from the instruction.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
		for the lesson taught.		

Spring 2017

Criteria	N	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4	MEAN	Standard Deviation
Knowledge of Content & Pedagogy (Component 1a in AR-TESS)	3			100%		3.00	0.00
Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (Component 1b in AR-TESS)	3			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Setting Instructional Outcomes (Goals and Objectives) (Component 1c in AR-TESS)	3			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources (Component 1d in AR-TESS)	3			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
Designing Coherent Instruction (Component 1e in AR-TESS)	3			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Designing Student Assessments (Component 1f in AR-TESS)	3			100%		3.00	0.00
Lesson Design: Appropriateness (from SPED Program CEC SPA assessment)	3			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
Lesson Design: Adaptations (from SPED Program CEC SPA assessment)	3			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Lesson Design: Extensions of Learning (from SPED Program CEC SPA assessment)	3			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
Lesson Design: Student Products (from SPED Program CEC SPA assessment)	3			67%	33%	3.33	0.58

The data above suggests that our completers demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the use of relevant aspects of student backgrounds in planning instruction; and, candidates clearly articulate instructional goals based on this analysis. Additionally, candidates show mastery in use and selection of appropriate instructional resources and in using evaluation to plan future instruction. Finally, completers can plan lessons that are appropriate for students with a wide range of disabilities and provide appropriate adaptations for these students. The lessons provide plans for extending learners to use higher order thinking and include descriptions of student products and processes required.

Assessment 4: AR-TESS and CEC Evaluation of Internship Experience

The program includes two 12-week internship experiences, one in an elementary special education setting and one in a secondary special education setting. One of the semester internships must be in settings primarily for students with mild disabilities and one for students with more moderate/severe/profound disabilities, but it does not matter if these are either elementary or secondary settings. Each internship is for 12 weeks and the intern is supposed to

start at the same time that the CT starts at the beginning of the semester and then intern for 12 weeks starting from the first day of internship experience. The expectations are that the intern work the same hours as the CT and assists the CT in all duties. We expect the intern to be actively involved at all times rather than observing. The intern is to be actively assisting the CT in teaching students the entire 12 weeks. However, the intern also is to be able to observe the other special education settings in the building across the 12-week period. The intern is to be able to attend and participate in IEP meetings, referral conferences, parent teacher conferences, etc., as much as is possible.

The intern is also enrolled in a seminar course that corresponds to the internship. These seminar courses require certain assignments that you the CT may need to help the intern with in some ways, such as developing lesson and unit plans and writing daily and weekly reflections of experiences and events. Further, the intern must complete the following assignments that are tied to the internship experience: an assessment of the classroom environment; an academic case study where the intern tries to identify, assess, and solve an academic problem; a behavior case study where the intern tries to identify, assess, and solve a behavior problem; writing an IEP (with names and other information changed); and, creating a future professional development plan.

The intern also must be “in charge” of teaching for a significant part of a "unit of instruction” (however we can define this for each situation and class) for at least 2 weeks. The University Supervisor (US) observes the intern for at least 4 times. The first visit is just an informal one to meet the CT, paraprofessionals, staff, and, perhaps the principal and to get acquainted with the students and the classroom and school environment. The second visit is an informal observation of the intern doing whatever is typical for the intern to do (assisting the CT, teaching small groups, roving and helping individuals, etc.). The final 2 visits are formal observations during the 2-week unit teaching period. Each visit requires meeting privately with the intern for about 15-30 minutes prior to the observation and for about 30-45 minutes after the observation.

The US uses the EdReflect/Bloomboard system for special education teachers that is being used by the LRSD and that is based on the AR-TESS observation instrument (adapted for special ed). The CT is asked to assess the intern using the same TESS instrument as well as an instrument based on the CEC Standards as final summative assessments of candidate teaching across the 12 weeks. The US also completes a final summative assessment using the same TESS and CEC instruments. The candidate submits at least one of the CT and US TESS and CEC observations and these are used as evidence to provide a score on the following rubric.

	UNSATISFACTORY 1	BASIC 2	PROFICIENT 3	DISTINGUISHED 4
DOMAIN 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION				
Component 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	The teacher's plans and practice display little knowledge of the content, prerequisite relationships between different	The teacher's plans and practice reflect some awareness of the important concepts in the discipline, prerequisite	The teacher's plans and practice reflect solid knowledge of the content, prerequisite relationships between important concepts, and the	The teacher's plans and practice reflect extensive knowledge of the content and the structure of the discipline. The teacher actively builds on knowledge of

	UNSATISFACTORY 1	BASIC 2	PROFICIENT 3	DISTINGUISHED 4
	aspects of the content, or the instructional practices specific to that discipline.	relationships between them, and the instructional practices specific to that discipline.	instructional practices specific to that discipline.	prerequisites and misconceptions when describing instruction or seeking causes for student misunderstanding.
Component 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	The teacher demonstrates little or no knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and does not seek such understanding	The teacher indicates the importance of understanding students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for the class as a whole.	The teacher actively seeks knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for groups of students.	The teacher actively seeks knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs from a variety of sources, and attains this knowledge for individual students.
Component 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes	Instructional outcomes are unsuitable for students, represent trivial or low-level learning, or are stated only as activities. They do not permit viable methods of assessment.	Instructional outcomes are of moderate rigor and are suitable for some students, but consist of a combination of activities and goals, some of which permit viable methods of assessment. They reflect more than one type of learning, but the teacher makes no attempt at coordination or integration.	Instructional outcomes are stated as goals reflecting high-level learning and curriculum standards. They are suitable for most students in the class, represent different types of learning, and can be assessed. The outcomes reflect opportunities for coordination.	Instructional outcomes are stated as goals that can be assessed, reflecting rigorous learning and curriculum standards. They represent different types of content, offer opportunities for both coordination and integration, and take the needs of individual students into account.
Domain 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	The teacher demonstrates little or no familiarity with resources to enhance own knowledge, to use in teaching, or for students who need them. The teacher does not seek such knowledge.	The teacher demonstrates some familiarity with resources available through the school or district to enhance own knowledge, to use in teaching, or for students who need them. The teacher does not seek to extend such knowledge.	The teacher is fully aware of the resources available through the school or district to enhance own knowledge, to use in teaching, or for students who need them.	The teacher seeks out resources in and beyond the school or district in professional organizations, on the Internet, and in the community to enhance own knowledge, to use in teaching, and for students who need them.
Domain 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction	The series of learning experiences is poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes and does not represent a coherent structure. The experiences are suitable for only some students.	The series of learning experiences demonstrates partial alignment with instructional outcomes, and some of the experiences are likely to engage students in significant learning. The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure and reflects partial knowledge of students and resources.	The teacher coordinates knowledge of content, of students, and of resources to design a series of learning experiences aligned to instructional outcomes and suitable for groups of students. The lesson or unit has a clear structure and is likely to engage students in significant learning.	The teacher coordinates knowledge of content, of students, and of resources, to design a series of learning experiences aligned to instructional outcomes, differentiated where appropriate to make them suitable to all students and likely to engage them in significant learning. The lesson or unit structure is clear and allows for different pathways according to student needs.
Domain 1f: Designing Student Assessments	The teacher's plan for assessing student learning contains no clear criteria or standards, is poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes, or is inappropriate for many students. The results of assessment have minimal impact on the design of future instruction.	The teacher's plan for student assessment is partially aligned with the instructional outcomes, without clear criteria, and inappropriate for at least some students. The teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for the class as a whole.	The teacher's plan for student assessment is aligned with the instructional outcomes, uses clear criteria, and is appropriate to the needs of students. The teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for groups of students.	The teacher's plan for student assessment is fully aligned with the instructional outcomes, with clear criteria and standards that show evidence of student contribution to their development. Assessment methodologies may have been adapted for individuals, and the teacher intends to use assessment results to plan future instruction for individual students.
DOMAIN 2: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT				
Component 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are negative, inappropriate, or insensitive to students' cultural backgrounds and are characterized by sarcasm, put-downs, or conflict.	Classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are generally appropriate and free from conflict, but may be characterized by occasional displays of insensitivity or lack of responsiveness to cultural or developmental differences among students.	Classroom interactions between the teacher and students and among students are polite and respectful, reflecting general warmth and caring, and are appropriate to the cultural and developmental differences among groups of students.	Classroom interactions between the teacher and individual students are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and caring and sensitivity to students' cultures and levels of development. Students themselves ensure high levels of civility among members of the class.
Component 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning	The classroom environment conveys a negative culture for learning, characterized by low teacher commitment to the subject, low expectations for student achievement, and little or no student pride in work.	The teacher's attempt to create a culture for learning is partially successful, with little teacher commitment to the subject, modest expectations for student achievement, and little student pride in work. Both the teacher and students appear to be only "going through the motions."	The classroom culture is characterized by high expectations for most students and genuine commitment to the subject by both teacher and students, with students demonstrating pride in their work.	High levels of student energy and teacher passion for the subject create a culture for learning in which everyone shares a belief in the importance of the subject and all students hold themselves to high standards of performance--for example, by initiating improvements to their work.
Component 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures	Much instructional time is lost because of inefficient classroom routines and procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of noninstructional duties.	Some instructional time is lost because classroom routines and procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of noninstructional duties are only partially effective.	Little instructional time is lost because of classroom routines and procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of noninstructional duties, which occur smoothly.	Students contribute to the seamless operation of classroom routines and procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of noninstructional duties.
Component 2d: Managing Student Behavior	There is no evidence that standards of conduct have been established and little or no teacher monitoring of student behavior. Response to student misbehavior is repressive or disrespectful of student dignity.	It appears that the teacher has made an effort to establish standards of conduct for students. The teacher tries, with uneven results, to monitor student behavior and respond to student misbehavior.	Standards of conduct appear to be clear to students, and the teacher monitors student behavior against those standards. The teacher's response to student misbehavior is appropriate and respects the students' dignity.	Standards of conduct are clear, with evidence of student participation in setting them. The teacher's monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive, and the teacher's response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs. Students take an active role in monitoring the standards of behavior.
Component 2e: Organizing Physical Space	The physical environment is unsafe, or some students don't	The classroom is safe, and essential learning is accessible to	The classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students; the teacher	The classroom is safe, and the physical environment ensures the learning of all

