

**Program Report for the
Preparation of Special Education Professionals**
Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

C O V E R S H E E T

xi

Institution UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK **State** Arkansas

Date submitted March 15, 2013

Name of Preparer Jennifer B. Hune, Ed.D

Phone # 501-569-8710 **Email** jbhune@ualr.edu

Program documented in this report:

Name of institution's program (s) Early childhood special Education (birth-4th grade);
Instructional Specialist 4-12

Grade levels for which candidates are being prepared Birth to Grade 4; Grades 4-
12

Degree or award level Master's of Education

Is this program offered at more than one site? **Yes** **No**
If yes, list the sites at which the program is offered _____

Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared
Early childhood special Education (birth-4th grade; Instructional Specialist 4-12)

Program report status:

- **Initial Review**
- Response to a Not Recognized Decision**
- Response to National Recognition With Conditions**
- Response to a Deferred Decision**

State licensure requirement for national recognition:

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

Yes **No**

SECTION I—CONTEXT

1. Description of State and Institutional Policies that influence the Application of CEC Standards

The Special Education program is housed in the Teacher Education Department in the College of Education (COE). 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 professional candidates who will use state of the art methodologies and technologies that promote higher order thinking and content mastery that are resources to their school and community. In this case, the operational definition includes evidence-based practices that range from the technology of teaching through assistive technology. The program mission aligns with the Specialized Professional Association, Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), College of Education and state performance expectations. In order to obtain licensure in the state, candidates must present evidence that they graduated from an NCATE program or a regionally accredited institution of higher education or hold certification from the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

The Special Education program mission aligns perfectly with the College of Education Mission. The focus on the College mission is to “promote and strengthen the professional development of individuals concerned with education and human resource development.” Teachers may obtain four licenses in Arkansas. The areas are: Early Childhood Instructional Specialist (Birth through grade 4 or eight years old) and Instructional Specialist 4-12 (Grades 4-12). The Special Education program prepares candidates to serve students with various disabilities in the Early Childhood Instructional Specialist (Birth through grade 4, age 8) and Instructional Specialist, grades 4-12. At the center of all preparation programs is the application of activities that align with evidence based practices. The courses help to prepare candidates to meet the individualized needs of children with exceptional learning needs. Some examples are assessment, instructional planning, instructional strategies, and managing the learning environment. All of these standards align perfectly with the CEC standards of professional performance. The college and program missions also target developing professionals who will use state-of-the-art methodologies. The mission of the Special Education program fits well within the conceptual Framework of the College of Education. Our mission is to develop “Leaders in Learning for All.” The conceptual frameworks for the special education graduate program is “Leaders in Learning” as demonstrated through specialized expertise, professional development and a strong commitment to diversity in competency, discipline and behavior. These four areas are embedded within the curricula and facilitate meeting the standards of the Arkansas Department of Education, National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education, and the Council for Exceptional Children, including the specialty areas.

Alignment with UALR Mission

The program mission relates to the UALR mission, which is to “develop the intellect of students; to discover and disseminate knowledge; to serve and strengthen society....; and to promote humane sensitivities and understanding of interdependence.” The program mission develops the intellect of students and produces program graduates who will serve and strengthen society, discover and disseminate information, and promote the development of sensitivities to diversity. Program graduates, by providing services and supports to individuals with disabilities, definitely strengthen society by enhancing the lives of individuals and promoting sensitivities toward persons with disabilities among community members. Evidence based practices are enfolded into the performance expectations for ages Birth to grade 4 and grades 4-12.

Program Structure

Age levels. The Special Education program has two active programs. Both programs are non-categorical; there is a focus on a various disabilities. Early Childhood Instructional Specialist (Birth through grade 4, 8 years) emphasis area serves to prepare candidates to work with students young children with special needs. The program focuses on preparing candidates to serve children birth to age 5 and grades kindergarten to 4. Candidates are prepared for service provisions in both public schools, public child care, and family service agencies. The Instructional Specialist 4-12 emphasis area prepares candidates to intervene with students grades 4 through 12. The focus is on preparing candidates to support students in the general education content in inclusive public settings.

Knowledge Base. The program of study uses the Council for Exceptional Children’s Core Knowledge and Skill Statements in program development. **Attachment C** contains revised Programs of Study for both active programs.

2. Description of Field and Clinical Experiences

The UALR Special Education program recognizes the importance of field experiences in pre-service training. The UALR graduate program includes two practicum experiences for each of the emphasis areas. Each of the field experiences are taken concurrently with a methods course work on campus. Each field experience has different goals and involves different experiences. The following is a brief overview for Special Education program and its field components.