	UNSATISFACTORY 1	BASIC 2	PROFICIENT 3	DISTINGUISHED 4
	have access to learning. Alignment between the physical arrangement and the lesson activities is poor.	most students; the teacher's use of physical resources, including computer technology, is moderately effective. The teacher may attempt to modify the physical arrangement to suit learning activities, with partial success.	ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities. The teacher makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology.	students, including those with special needs. Students contribute to the use or adaptation of the physical environment to advance learning. Technology is used skillfully, as appropriate to the lesson.
DOMAIN 3: INSTRUCTION				
Component 3a: Communicating with Students	Expectations for learning, directions and procedures, and explanations of content are unclear or confusing to students. The teacher's use of language contains errors or is inappropriate for students' cultures or levels of development.	Expectations for learning, directions and procedures, and explanations of content are clarified after initial confusion; the teacher's use of language is correct but may not be completely appropriate for students' cultures or levels of development.	Expectations for learning, directions and procedures, and explanations of content are clear to students. Communications are appropriate for students' cultures and levels of development.	Expectations for learning, directions and procedures, and explanations of content are clear to students. The teacher's oral and written communication is clear and expressive, appropriate for students' cultures and levels of development, and anticipates possible student misconceptions.
Component 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	The teacher's questions are low-level or inappropriate, eliciting limited student participation and recitation rather than discussion.	Some of the teacher's questions elicit a thoughtful response, but most are low-level, posed in rapid succession. The teacher's attempts to engage all students in the discussion are only partially successful.	Most of the teacher's questions elicit a thoughtful response, and the teacher allows sufficient time for students to answer. All students participate in the discussion, with the teacher stepping aside when appropriate.	Questions reflect high expectations and are culturally and developmentally appropriate. Students formulate many of the high-level questions and ensure that all voices are heard.
Component 3c: Engaging Students in Learning	Activities and assignments, materials, and groupings of students are inappropriate for the instructional outcomes or students' cultures or levels of understanding, resulting in little intellectual engagement. The lesson has no structure or is poorly paced.	Activities and assignments, materials, and groupings of students are partially appropriate to the instructional outcomes or students' cultures or levels of understanding, resulting in moderate intellectual engagement. The lesson has a recognizable structure, but that structure is not fully maintained.	Activities and assignments, materials, and groupings of students are fully appropriate for the instructional outcomes and students' cultures and levels of understanding. All students are engaged in work of a high level of rigor. The lesson's structure is coherent, with appropriate pace.	Students, throughout the lesson, are highly intellectually engaged in significant learning, and make material contributions to the activities, student groupings, and materials. The lesson is adapted as necessary to the needs of individuals, and the structure and pacing allow for student reflection and closure.
Component 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction	Assessment is not used in instruction, either through monitoring of progress by the teacher or students, or through feedback to students. Students are unaware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work.	Assessment is occasionally used in instruction, through some monitoring of progress of learning by the teacher and/or students. Feedback to students is uneven, and students are aware of only some of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work.	Assessment is regularly used in instruction, through self-assessment by students, monitoring of progress of learning by the teacher and/or students, and high-quality feedback to students. Students are fully aware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work.	Assessment is used in a sophisticated manner in instruction, through student involvement in establishing the assessment criteria, self-assessment by students, monitoring of progress by both students and teacher, and high-quality feedback to students from a variety of sources.
Component 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	The teacher adheres to the instruction plan, even when a change would improve the lesson or address students' lack of interest. The teacher brushes aside student questions; when students experience difficulty, the teacher blames the students or their home environment.	The teacher attempts to modify the lesson when needed and to respond to student questions, with moderate success. The teacher accepts responsibility for student success, but has only a limited repertoire of strategies to draw upon.	The teacher promotes the successful learning of all students, making adjustments as needed to instruction plans and accommodating student questions, needs, and interests.	The teacher seizes an opportunity to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous event or student interests. The teacher ensures the success of all students, using an extensive repertoire of instructional strategies.
DOMAIN 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES				
Component 4a: Reflecting on Teaching	The teacher does not accurately assess the effectiveness of the lesson and has no ideas about how the lesson could be improved.	The teacher provides a partially accurate and objective description of the lesson but does not cite specific evidence. The teacher makes only general suggestions as to how the lesson might be improved.	The teacher provides an accurate and objective description of the lesson, citing specific evidence. The teacher makes some specific suggestions as to how the lesson might be improved.	The teacher's reflection on the lesson is thoughtful and accurate, citing specific evidence. The teacher draws on an extensive repertoire to suggest alternative strategies and predicts the likely success of each.
Component 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records	The teacher's systems for maintaining both instructional and noninstructional records are either nonexistent or in disarray, resulting in errors and confusion.	The teacher's systems for maintaining both instructional and noninstructional records are rudimentary and only partially effective.	The teacher's systems for maintaining both instructional and noninstructional records are accurate, efficient, and effective.	The teacher's systems for maintaining both instructional and noninstructional records are accurate, efficient, and effective, and students contribute to its maintenance.
Component 4c: Communicating with Families	The teacher's communication with families about the instructional program or about individual students is sporadic or culturally inappropriate. The teacher makes no attempt to engage families in the instructional program.	The teacher adheres to school procedures for communicating with families and makes modest attempts to engage families in the instructional program. But communications are not always appropriate to the cultures of those families.	The teacher communicates frequently with families and successfully engages them in the instructional program. Information to families about individual students is conveyed in a culturally appropriate manner.	The teacher's communication with families is frequent and sensitive to cultural traditions; students participate in the communication. The teacher successfully engages families in the instructional program, as appropriate.
Component 4d: Participating in a Professional Community	The teacher avoids participating in a professional community or in school and district events and projects; relationships with colleagues are negative or self-serving.	The teacher becomes involved in the professional community and in school and district events and projects when specifically asked; relationships with colleagues are cordial.	The teacher participates actively in the professional community and in school and district events and projects, and maintains positive and productive relationships with colleagues.	The teacher makes a substantial contribution to the professional community and to school and district events and projects, and assumes a leadership role among the faculty.
Component 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally	The teacher does not participate in professional development activities and makes no effort to share knowledge with colleagues. The teacher is	The teacher participates in professional development activities that are convenient or are required, and makes limited contributions to the profession.	The teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development based on an individual assessment of need and actively shares expertise with others. The teacher welcomes	The teacher actively pursues professional development opportunities and initiates activities to contribute to the profession. In addition, the teacher