The master’s programs in special education contain two different practicum experiences. Field placements should not occur prior to the completion of core courses, SPED 7301 Foundations of Special Education and SPED 7305 Managing the Learning Environment. Each field placement is a co-requisite to a methods course. For example, the methods course SPED 7351 Assessment in Special Education, which focuses on formal assessment, is concurrently offered with SPED 7390. For the experience, the candidates must

administer four different kinds of formal assessments, write reports, and make instructional recommendations, based on assessments. It is the responsibility of the university supervisor, a clinical supervisor (if applicable), and the candidate to determine the appropriate practicum placement activities as required at the various learning junctures in the methods courses. Candidates seeking endorsement must follow identical activities for practicum experiences.

The experiences for the special education graduate program are divided into three courses. Each experience requires a minimum of 120 clock hours. The total contact hours for the two (2) practicum experiences in the program are 240 hours or the equivalent of 10 full weeks of supervised practice. Practicum experiences are sequential and serve as prerequisites to activities in each successive experience. **Appendix A** contains an excerpt of the field experience handbooks.

As the Special Education program seeks to license individuals to serve children with differing disabilities, professionals who serve as clinical supervisors will be required to exhibit a wide range of abilities. Clinical supervisors must have at least three years in the profession and possess standard credentials. Efforts will be made to secure clinical supervisors who have a Master's Degree and have been Pathwise trained. Candidates who are in nine month or twelve month positions should seek information from the field supervisor regarding work-site experiences. On-site administrators must be willing to offer creative opportunities for the candidate to practice experiences outside of the typical work situation. Practicum assessments include both direct observations and performance observations. **Appendix A** contains excerpts of the practicum handbook for the second practicum experiences.

3. Description of Criteria for Admission, Retention, and Exit

Admission

Graduate candidates entering the Master's in Education must present a valid license to be admitted; additionally, the candidate must present an undergraduate GPA of 2.75 or better or 3.0 on the last 60 baccalaureate hours. A candidate may be admitted with a GPA of no lower than 2.50 and a graduate Record Exam of at least 370 on the Verbal scale, 440 on the Quantitative Scale and 4.5 on the Analytical Writing Scale.

Alternatively, a candidate may complete 12 hours in another graduate program or another UALR graduate program with a GPA of at least 3.0 on a 4.0 scale with a grade of no lower than a B. The final requirement is admission by program faculty.

Retention

Candidates must maintain a GPA of 3.0 throughout their matriculation. Candidates' GPAs are monitored each semester to assure proper progress. Should a candidate's GPA fall below 3.0, the candidate has up to 12 credit hours to raise the GPA to the required level unless the candidate is within 12 hours. In that case, the candidate will not be allowed to take courses in the program. Candidates may need remedial assistance during the period when attempting to meet program retention standards. Students submit

Advancement to Candidacy or a degree plan upon completion of their first sixteen (16) hours of study, along with the identification of the Portfolio of Scholarship Supervisory Committee. The Supervisory Committee will consist of the candidate's advisor and at least one additional member of the special education faculty and faculty from other program areas.

Exit

To exit the program, candidates must have maintained a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or better on all special education and professional courses. The state board has revised the requirements for special education testing for Birth to grade 4 and grades 4-12. Candidates are only required to take one assessment, no longer required to take special emphasis area tests (0690 and 0352, respectively). The candidate must pass a Praxis II examination to exit the program. This Praxis Examination is Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications, 0354 for all candidates. The minimum passing score is 151. Candidates must also present acceptable passing scores for relevant specialty examinations. **Table 2, in Appendix B**, shows results of the for three consecutive academic years.

Candidates completing the Master of Education in Special Education must present evidence in their Portfolio of Scholarship of competent performance in each of the ten CEC standards and the five Arkansas licensure principles. A Portfolio of Scholarship is required of any students completing a program of study in special education. The Portfolio of Scholarship contains elements of both the Common Core and Specialty standards unique to the individual's area of emphasis. In addition, all candidates completing the Master of Education in Special Education will present an Acceptable or Target Exit Portfolio for evaluation by a team of faculty. Early in the program, candidates receive a topical outline of the content that is to be addressed in the Portfolio of Scholarship at the time they complete the Advancement to Candidacy process. Candidates are encouraged to select and describe artifacts for their Portfolio of Scholarship based upon their interpretation of the five Arkansas licensure principles and CEC's ten performance standards. It is intended that this self-directed approach to portfolio development provides the Supervisory Committee with a complete understanding of the candidate's perspectives and professionalism.