	UNSATISFACTORY 1	BASIC 2	PROFICIENT 3	DISTINGUISHED 4
	resistant to feedback from supervisors or colleagues.	The teacher accepts, with some reluctance, feedback from supervisors and colleagues.	feedback from supervisors and colleagues.	seeks feedback from supervisors and colleagues.
Component 4f: Showing Professionalism	The teacher has little sense of ethics and professionalism and contributes to practices that are self-serving or harmful to students. The teacher fails to comply with school and district regulations and time lines.	The teacher is honest and well intentioned in serving students and contributing to decisions in the school, but the teacher's attempts to serve students are limited. The teacher complies minimally with school and district regulations, doing just enough to get by.	The teacher displays a high level of ethics and professionalism in dealings with both students and colleagues and complies fully and voluntarily with school and district regulations.	The teacher is proactive and assumes a leadership role in making sure that school practices and procedures ensure that all students, particularly those traditionally underserved, are honored in the school. The teacher displays the highest standards of ethical conduct and takes a leadership role in seeing that colleagues comply with school and district regulations.
CEC 1: Philosophical, historical, and legal foundations	Uses some inappropriate language related to learners with disabilities. Exhibits a general incompetence in approach to teaching learners with disabilities. Does not adhere to legal regulations, procedures or due process requirements.	Uses appropriate language related to learners with disabilities. Exhibits a philosophy of competence regarding learners with disabilities	Uses appropriate language related to learners with disabilities. Exhibits a philosophy of competence regarding learners with disabilities. Adheres to legal regulations in service provision and due process requirements for all students.	Uses appropriate language related to learners with disabilities. Exhibits a philosophy of competence regarding learners with disabilities. Adheres to legal regulations in service provision and due process requirements for all students. Prepares appropriate documents for due process in the correct sequence.
CEC 2: Characteristics of learners	Exhibits a lack of openness to learners with disability, ranging from mild to challenging. Does not adjust interactions to address needs of students with various disabilities. Does not select instructional activities according to learner characteristics and/or provide curricular adjustments related to learner characteristics.	Openness to learners with disability, ranging from mild to challenging . Adjusts interactions to address needs of most students with various disabilities.	Openness to learners with disability, ranging from mild to challenging . Adjusts interactions to address needs of students with various disabilities. Selects some instructional activities and/or adjusts curriculum according to learner characteristics.	Openness to learners with disability, ranging from mild to challenging . Adjusts interactions to address needs of students with various disabilities. Selects instructional activities and adjusts curriculum according to learner characteristics.
CEC 3: Assessment, Diagnosis and evaluation	Does not appropriately use informal and formal assessments for instructional use in the the special education setting.	Appropriately uses informal and formal assessments for instructional use in the the special education setting.	Appropriately uses informal and formal assessments for instructional use in the the special education setting. Analyzes assessment information for eligibility decision-making.	Appropriately uses informal and formal assessments for instructional use in the the special education setting. Analyzes assessment information for eligibility decision-making and is able to clearly discuss and explain assessment outcomes with colleagues and/or parents.
CEC 4: Instructional Content and Practice	Does not adjust learning requirements to the needs of the learner in relation to the general education curriculum or standards. Fails to develop complete instructional plans according to assessed student needs. Instruction is not directly related to assessed objectives.	Detects learner needs related to the general curriculum and adjusts to learner requirements. Develops complete instructional plans according to assessed student needs. Instructional activities are directly related to assessed objectives.	Detects learner needs related to the general curriculum and adjusts to learner requirements. Develops complete instructional plans according to assessed student needs. Instructional activities are directly related to assessed objectives. Monitors social skills needed to participate in the general education setting.	Detects learner needs related to the general curriculum and adjusts to learner requirements. Develops complete instructional plans according to assessed student needs. Instructional activities are directly related to assessed objectives. Monitors social skills needed to participate in the general education setting. Identifies and secures related services required for the instructional setting.
CEC 5a: Planning and Managing the Teaching and Learning Environment	Has trouble establishing an orderly environment. Selects inappropriate instructional objectives. Does not interact equitably with all students. Is often unprepared.	Establishes an orderly environment. Selects appropriate instructional objectives. Interacts equitably with all students. Prepares the instructional environment	Establishes an orderly environment. Selects appropriate instructional objectives. Interacts equitably with all students. Prepares the instructional environment. Provides clear and specific feedback to students. Provides appropriate type and degree of assistance. Successfully integrates technology into instruction.	Establishes an orderly environment. Selects appropriate and challenging instructional objectives. Interacts equitably with all students. Prepares the instructional environment. Provides clear and specific feedback to students that is positive and useful. Provides appropriate type and degree of assistance. Successfully integrates technology into instruction. Plans for both group and 1:1 instruction.
CEC 5b: Managing Student Behavior and Social Interaction Skills	Often does not manage student behavior with least intensive intervention. Does not adjust the learning environment to promote prosocial student behavior or necessary social skills for success in various school and classroom environments. Often does not maintain calm in behavioral crisis situations. Management and discipline is	Manages student behavior with least intensive intervention. Adjust the learning environment to promote prosocial student behavior. Administers intervention programs in accordance with laws, policies, and ethical principles regarding behavior management and discipline regulations. Mostly maintains calm in behavioral situations.	Manages student behavior with least intensive intervention. Adjust the learning environment to promote prosocial student behavior. Administers intervention programs in accordance with laws, policies, and ethical principles regarding behavior management and discipline regulations. Maintains calm in behavioral situations.	Manages student behavior with least intensive intervention. Administers intervention programs in accordance with laws, policies, and ethical principles regarding behavior management and discipline regulations. Maintains calm in behavioral situations. Adjust the learning environment to promote prosocial student behavior and selects interventions required to teach the student to exhibit social

	UNSATISFACTORY 1	BASIC 2	PROFICIENT 3	DISTINGUISHED 4
	not in accordance with laws, policies and ethical principles.			skills needed for educational and other environments.
CEC 6: Communication and Collaborative Partnerships	Does not use appropriate vocabulary in professional settings. Does not assume a collaborative role in assessment and program planning. Inappropriately or unethically shares instructional information with colleagues and parents or does not communicate well with colleagues and parents.	Uses appropriate vocabulary in professional settings. Maintains positive rapport with parents.	Uses appropriate vocabulary in professional settings. Maintains positive rapport with parents. Appropriately and professionally shares instructional information with colleagues and parents.	Uses appropriate vocabulary in professional settings. Maintains positive rapport with parents. Appropriately and professionally shares instructional information with colleagues and parents. Assumes a collaborative role in assessment and program planning.
CEC 7: Professionalism and Ethical Practice	Does not maintain confidentiality. Demonstrates an insensitivity for the culture, language, religion, gender, disability, socioeconomic status and sexual orientation of individual students. Conducts some professional activities that are not in compliance with applicable laws and policies. Does not seek out or utilize resources. Is often not prepared for daily lessons. Does not accept corrective feedback well.	Maintains confidentiality and adheres to professional requirements. Demonstrates sensitivity for the culture, language, religion, gender, disability, socioeconomic status and sexual orientation of individual students. Conducts professional activities in compliance with applicable laws and policies. Is prepared for daily lessons. Accepts corrective feedback.	Maintains confidentiality and adheres to professional requirements. Demonstrates sensitivity for the culture, language, religion, gender, disability, socioeconomic status and sexual orientation of individual students. Conducts professional activities in compliance with applicable laws and policies. Is prepared for daily lessons. Accepts corrective feedback and makes some effort to use the feedback for improvement.	Maintains confidentiality and adheres to professional requirements. Demonstrates sensitivity for the culture, language, religion, gender, disability, socioeconomic status and sexual orientation of individual students. Conducts professional activities in compliance with applicable laws and policies. Is prepared for daily lessons. Accepts corrective feedback and makes a good effort to use the feedback for improvement by seeking out and utilizing resources.

Spring 2017 (N=3)

	UNSATISFACTORY 1	BASIC 2	PROFICIENT 3	DISTINGUISHED 4	MEAN	Standard Deviation
DOMAIN 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION						
Component 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy			100%		3.00	0.00
Component 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students			100%		3.00	0.00
Component 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes			100%		3.00	0.00
Domain 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources			100%		3.00	0.00
Domain 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Domain 1f: Designing Student Assessments			100%		3.00	0.00
DOMAIN 2: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT						
Component 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
Component 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
Component 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Component 2d: Managing Student Behavior			100%		3.00	0.00
Component 2e: Organizing Physical Space			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
DOMAIN 3: INSTRUCTION						
Component 3a: Communicating with Students				100%	4.00	0.00
Component 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Component 3c: Engaging Students in Learning			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
Component 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction			100%		3.00	0.00
Component 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
DOMAIN 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES						
Component 4a: Reflecting on Teaching			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Component 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records			100%		3.00	0.00
Component 4c: Communicating with Families			100%		3.00	0.00

	UNSATISFACTORY 1	BASIC 2	PROFICIENT 3	DISTINGUISHED 4	MEAN	Standard Deviation
Component 4d: Participating in a Professional Community			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Component 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Component 4f: Showing Professionalism			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
CEC Observation						
CEC 1: Philosophical, historical, and legal foundations			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
CEC 2: Characteristics of learners			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
CEC 3: Assessment, Diagnosis and evaluation			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
CEC 4: Instructional Content and Practice			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
CEC 5a: Planning and Managing the Teaching and Learning Environment			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
CEC 5b: Managing Student Behavior and Social Interaction Skills			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
CEC 6: Communication and Collaborative Partnerships			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
CEC 7: Professionalism and Ethical Practice			33%	67%	3.67	0.58

Review of the above table suggests that our completers were observed by University Supervisors and their Cooperating Teachers as being proficient to exemplary across all four broad domains and all 22 components or subdomains of the TESS Observation Scoring Rubric. While there is some variation across candidates, in general, our initial licensure candidates:

- plans and practice reflect solid knowledge of the content, prerequisite relationships between important concepts, and the instructional practices specific to that discipline.
- actively seeks knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for groups of students.
- Instructional outcomes are stated as goals reflecting high-level learning and curriculum standards. They are suitable for most students in the class, represent different types of learning, and can be assessed. The outcomes reflect opportunities for coordination.
- Are fully aware of the resources available through the school or district to enhance own knowledge, to use in teaching, or for students who need them.
- coordinate knowledge of content, of students, and of resources to design a series of learning experiences aligned to instructional outcomes and suitable for groups of students. The lesson or unit has a clear structure and is likely to engage students in significant learning.
- plans for student assessment are aligned with the instructional outcomes, uses clear criteria, and is appropriate to the needs of students. The candidate intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for groups of students.
- Classroom interactions between the teacher and students and among students are polite and respectful, reflecting general warmth and caring, and are appropriate to the cultural and developmental differences among groups of students.
- The classroom culture is characterized by high expectations for most students and genuine commitment to the subject by both teacher and students, with students demonstrating pride in their work.
- Little instructional time is lost because of classroom routines and procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties, which occur smoothly.

- Standards of conduct appear to be clear to students, and the teacher monitors student behavior against those standards. The candidate's response to student misbehavior is appropriate and respects the students' dignity.
- The classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students; the teacher ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities. The candidate makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology.
- Expectations for learning, directions and procedures, and explanations of content are clear to students. Communications are appropriate for students' cultures and levels of development.
- Most of the candidate's questions elicit a thoughtful response, and the teacher allows sufficient time for students to answer. All students participate in the discussion, with the teacher stepping aside when appropriate.
- Activities and assignments, materials, and groupings of students are fully appropriate for the instructional outcomes and students' cultures and levels of understanding. All students are engaged in work of a high level of rigor. The lesson's structure is coherent, with appropriate pace.
- Assessment is regularly used in instruction, through self-assessment by students, monitoring of progress of learning by the candidate and/or students, and high-quality feedback to students. Students are fully aware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work.
- promotes the successful learning of all students, making adjustments as needed to instruction plans and accommodating student questions, needs, and interests.
- provides an accurate and objective description of the lesson, citing specific evidence. The candidate makes some specific suggestions as to how the lesson might be improved.
- systems for maintaining both instructional and non-instructional records are accurate, efficient, and effective.
- communicates frequently with families and successfully engages them in the instructional program. Information to families about individual students is conveyed in a culturally appropriate manner.
- participates actively in the professional community and in school and district events and projects, and maintains positive and productive relationships with colleagues.
- seeks out opportunities for professional development based on an individual assessment of need and actively shares expertise with others. The candidate welcomes feedback from supervisors and colleagues.
- displays a high level of ethics and professionalism in dealings with both students and colleagues and complies fully and voluntarily with school and district regulations.

Further, the data suggests that our completers were observed by University Supervisors and their Cooperating Teachers in both elementary and secondary special education settings as being proficient to exemplary in their practice across the ten CEC Standards for Beginning Special Educators.

Assessment 5: Case Study

The case study is a performance assessment, by rubric, required in both internships. Program standards require that candidates can show an effect on student learning. Candidates must provide evidence that they can design instruction and management based upon the assessment of both an academic and behavior issue in the classroom. Candidates are also required to use assessment data to assure appropriate progress toward learning and behavioral objectives. To that end, candidates develop instructional and behavioral plans to meet individualized or group learning needs. The case study is used to determine if candidates can identify and address specific concerns related to child learning and behavior and intervening on those concerns. The assignment calls for candidates to address individual learning and behavior differences, plan and deliver instruction and management/discipline, identify effective instructional and behavioral strategies, assess the learning environment, assure that the subject's academic and behavioral issues are resolved and assess the success of the intervention.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
A detailed description of the setting, the student and the academic or behavior concern	Description about the setting, student, and/or the concern is lacking, inaccurate, is difficult to understand, leads readers to inaccurate or vague understanding, or lacks professionalism in tone. Ethical issues, especially those involving confidentiality, are not upheld.	Description about the setting, student, and/or the concern is predominantly accurate, clear, and professional in tone, but there may be up to two instances of unclear expression. Professional tone is maintained. Ethical issues, especially those involving confidentiality, are upheld.	Description about the setting, student, and/or the concern is accurate, clear, and professional. Ethical issues, especially those involving confidentiality, appropriately maintained and explained.	An especially clear, pertinent, and meaningful description about the setting, student, and/or the concern is accurate, clear, and professional and exceptionally sets up the data. Ethical issues, especially those involving confidentiality, highly maintained and explained.
A pre-assessment of the concern with supporting data	Assessment is generally inappropriate for the student(s) and/or situation. Incorrect procedures are followed. Student responses to assessment are not described; or, only a numerical score or rating is provided.	Most components of the assessment are appropriate for the student(s). Correct procedures are followed. A minimal description of the students' responses is provided; more information is given than just numerical scores or ratings, but these are limited in number or lacking for some assessment components.	All components of assessment are appropriate. Correct procedures are followed. Clear narrative description of the student's responses is provided, for all components of the assessment.	Candidate selects an appropriate assessment instrument or instruments for the student(s) OR designs an appropriate assessment for a unique student by selecting activities from an array of options. Clear, detailed, and meaningful narrative description of the student's responses is provided, for all components of the assessment.
Unit and lesson plans for remediating the concern that is based on the pre-assessment and	Demonstrates minimal or no ability to plan instruction that supports every student in	Demonstrates limited ability to plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous	Demonstrates emerging ability to plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous	Demonstrates comprehensive ability to plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon

above descriptions	meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.	learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.	learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.	knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.
A description of the implementation of the plan and of the instructional strategies used, including formative assessment during instruction.	Demonstrates minimal or no understanding and use of a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.	Demonstrates limited understanding and use of a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.	Demonstrates emerging ability to plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.	Demonstrates comprehensive ability to plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.
Results of the plan with supporting data from post-assessment	Assessment is generally inappropriate for the student(s) and/or situation. Incorrect procedures are followed. Student responses to assessment are not described; or, only a numerical score or rating is provided. Demonstrates minimal or no understanding and use of multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth,	Most components of the assessment are appropriate for the student(s). Correct procedures are followed. A minimal description of the students responses is provided; more information is given than just numerical scores or ratings, but these are limited in number or lacking for some assessment components. Demonstrates	All components of assessment are appropriate. Correct procedures are followed. Clear narrative description of the student's responses is provided, for all components of the assessment. Demonstrates emerging understanding and use of multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner	All components of assessment are highly appropriate. Correct and rigorous procedures are followed. Clear, detailed, and meaningful narrative description of the student's responses is provided, for all components of the assessment. Demonstrates comprehensive understanding and use of multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.

	to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.	limited understanding and use of multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.	progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.	
Further recommendations	One or more recommendations are not supported by evidence in the report, AND one or more significant needs identified by the assessment process are not addressed in the recommendations . Two or more recommendations are vague or are not reasonably within the capacity of those expected to follow them.	One or two recommendations are not supported by evidence in the report, OR one significant need identified by the assessment process is not addressed in the recommendations . One recommendation is vague or not reasonably within the capacity of those expected to follow them.	All recommendations are supported by evidence in the report, AND, all significant needs identified by the assessment process are addressed in the recommendations . All recommendations are precise, and are reasonably within the capacity of those expected to follow them.	Recommendations that follow the assessment are based on background Information and the outcomes of formative and post- assessment. All recommendations are based on the outcomes of assessments completed and information presented in background Information. Recommendations address the spectrum of needs revealed by the case study process. Recommendations provide specific, detailed steps, supported by the assessment findings and the professional knowledge base, and are within the capacity of those expected to follow them, that a classroom teacher or other provider could take to provide appropriate instruction or classroom modifications for a student with special learning needs.
Reflection on the entire case study.	The teacher does not accurately assess the effectiveness of the lesson and has no ideas about how the case	The teacher provides a partially accurate and objective description of his/her performance and	The teacher provides an accurate and objective description of his/her performance and	The teacher's reflection on his/her performance and learnings, citing specific evidence to support these reflections. The teacher makes several specific suggestions as to how the

	study could be improved.	learnings but does not cite specific evidence to support these reflections. The teacher makes only general suggestions as to how the case study might be improved and for future development.	learnings, citing specific evidence to support these reflections. The teacher makes some specific suggestions as to how the case study might be improved and for future development.	case study might be improved and for future development. The teacher draws on an extensive repertoire to suggest alternative assessments and strategies and predicts the likely success of each.
--	--------------------------	---	--	--

Spring 2017

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4	MEAN	Standard Deviation
A detailed description of the setting, the student and the academic or behavior concern			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
A pre-assessment of the concern with supporting data			100%		3.00	0.00
Unit and lesson plans for remediating the concern that is based on the pre-assessment and above descriptions			100%		3.00	0.00
A description of the implementation of the plan and of the instructional strategies used, including formative assessment during instruction.			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Results of the plan with supporting data from post-assessment			67%	33%	3.33	0.58

Further recommendations.			100%		3.00	0.00
Reflection on the entire case study.			100%		3.00	0.00

Review of the above tables suggests our completers demonstrate an emerging to comprehensive understanding of the use of multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making. Additionally, candidates show emerging to comprehensive ability to plan instruction and discipline that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning and behavioral goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, pedagogy and management/discipline, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. Finally, they demonstrate a proficient ability to reflect on the experience and make further recommendations for the future.

Assessment 6: IEP

Candidates must demonstrate that they can design formats to facilitate collaboration and to advocate for the needs of learners among other professionals. Such performances signal that the special educator can serve as a resource to colleagues to facilitate successful functioning in and across settings. To that end, the program provides candidates with simulated as well as actual opportunities to design a team-based Individualized Education Plan (IEP) that relies on collaboration.