4. Description of the Conceptual Framework

Specialized Expertise

The Special Education program expects that graduates of the Master of Education degree program will demonstrate a commitment to the education of people with varying degrees of disabilities across the developmental span. Graduates will possess knowledge, skills in teaching, learning, assessment, identification, instructional planning, including racial and cultural backgrounds. It is the intent of the faculty that this commitment is achievable through the provision of supported educational opportunities in early childhood, school, and community settings. The basic philosophy that underlies this belief focuses on providing individuals with disabilities with quality-of-life opportunities and experiences in

natural environments, including the general education environment. Graduates will also demonstrate skills in the use of technology, working with families, collaboration, and evaluation. These skills incorporate the major themes presented by all accreditation bodies identified in the narrative and are related to the COE's unit mission statement.

Professional Development

The Special Education program expects that individuals completing an advanced degree 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.

Communication

Graduates of the Master of Education in Special Education degree program are expected to develop and maintain effective oral, written, and technological communication skills through technology and reflect awareness of cultural and ethnic differences among families, professional, and individuals with disabilities.

Commitment to Diversity

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. First, student recruitment activities include identification of diverse cultural and ethnic populations, including persons with disabilities. Second, core courses reflect attention to serving diverse populations, giving specific attention to culturally diverse families and professionals. Third, program faculty is committed to collaborating with colleagues regarding diversity issues as they relate to students with disabilities in the general education setting. Fourth, the program has a communication component that seeks to infuse communication with culturally and ethnically diverse populations throughout course activities and field experiences.

Commitment to Technology

The faculty in the Special Education program is committed to learning and using emerging technological devices to enhance learning opportunities for candidates in the graduate program. This will help students with disabilities improve communication skills and foster professional development. This is reflected in technology being an integral part of each course in both the delivery, instruction and the standards of performance for students.

Alignment with Arkansas Principles

The program's mission also aligns with the five teacher licensure principles set forth by the Arkansas Department of Education on teacher competencies. These competencies include, Principle 1: The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and

structures of the discipline he or she teaches, can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students and can link the discipline to other subjects. Principle 2: the teacher plans and teaches curriculum appropriate to the students, to the content, and to the learning objective; Principle 3: the teacher plans and presents instruction based upon human growth and development, learning theory, and the needs of students; Principle 4: the teacher exhibits human relations skills which support the development of human potential; Principle 5: the teacher works collaboratively with school colleagues, parents/guardians, and the community to support student learning and well-being. Each principle is aligned with a CEC Standard and required identification of some course assignments. Evidence-based practices are enfolded into the performance expectations for ages Birth to grade 4 and grades 4 through 12. Since the program encompasses common core knowledge and skills, one report will be submitted.

Program data are collected primarily in performances in the core special education courses. **Common Core objectives for the program may be found in Appendix A.** The objectives are aligned with CEC standards, as well as the College of Education and Arkansas Licensure Principles.

5. Indication of Unique Set of Program Assessments

The Unit Assessment System maintains specific attention to performance assessment. Programs are assessed annually. Programs must submit data that quantifies adherence to the performance requirements of each SPA as well as NCATE, and the College of Education's Conceptual Framework. The mechanism to garner the data is in the College of Education's data base and Specific Table of Contents in the electronic portfolio system, Chalk and Wire. A **program data collection matrix** which provides the program's data points, artifacts and schedule of submission is supplied in **Appendix A**.

SECTION II

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

Name of Assessment¹		Type or Form of Assessment²	When the Assessment Is Administered³	Chalk and Wire Rubric #
1	Praxis II 0354	Standardized State Licensure Test	Intermediate OR Exit gate	445-Common core
2	Professional Presentation	Performance Assessment	Intermediate gate	1272-Presentation
3	Lesson Plan	Performance Assessment by Rubric	Field Experience/Capstone gate	1273-Lesson Plan Scoring Rubric
4	Field Experience Assessment	Performance assessment by Rubric	Field Experience/Capstone gate SPED 7141/7292	1274-Teaching Evaluation
5	Case Study	Performance Assessment by Rubric	Field Experience/Capstone gate SPED 7305/7341/7352	520-Case Study CEC
6	Facsimile IEP	Course Performance Assessment	Field Experience / Capstone gate SPED 7341/SPED 7352	459-Facsimile IEP
7	Reflective Summary	Exit Portfolio Assessment	Exit/Professional gate SPED 7309	524-Exit Portfolio: Reflective Summary
8	Professional Development Plan	Course performance Assessment	Professional gate SPED 7309	447-Professional Development plan Rubric