The IEP must align with assessment and guide **instructional** planning. **Foundational** knowledge is crucial for the candidate to complete federal and state required IEP forms for the assignment. Candidates submit in their exit portfolio one or more IEP's they have completed in courses and/or in the field and internship experiences.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
Criterion 1 Stylistic Elements	Neither spelling, punctuation, nor written expression meet standards.	Writing is clear and understandable, but there may be errors of spelling and punctuation.	Spelling, punctuation, and written expression meet standards.	Spelling, punctuation, and written expression exceed standards and display a professional manner of excellence.
Criterion 2 Schedule of Services	Neither Direct nor Related Services are appropriately identified and scheduled.	Either, but not both, Direct or Related Services are appropriately identified and scheduled.	Both Direct and Related Services are appropriately identified and scheduled.	Schedule of Services is appropriate to meet identified student needs; all needed related services are identified and scheduled.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
Criterion 3 Parental Participation	Statements about parents and their participation and concerns are missing or not respectful or are inappropriate.	Statements about parents and their participation and concerns are respectful and appropriate.	Statements about parents and their participation and concerns are respectful and appropriate. Parents concerns are considered and acted on in the IEP.	Statements about parents and their participation and concerns are respectful and appropriate. There is evidence that the parents participated and collaborated in the process and/or the parents' concerns were considered and aligned throughout the document.
Criterion 4: Present Levels of Performance	Either levels of current performance are described incorrectly, or relevant information is omitted.	Levels of current performance are described; some relevant information is included, the information is not especially relevant to day-to-day instruction and some relevant information on crucial subjects/areas are missing.	Levels of current performance are described; Information provided is clear and objective. Information is relevant to Evaluation Report findings, assessment results, and progress-monitoring data. Includes instructional/behavioral levels and pertinent baseline data in some, but not all, relevant areas and subjects	Levels of current performance are described; Information provided is clear and objective. Information is relevant to Evaluation Report findings, assessment results, and progress-monitoring data, and is relevant to day-to-day instruction. Includes instructional/behavioral levels and pertinent baseline data in all relevant areas and subjects
Criterion 5: Effects of Disability	Does not clearly state how the disability affects the student's involvement and progress in the general curriculum. The student's strengths are not described or are not appropriately described.	Clearly states how the disability affects the student's involvement and progress in the general curriculum. The student's strengths are described appropriately.	Clearly states how the disability affects the student's involvement and progress in the general curriculum. The student's strengths are described appropriately. The student's needs are derived from the Present Levels of Academic & Functional Performance and are described appropriately. The student's needs are addressed throughout the IEP.	Clearly states how the disability affects the student's involvement and progress in the general curriculum. The student's strengths are described appropriately. The student's needs are derived from the Present Levels of Academic & Functional Performance and are described appropriately. The student's needs reflect a priority for the year. The student's interests, strengths, and needs are addressed throughout the IEP.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
Criterion 6: Consideration of Special Factors	Checklist responses are not aligned with information in Background Information and assessments.	The checklist is completed and aligned with background information, but some permissible accommodations are not identified or are questionable considering assessment information.	The checklist is aligned with information in the Background Information section of the Case Study and any assessments completed by the candidate. Permissible accommodations are noted and supported by assessment data.	The checklist is aligned with information in the Background Information section of the Case Study and any assessments completed by the candidate. Permissible accommodations are noted and supported by assessment data and are adequately explained.
Criterion 7: Goals and Objectives Based on Data	Annual goals and/or short-term objectives do not reflect either Background Information or results of assessments, or areas of concern identified by IEP team members are not addressed on the IEP.	Annual goals and short-term objectives are based on Background Information, results of assessments, or areas of concern identified by IEP team members.	Annual goals and short-term objectives are based on Background Information, results of assessments, or areas of concern identified by IEP team members. Goals are aligned with the Academic Content standards for the student's grade level and chronological age.	Annual goals and short-term objectives are based on Background Information, results of assessments, or areas of concern identified by IEP team members. Goals are aligned with the Academic Content standards for the student's grade level and chronological age. Goals address the content areas directly affected by the student's disability and other needs that may interfere with access to the general curriculum, such as behavior. Goals for the transition plan are included, if appropriate.
Criterion 8: Measurable Objectives	Objectives are unclear, or describe behaviors that can not be observed or measured. There is not a direct relationship between the annual goals and the present levels of performance.	Objectives are clear, and describe behaviors that can be observed or measured. There is a direct relationship between the annual goals and the present levels of performance.	Objectives are clear, and describe behaviors that can be observed or measured. There is a direct relationship between the annual goals and the present levels of performance. How progress will be monitored for each goal is identified and is appropriately linked.	Objectives are clear, and describe behaviors that can be observed or measured. There is a direct relationship between the annual goals and the present levels of performance. How progress will be monitored for each goal is identified and is appropriately linked, and it is clear how

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
				progress will be reported to parents.
Criterion 9: Mastery Criteria	Criteria for mastery are routinely set too low or do not reflect functional level of achievement	Criteria for mastery are appropriate for student and reflect a functional level of achievement.	Criteria for mastery are appropriate, but rigorous, for student and reflect a functional level of achievement--ones that are attainable and reasonable.	Criteria for mastery are appropriate, but rigorous, for student and reflect a functional level of achievement--ones that are attainable, reasonable, but are also reflective of high expectations for progress.
Criterion 10: Instructional Modifications	Modifications do not provide adequate support for the student, OR modifications impinge on student's development of attainable skills.	Modifications identified on the IEP provide appropriate support for the student.	Modifications identified on the IEP provide appropriate support for the student. They are appropriately aligned with the student's individual profile.	Modifications identified on the IEP provide appropriate support for the student. They are appropriately aligned with the student's individual profile as well as the school context.
Criterion 11: Aids and Supports	Recommendations for related services, school personnel, and equipment are not identified and/or do not reflect actual student needs.	Recommendations for related services, school personnel, and equipment are identified, but details are lacking. They reflect actual student needs.	Recommendations for related services, school personnel, and equipment are identified and detailed information is given. They reflect actual student needs.	Recommendations for related services, school personnel, and equipment are identified and detailed information is given. They reflect actual student needs and appear to be well coordinated throughout the student's schedule, and are only applied where and when it is appropriate.
Criterion 12: Determination of LRE	Identified LRE is inappropriate and does not reflect identified student needs.	Identified LRE is appropriate and reflects identified student needs.	Identified LRE is appropriate and reflects identified student needs. Explanation of the extent to which the child will not participate with non-disabled peers. is adequately explained.	Identified LRE is appropriate and reflects identified student needs. Explanation of the extent to which the child will not participate with non-disabled peers is adequately explained as are the justifications for not considering each of the less restrictive placements.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
Criterion 13: Professional Elements	The IEP is often not positively written and/or person first language and unprofessional terms are used.	The IEP is mostly positively written and person first language and some professional terms are used but lay terms are also used.	The IEP is positively written and person first language and professional terms are used throughout.	The IEP is positively written and person first language and professional terms are used throughout and goals, objectives, accommodations, etc., are aligned with the professional knowledge base.
Criterion 14: Self-Efficacy and Self-Determination	Decisions made throughout the IEP will not support the development of self-efficacy and self-determination.	Decisions made throughout the IEP can support the development of self-efficacy and self-determination. However, there is no thought or indication of student participation in the IEP process (if appropriate).	Decisions made throughout the IEP will support the development of self-efficacy and self-determination. There is some thought and indication of potential student participation in the IEP process (if appropriate).	Decisions made throughout the IEP will support the development of self-efficacy and self-determination and these are explicitly planned for in the IEP. Further, the student's role of participation in the IEP process is described and is appropriate.

Spring 2017

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4	MEAN	Standard Deviation
Criterion 1 Stylistic Elements			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
Criterion 2 Schedule of Services			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
Criterion 3 Parental Participation			100%		3.00	0.00
Criterion 4: Present Levels of Performance			100%		3.00	0.00
Criterion 5: Effects of Disability			33%	67%	3.67	0.58

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4	MEAN	Standard Deviation
Criterion 6: Consideration of Special Factors			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
Criterion 7: Goals and Objectives Based on Data				100%	4.00	0.00
Criterion 8: Measurable Objectives				100%	4.00	0.00
Criterion 9: Mastery Criteria				100%	4.00	0.00
Criterion 10: Instructional Modifications			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
Criterion 11: Aids and Supports				100%	3.00	0.00
Criterion 12: Determination of LRE			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Criterion 13: Professional Elements			33%	67%	3.67	0.58
Criterion 14: Self- Efficacy and Self- Determination		33%	67%		2.67	0.58

The data above suggests that our completers have developed proficient knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to develop and produce effective and useful IEPs to guide the instruction and management of students with disabilities.

Assessment 7: Reflection on Teaching

A reflective summary provides the program with information about professionalism, a requirement of the performance assessments for the Council for Exceptional Children. As the special educator serves as a resource to others in education, in addition to collaboration, candidates must engage in reflective practices that guide their practice and its adjustment. Candidate reflection is required throughout course, field and internship activities. Across their program. Candidates must engage in self-reflection to inform both activities and to

ascertain gaps in knowledge and skill. Such reflection is accomplished through reflective journals along with feedback on activities and direct observations. As part of the Exit Portfolio, the candidate must submit an overall reflection of pre-service development of essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions. This reflection must detail evidence of professional growth as well as self- evaluation to guide further professional development.

At exit, in the exit portfolio, the candidate submits at least 3 reflective summaries that were submitted in their field and/or internship seminars as evidence of being a reflective special educator.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
Reflection on Teaching (Component 4a in AR-TESS)	The teacher does not accurately assess the effectiveness of the lesson and has no ideas about how the lesson could be improved.	The teacher provides a partially accurate and objective description of the lesson but does not cite specific evidence. The teacher makes only general suggestions as to how the lesson might be improved.	The teacher provides an accurate and objective description of the lesson, citing specific evidence. The teacher makes some specific suggestions as to how the lesson might be improved.	The teacher's reflection on the lesson is thoughtful and accurate, citing specific evidence. The teacher draws on an extensive repertoire to suggest alternative strategies and predicts the likely success of each.
Adjusting Practice based on reflection (CEC 6)	No evidence of adjusting practice is supplied in the reflection. statements are very weak	The reflection contains specific evaluative statements regarding professional growth through reflection on teaching. Statements are basic and lacking detail.	There is evidence that the candidate has evaluated teaching and specifies professional remedies or professional outcomes; reflections are rich descriptions of teaching and the issues experienced, but may lack important contextual aspects.	There is strong evidence that the candidate uses reflection to evaluate teaching and to suggest possible adjustments in practice or professional remedies; reflections are rich and contextual.
Recognition of areas needing improvement and making suggestions from the professional knowledge base for possible improvement. (CEC 6)	Reflection statements of suggestions for improvement are not supported by the professional knowledge base and/or do not reflect on the knowledge base	Some reflection statements of suggestions for improvement are supported by the professional knowledge base and CEC Standards, though not explicitly discussed.	Reflection contains evaluative statements that are explicitly discussed as being based upon research and some of the CEC Standards	Reflection contains evaluative statements that are explicitly discussed as being based upon research and the CEC Standards and professional development goals and plans are

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
	(nor CEC Standards).			discussed in the reflection to review and enact the suggestions from the knowledge base.

Spring 2017

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4	MEAN	Standard Deviation
Reflection on Teaching (Component 4a in AR-TESS)			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Adjusting Practice based on reflection (CEC 6)			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Recognition of areas needing improvement and making suggestions from the professional knowledge base for possible improvement. (CEC 6)			100%		3.00	0.00

The data above suggests that our completers have developed the skills and dispositions to be able to reflect on their teaching experiences in ways that allow for adjustments to be made in their teaching. Further, through their reflection they appear able to recognize areas needing improvement and finding suggestions in the professional knowledge base for improving in these areas.

Assessment 8: Professional Development Plan

At exit, candidates provide a professional development plan that details their plans for ongoing professional activities after graduation from the program. A self-evaluation of strengths and weaknesses must be included. The "mission statement" details plans to engage in the ongoing development of professional knowledge and skills, planned contributions to the professional community, and people, institutions, and agencies they may use for personal/professional support. The narrative addresses goals, supports, timelines, and self-evaluation plans.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
Strengths and Weaknesses	No or superficial assessments of strengths and weaknesses, not aligned with state or professional standards provided	Particularly effective assessment of strengths and weaknesses, or simple restatements of course content; contains some alignment with state or professional standards	Clear statements of personal strengths and weaknesses, with specific, clear alignment with state or professional standards	Clear statements of personal strengths and weaknesses, with specific, clear alignment with state or professional standards Strengths and weaknesses are essential aspects of a beginning special educator and are supported by evidence from documents submitted in previous assessments in this portfolio.
Mission Statement	No or weak mission statement, or mission statement has no basis in special education laws, professional practices and collaborative efforts; focus on professional growth is not evident or is weak	Mission statement provided but may not adequately address assessment of strengths and weaknesses; it includes statements that detail special education laws, professional practices and collaborative efforts; candidate does show focus on professional growth	Mission statement is provided and is aligned with assessment of strengths and weaknesses; focus on professional growth and clearly details special education laws, professional practices and collaborative efforts	Mission statement is provided and is aligned with assessment of strengths and weaknesses; focus on professional growth and clearly details special education laws, professional practices and collaborative efforts that are essential aspects of a beginning special educator (as detailed in the CEC Standards).
Goals, Supports, Timelines, and Evaluation	Narrative is unclear, goals are unrealistic or not evident, supports may not be given consideration, timeline is unrealistic, and no evidence of planned self-evaluation of	Narrative is clear, goals are realistic, but candidate does not clearly communicate how to maintain lifelong learning through supports, timeline, or planned self-evaluation may be	Narrative clearly communicates how the candidate will maintain lifelong learning through goals that are realistic, supports, timeline, and planned self-evaluation are	Narrative clearly communicates how the candidate will maintain lifelong learning through goals that are realistic, supports, timeline, and planned self-evaluation are

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
	life-long learning is given; narrative does not describe a plan that is likely to result in professional success.	omitted or unrealistic; narrative describes a partially complete plan.	present and realistic; narrative describes a plan that is likely to result in professional success.	present and realistic; narrative describes a plan that is likely to result in becoming a leader and strong advocate for students with disabilities and their parents and families in the schools, community and in the special education profession.

Spring 2017

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4	MEAN	Standard Deviation
Strengths and Weaknesses			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Mission Statement			67%	33%	3.33	0.58
Goals, Supports, Timelines, and Evaluation			67%	33%	3.33	0.58

The data above suggests that our completers have developed proficient to exemplary professional development plans to help guide their future development as special educators.

Assessment 9: Exit Portfolio

At exit, candidates provide an exit portfolio that presents their best evidences that they have met the CEC Initial Preparation Standards for a beginning special educator. The CEC Initial Preparation Standards represent the specialized knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the profession demands all beginning special education teachers must master to assure the public that they can provide safe and effective practices in teaching students with disabilities. The Exit Portfolio assessment provides evidence that the candidate has attained the specialized knowledge, skills, and dispositions to begin practice as a special education teacher.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3
Standard 1: Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences	Evidence provided does not demonstrate the development of basic understandings of how exceptionalities may interact with development and learning and/or the abilities to use this knowledge to provide meaningful and challenging learning experiences for individuals with exceptionalities.	Evidence provided demonstrates an adequate development of understandings of how exceptionalities may interact with development and learning and the abilities to use this knowledge to provide meaningful and challenging learning experiences for individuals with exceptionalities.	Evidence provided suggests that the candidate's knowledge, skills and dispositions exceed those described in Standard 1 for a beginning special educator
Standard 2: Learning Environments	Evidence provided does not demonstrate the development of basic knowledge, skills, and dispositions for creating safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments so that individuals with exceptionalities become active and effective learners and develop emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and self-determination.	Evidence provided demonstrates an adequate development of basic knowledge, skills, and dispositions for creating safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments so that individuals with exceptionalities become active and effective learners and develop emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and self-determination.	Evidence provided suggests that the candidate's knowledge, skills and dispositions exceed those described in Standard 2 for a beginning special educator
Standard 3: Curricular Content Knowledge	Evidence provided does not demonstrate the candidate can use knowledge of general and specialized curricula to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities.	Evidence provided demonstrates the candidate can use knowledge of general and specialized curricula to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities.	Evidence provided suggests that the candidate's knowledge, skills and dispositions exceed those described in Standard 3 for a beginning special educator
Standard 4: Assessment	Evidence provided does not demonstrate that the candidate can use multiple methods of assessment and data-sources in making educational decisions.	Evidence provided demonstrates that the candidate can use multiple methods of assessment and data-sources in making educational decisions.	Evidence provided suggests that the candidate's knowledge, skills and dispositions exceed those described in Standard 4 for a beginning special educator
Standard 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies	Evidence provided does not demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to select, adapt, and use a repertoire of evidence-based	Evidence provided demonstrates an adequate development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to select, adapt, and use a repertoire	Evidence provided suggests that the candidate's knowledge, skills and dispositions exceed those described in Standard 5 for

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3
	instructional strategies 6 to advance learning of individuals with exceptionalities.	of evidence-based instructional strategies 6 to advance learning of individuals with exceptionalities.	a beginning special educator
Standard 6: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice	Evidence provided does not demonstrate the development of basic knowledge, skills, and dispositions to use foundational knowledge of the field and their professional Ethical Principles and Practice Standards to inform special education practice, to engage in lifelong learning, and to advance the profession.	Evidence provided demonstrates an adequate development of basic knowledge, skills, and dispositions to use foundational knowledge of the field and their professional Ethical Principles and Practice Standards to inform special education practice, to engage in lifelong learning, and to advance the profession.	Evidence provided suggests that the candidate's knowledge, skills and dispositions exceed those described in Standard 6 for a beginning special educator
Standard 7: Collaboration	Evidence provided does not demonstrate the development of basic knowledge, skills, and dispositions to collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, individuals with Initial Preparation Standards with Elaborations exceptionalities, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways to address the needs of individuals with exceptionalities across a range of learning experiences.	Evidence provided demonstrates an adequate development of basic knowledge, skills, and dispositions to collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, individuals with Initial Preparation Standards with Elaborations exceptionalities, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways to address the needs of individuals with exceptionalities across a range of learning experiences.	Evidence provided suggests that the candidate's knowledge, skills and dispositions exceed those described in Standard 7 for a beginning special educator

Spring 2017

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	MEAN	Standard Deviation
Standard 1: Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences		33%	67%	2.67	0.58
Standard 2: Learning Environments		33%	67%	2.67	0.58

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	MEAN	Standard Deviation
Standard 3: Curricular Content Knowledge			100%	3.00	0.00
Standard 4: Assessment		100%		2.00	0.00
Standard 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies				3.00	0.00
Standard 6: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice		33%	67%	2.67	0.58
Standard 7: Collaboration		33%	67%	2.67	0.58

The data above provides evidence that our completers have attained the specialized knowledge, skills, and dispositions deemed by our specialty professional association, CEC, as essential to begin practice as a special education teacher.

Assessment 10: Exit Portfolio Presentation

At exit, the candidates present their exit portfolio to the Special Education faculty. Their performance is scored by the faculty using the scoring rubric below. It is the final performance of the candidate and a culminating event in which they provide final evidence that they have met the CEC Initial Preparation Standards for a beginning special educator. A plain Powerpoint template is provided and includes an introduction, slides for each of the seven CEC standards, a future plan for development slide, a conclusion slide, and a slide to help guide candidate discussion of the program’s strengths and ways that the program can be improved.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
Organization	The presentation is unorganized, and/or difficult to follow.	The presentation is organized and easy to follow.	The presentation is well organized and easy to follow and provides some meaningful material.	The presentation is well organized and easy to follow and provides consistently meaningful material that stimulates good questions and discussion.
Communication Skills	The candidate uses three or fewer of the following criteria: remains on	The candidate uses four to five of the following criteria: remains on topic	The candidate remains on topic during the presentation, uses	The candidate remains on topic during the presentation, uses

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4
	topic during the presentation, uses appropriate grammar, uses appropriate speaking voice, follows an effective pace, and responds to audience questions appropriately.	during the presentation, uses appropriate grammar, uses appropriate speaking voice, follows an effective pace, and responds to audience questions appropriately.	appropriate grammar, uses appropriate speaking voice, follows an effective pace, and responds to audience questions appropriately.	appropriate grammar, uses appropriate speaking voice, follows an effective pace, and responds to audience questions appropriately. The result is an exceptional performance that is exceptionally persuasive in communicating the evidence represented in the exit portfolio.
Presentation Materials	The presentation materials do not contain many of the required elements OR the elements are mis- or not labeled.	The presentation materials contains all of the required elements.	The presentation materials contains all required elements AND more examples than required and positively adds to the presentation.	The presentation materials contents are professionally presentable and contains all required elements AND more examples than required and positively adds to the presentation.

Spring 2017

Criteria	Unsatisfactory 1	Basic 2	Proficient 3	Exemplary 4	MEAN	Standard Deviation
Organization				100%	4.00	0.00
Communication Skills				100%	4.00	0.00
Presentation Materials				100%	4.00	0.00

The above data suggest that the exiting candidates provided exemplary performances in presenting their exit portfolios.

Continuous Improvement Process

The Special Education Program follows the SOE Assessment Timeline (offered below). The special education program faculty reviewed the previous program data of completer performance compared to established benchmarks and develop a “Program Data Review” form (see Appendix 1) that required analyses and interpretations of the findings in the key assessments from iLab as compared to established benchmarks, as well as the data in the key assessments for CEC. This process helps guide continuous improvement in the program as well as in the assessments.

While we have only had three candidates who have completed the program so far, some general but cautious statements can be made. We base the following interpretations on the 2016-17 completer data, but also on our experiences with these three candidates in classes and in clinical settings (and the three other candidates in internship across the fall and spring semesters for AY 2017-18). Two areas of concern about the program can be tentatively made that follow from the iLab data as well as from our Annual Assessment Report that we submitted in spring 2017. First, we note that the data from the Lesson Plan, Teacher Work Sample, and the TESS Internship Observations suggest a relative weakness in designing and implementing instructional assessments. Since we are the ones who observed these candidates (and the current ones) in the field we can provide a more detailed analysis that suggests that while our candidates appear to be proficient to distinguished in the important aspects of special education assessment (e.g., interpretation of scores on individualized, standardized assessments for instruction, use of ABA assessments in resolving individual behavior issues), they may need more knowledge and skills in designing curriculum-based assessment in group classroom situations as well as informal observations during teaching. We have reviewed our curriculum in pertinent courses, especially in SPED 4326 Assessment in Special Education, where the strong emphasis is in learning about assessment issues in identifying students with disabilities and in interpreting psychological reports for individualized instruction and management. Based on the findings presented above and on our assessments across this year as we analyzed the data, we have provided increased emphases on informal data gathering techniques during teaching as well as more emphases on developing pre-assessments, assessments during teaching, and post-assessments during lessons and units.

The second general, tentative area of concern that needs attention is in communication with parents, based on the data from the TESS observations (which also is used for the Disposition Assessment). We were aware of this potential issue after the first internship experiences in fall 2016 as we were unable to document such interaction due to concerns about confidentiality and just a general unease of the school personnel in allowing much interaction with parents of students with disabilities. Some attempts were made to ask the CTs in the 2017 spring semester (and in meetings with special education supervisors at district offices) to ensure that the interns were able to have more experiences interacting with parents. It can be difficult for our candidates to be able to have many experiences with parents of students with disabilities. So far, it does not appear to be an issue of a lack of skill or dispositions as much as a lack of experiences to display their skills and dispositions. We will continue to ask for our interns to be able to have such experiences, but we have also added increased emphasis on communicating with parents in the following courses: SPED 4301, SPED 4326, TCED 4321 and we may need to do this as well in both internship seminars: SPED 4331 and SPED 4332.

Stakeholder Involvement/Communication Plan

The SOE Assessment Timeline provides a process by which stakeholders are involved in analyzing and interpreting data as well as by offering suggestions for improvement (as members of advisory committees, at stakeholder meetings, and by publicly reviewing and commenting on the annual program reports online). Across the 2016-17 AY, the special education faculty communicated with and shared the above data and findings with our candidates' cooperating teachers and with cooperating teachers at the bi-annual Cooperating Teachers Workshop. In both fall 2017 and spring 2018 workshops, we had a chance to discuss the findings with CT's, who provided suggestions and feedback. Due to the CAEP accreditation visit in October 2017, we completed much of the report above in spring 2017 and the report was posted online (with our completers' permission to display the data) since May 2017 for public review at <http://ualr.edu/cehp/assessment/>.

Appendix 1

Program Data Review Form

Semester and Year: Fall 2017

Program: Special Education BSE

Faculty Member(s) Completing the Form: Bruce Smith

Key Assessment: Praxis Content Exam(s): SPED Core Knowledge & Applications 5354

Academic Years of Data Reviewed: 2016-17

Benchmark:

Comparison Benchmark: program mean above both state and national means on all performance levels for each test and subcategory

Goal Benchmark: program achieve at least an 80% success rate on all exams including retakes

Brief Analysis and Interpretation of the data in relation to the Benchmark(s):

The mean (N=3) score was 176, greater than the state mean (174.87) and the national mean (172.59). There were no state and national subscore norms. There were no retakes and a 100% pass rate.

If the Benchmark was not reached, interpretation as to why it was not reached:

Not applicable for this exam

If necessary, a brief description of a program development plan, including a timeline for the rest of the academic year as to the specific actions the program faculty (and others) will undertake to try to remedy the situation and meet or exceed the Benchmark in the future:

Semester and Year: Fall 2017

Program:

Faculty Member(s) Completing the Form:

Key Assessment: Praxis Pedagogy Exam: N=3 took the PLT K-6 5621

Academic Years of Data Reviewed: 2016-17

Benchmark:

Comparison Benchmark: program mean above both state and national means on all performance levels for each test and subcategory

Goal Benchmark: program achieve at least an 80% success rate on all exams including retakes

Brief Analysis and Interpretation of the data in relation to the Benchmark(s):

Mean = 173.7 was greater than the state mean (169.95) and the national mean (168.03). There were no retakes and 100% passed on the first try.

If the Benchmark was not reached, interpretation as to why it was not reached:

Not applicable for this exam

If necessary, a brief description of a program development plan, including a timeline for the rest of the academic year as to the specific actions the program faculty (and others) will undertake to try to remedy the situation and meet or exceed the Benchmark in the future:

Semester and Year: Fall 2017
Program:
Faculty Member(s) Completing the Form:

Key Assessment: Lesson Plan

Academic Years of Data Reviewed:

Benchmark:

Goal Benchmark: a program mean of at least 3.33 on all performance levels with at least 67% of all candidates performing at the “Proficient” level on all levels of performance

Brief Analysis and Interpretation of the data in relation to the Benchmark(s):

For Knowledge of Students, Instructional Goals, and Instructional Design, 100% scored proficient with a mean of 3.0. For Instructional Resources, 67% scored proficient and 33% scored distinguished with a mean of 3.33. For Assessment, 33% scored Basic, while 67% scored proficient with a mean of 2.67.

If the Benchmark was not reached, interpretation as to why it was not reached:

It is difficult to interpret with only 1 year of data and the small N (N=3). Also, lesson plans can be quite different in resource rooms and self-contained classrooms, than typical whole-group regular education classroom plans.

If necessary, a brief description of a program development plan, including a timeline for the rest of the academic year as to the specific actions the program faculty (and others) will undertake to try to remedy the situation and meet or exceed the Benchmark in the future:

No action necessary at this time. Will wait for more data next academic year.

Please note that program faculty will also provide individual development plans for individuals who score “Basic” or below on any of the levels of performance.

Semester and Year: Fall 2017

Program:

Faculty Member(s) Completing the Form:

Key Assessment: Case Study

Academic Years of Data Reviewed:

Benchmark:

Goal Benchmark: a program mean of at least 3.33 on all performance levels with at least 67% of all candidates performing at the “Proficient” level on all levels of performance

Brief Analysis and Interpretation of the data in relation to the Benchmark(s):

For all three levels of the case study, 33% scored proficient, while 67% scored Distinguished with a mean of 3.67.

If the Benchmark was not reached, interpretation as to why it was not reached:

Not applicable for this assessment.

If necessary, a brief description of a program development plan, including a timeline for the rest of the academic year as to the specific actions the program faculty (and others) will undertake to try to remedy the situation and meet or exceed the Benchmark in the future:

Please note that program faculty will also provide individual development plans for individuals who score “Basic” or below on any of the levels of performance.

Semester and Year: Fall 2017

Program:

Faculty Member(s) Completing the Form:

Key Assessment: Unit Plan

Academic Years of Data Reviewed:

Benchmark:

Goal Benchmark: a program mean of at least 3.33 on all performance levels with at least 67% of all candidates performing at the “Proficient” level on all levels of performance

Brief Analysis and Interpretation of the data in relation to the Benchmark(s):

For Learner Development and Learner Differences, 100% scored proficient with mean of 3.0. For Learning Environment and Content Knowledge, 67% scored proficient and 33% scored distinguished with a mean of 3.33.

If the Benchmark was not reached, interpretation as to why it was not reached:

It is difficult to interpret with only 1 year of data and the small N (N=3). Also, unit plans can be quite different in resource rooms and self-contained classrooms, than typical whole-group regular education classroom plans.

If necessary, a brief description of a program development plan, including a timeline for the rest of the academic year as to the specific actions the program faculty (and others) will undertake to try to remedy the situation and meet or exceed the Benchmark in the future:

No action necessary at this time. Will wait for more data next academic year.

Please note that program faculty will also provide individual development plans for individuals who score “Basic” or below on any of the levels of performance.

Semester and Year: Fall 2017

Program:

Faculty Member(s) Completing the Form:

Key Assessment: Dispositions

Academic Years of Data Reviewed:

Benchmark:

Goal Benchmark: a program mean of at least 3.33 on all performance levels with at least 67% of all candidates performing at the “Proficient” level on all levels of performance

Brief Analysis and Interpretation of the data in relation to the Benchmark(s):

For Component 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport and Component 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning, 33% scored proficient while 67% scored distinguished with a mean of 3.67. For Component 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness and Component 4f: Showing Professionalism, 67% scored proficient and 33% scored distinguished with a mean of 3.33. For Component 4c: Communicating with Families, 100% scored Proficient with a mean of 3.00.

If the Benchmark was not reached, interpretation as to why it was not reached:

All Benchmarks were reached except for Component 4c: Communicating with Families. It is difficult to interpret with only 1 year of data and the small N (N=3).

If necessary, a brief description of a program development plan, including a timeline for the rest of the academic year as to the specific actions the program faculty (and others) will undertake to try to remedy the situation and meet or exceed the Benchmark in the future:

No action necessary at this time. Will wait for more data next academic year.

Please note that program faculty will also provide individual development plans for individuals who score “Basic” or below on any of the levels of performance.

Semester and Year: Fall 2017

Program:

Faculty Member(s) Completing the Form:

Key Assessment: Technology Assessment

Academic Years of Data Reviewed:

Benchmark:

Goal Benchmark: a program mean of at least 3.33 on all performance levels with at least 67% of all candidates performing at the “Proficient” level on all levels of performance

Brief Analysis and Interpretation of the data in relation to the Benchmark(s):

67% scored Proficient while 33% scored Distinguished with a mean of 3.33.

If the Benchmark was not reached, interpretation as to why it was not reached:

Not applicable for this assessment.

If necessary, a brief description of a program development plan, including a timeline for the rest of the academic year as to the specific actions the program faculty (and others) will undertake to try to remedy the situation and meet or exceed the Benchmark in the future:

Please note that program faculty will also provide individual development plans for individuals who score “Basic” or below on any of the levels of performance.

Semester and Year: Fall 2017

Program:

Faculty Member(s) Completing the Form:

Key Assessment: Teacher Work Sample

Academic Years of Data Reviewed:

Benchmark:

Goal Benchmark: a program mean of at least 3.33 on all performance levels with at least 67% of all candidates performing at the “Proficient” level on all levels of performance

Brief Analysis and Interpretation of the data in relation to the Benchmark(s):

For Assessment, 33% scored Basic, 33% scored Proficient, and 33% scored Distinguished for a mean of 3.0. For Planning for Instruction and Instructional Strategies, 67% scored Proficient and 33% scored distinguished with a mean of 3.33.

If the Benchmark was not reached, interpretation as to why it was not reached:

All Benchmarks were reached except Assessment. It is difficult to interpret with only 1 year of data and the small N (N=3).

If necessary, a brief description of a program development plan, including a timeline for the rest of the academic year as to the specific actions the program faculty (and others) will undertake to try to remedy the situation and meet or exceed the Benchmark in the future:

No action necessary at this time. Will wait for more data next academic year. However, the candidate who did score basic was advised to seek professional development in assessment prior to graduation.

Please note that program faculty will also provide individual development plans for individuals who score “Basic” or below on any of the levels of performance.

Semester and Year: Fall 2017

Program:

Faculty Member(s) Completing the Form:

Key Assessment: Teaching Philosophy

Academic Years of Data Reviewed:

Benchmark:

Goal Benchmark: a program mean of at least 3.33 on all performance levels with at least 67% of all candidates performing at the “Proficient” level on all levels of performance

Brief Analysis and Interpretation of the data in relation to the Benchmark(s):

100% scored Proficient on Learner Development, Learning Differences, and Learning Environment with means of 3.0. 67% scored Proficient and 33% scored Distinguished for Professional Learning and Ethical Practices.

If the Benchmark was not reached, interpretation as to why it was not reached:

Benchmarks were not reached for Learner Development, Learning Differences, and Learning Environment. It is difficult to interpret with only 1 year of data and the small N (N=3).

If necessary, a brief description of a program development plan, including a timeline for the rest of the academic year as to the specific actions the program faculty (and others) will undertake to try to remedy the situation and meet or exceed the Benchmark in the future:

No action necessary at this time. Will wait for more data next academic year.

Please note that program faculty will also provide individual development plans for individuals who score “Basic” or below on any of the levels of performance.

Semester and Year: Fall 2017

Program:

Faculty Member(s) Completing the Form:

Key Assessment: TESS Internship Observation

Academic Years of Data Reviewed:

Benchmark:

Goal Benchmark: a program mean of at least 3.33 on all performance levels with at least 67% of all candidates performing at the “Proficient” level on all levels of performance

Brief Analysis and Interpretation of the data in relation to the Benchmark(s):

No candidate scored below Proficient on any level of the TESS. 100% of the candidates scored Distinguished with a mean of 4.0 for the following level: Component 3a: Communicating with Students .

67% of the candidates scored Proficient while 33% scored Distinguished with a mean of 3.33 for the following levels: Domain 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction; Component 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures; Component 2e: Organizing Physical Space; Component 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques; Component 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness; Component 4a: Reflecting on Teaching; Component 4d: Participating in a Professional Community; Component 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally; Component 4f: Showing Professionalism.

33% of the candidates scored Proficient while 67% scored Distinguished with a mean of 3.67 for the following levels: Component 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport; Component 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning; Component 3c: Engaging Students in Learning;

100% of the candidates scored a Proficient with a mean of 3.0 for the following components: Component 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy; Component 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students; Component 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes; Domain 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources; Domain 1f: Designing Student Assessments; Component 2d: Managing Student Behavior; Component 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction; Component 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records; Component 4c: Communicating with Families

If the Benchmark was not reached, interpretation as to why it was not reached:

It is difficult to interpret with only 1 year of data and the small N (N=3).

If necessary, a brief description of a program development plan, including a timeline for the rest of the academic year as to the specific actions the program faculty (and others) will undertake to try to remedy the situation and meet or exceed the Benchmark in the future:

No action necessary at this time. Will wait for more data next academic year.

Please note that program faculty will also provide individual development plans for individuals who score “Basic” or below on any of the levels of performance.

General Comments, Interpretations and Next Steps

While we have only had three candidates who have completed the program so far, some general but cautious statements can be made. We base the following interpretations on the 2016-17 completer data, but also on our experiences with these three candidates in classes and in clinical settings. Two areas of concern about the program can be tentatively made that follow from the iLab data as well as from our Annual Assessment Report that we submitted in spring 2017. First, we note that the data from the Lesson Plan, Teacher Work Sample, and the TESS Internship Observations suggest a relative weakness in designing and implementing instructional assessments. Since we are the ones who observed these candidates in the field we can provide a more detailed analysis that suggests that while our candidates appear to be proficient to distinguished in the important aspects of special education assessment (e.g., interpretation of scores on individualized, standardized assessments for instruction, use of ABA assessments in resolving individual behavior issues), they may need more knowledge and skills in designing curriculum-based assessment in group classroom situations. We need to look at our curriculum especially in SPED 4326 Assessment in Special Education, where the strong emphasis is in learning about assessment issues in identifying students with disabilities and in interpreting psychological reports for individualized instruction and management.

The second general, tentative area of concern that needs attention is in communication with parents, based on the data from the TESS observations (which also is used for the Disposition Assessment). We were aware of this potential issue after the first internship experiences in fall 2016 as we were unable to document such interaction due to concerns about confidentiality and just a general unease of the school personnel in allowing much interaction with parents. Some attempts were made to ask the CTs in the 2017 spring semester to ensure that the interns were able to have more experiences interacting with parents. It can be difficult for our candidates to be able to have many experiences with parents of students with disabilities. So far, it does not appear to be an issue of a lack of skill or dispositions as much as a lack of experiences to display their skills and dispositions. We will continue to ask for our interns to be able to have such experiences, but we have also added increased emphasis on communicating with parents in the following courses: SPED 4301, SPED 4326, TCED 4321 and we may need to do this as well in both internship seminars: SPED 4331 and SPED 4332.