SECTION III

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

CEC STANDARD	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE STANDARD	
<p>Special education candidates progress through a series of developmentally sequenced field experiences for the full range of ages, types and levels of abilities, and collaborative opportunities that are appropriate to the license or roles for which they are preparing. These field and clinical experiences are supervised by qualified professionals.</p>	<p>Information should be provided in Section I (Context) to address this standard.</p>
CONTENT STANDARDS	
<p>1. Foundations. Special educators understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in school and society. Special educators understand how these influence professional practice, including assessment, instructional planning, implementation, and program evaluation. Special educators understand how issues of human diversity can impact families, cultures, and schools, and how these complex human issues can interact with issues in the delivery of special education services. They understand the relationships of organizations of special education to the organizations and functions of schools, school systems, and other agencies. Special educators use this knowledge as a ground upon which to construct their own personal understandings and philosophies of special education.</p>	<p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input type="checkbox"/> #3 <input type="checkbox"/> #4 <input type="checkbox"/> #5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #8 </p>

CEC STANDARD	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
<p>Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the program is preparing candidates.</p>	
<p>2. Development and Characteristics of Learners. Special educators know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings. Special educators understand the similarities and differences in human development and the characteristics between and among individuals with and without exceptional learning needs (ELN)^{1/}. Moreover, special educators understand how exceptional conditions can interact with the domains of human development and they use this knowledge to respond to the varying abilities and behaviors of individual’s with ELN. Special educators understand how the experiences of individuals with ELN can impact families, as well as the individual’s ability to learn, interact socially, and live as fulfilled contributing members of the community.</p> <p>Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.</p>	<p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 <input type="checkbox"/> #8 </p>
<p>3. Individual Learning Differences. Special educators understand the effects that an exceptional condition^{2/} can have on an individual’s learning in school and throughout life. Special educators understand that the beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures can affect relationships among and between students, their families, and the school community. Moreover, special educators are active and resourceful in seeking to understand how primary language, culture, and familial backgrounds interact with the individual’s</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 <input type="checkbox"/> #8 </p>

CEC STANDARD	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
<p>exceptional condition to impact the individual's academic and social abilities, attitudes, values, interests, and career options. The understanding of these learning differences and their possible interactions provides the foundation upon which special educators individualize instruction to provide meaningful and challenging learning for individuals with ELN.</p> <p>Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the program is preparing candidates.</p>	
<p>4. Instructional Strategies. Special educators possess a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with ELN. Special educators select, adapt, and use these instructional strategies to promote positive learning results in general and special curricula^{3/} and to appropriately modify learning environments for individuals with ELN. They enhance the learning of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills of individuals with ELN, and increase their self-awareness, self-management, self-control, self-reliance, and self-esteem. Moreover, special educators emphasize the development, maintenance, and generalization of knowledge and skills across environments, settings, and the lifespan.</p> <p>Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the program is preparing candidates.</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 <input type="checkbox"/> #8 </p>
<p>5. Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Special educators actively create learning environments for individuals with ELN that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with ELN. In addition, special educators foster</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 <input type="checkbox"/> #8 </p>

CEC STANDARD	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
<p>environments in which diversity is valued and individuals are taught to live harmoniously and productively in a culturally diverse world. Special educators shape environments to encourage the independence, self-motivation, self-direction, personal empowerment, and self-advocacy of individuals with ELN. Special educators help their general education colleagues integrate individuals with ELN in regular environments and engage them in meaningful learning activities and interactions. Special educators use direct motivational and instructional interventions with individuals with ELN to teach them to respond effectively to current expectations. When necessary, special educators can safely intervene with individuals with ELN in crisis. Special educators coordinate all these efforts and provide guidance and direction to paraeducators and others, such as classroom volunteers and tutors.</p> <p>Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.</p>	
<p>6. Language. Special educators understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language. Special educators use individualized strategies to enhance language development and teach communication skills to individuals with ELN. Special educators are familiar with augmentative, alternative, and assistive technologies to support and enhance communication of individuals with exceptional needs. Special educators match their communication methods to an individual's language proficiency and cultural and linguistic differences. Special educators provide effective language models and they use communication strategies and resources to facilitate understanding of subject matter for individuals with ELN whose primary language is not English.</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 <input type="checkbox"/> #8 </p>

CEC STANDARD	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
<p>Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of language for and with individuals with ELN through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.</p>	
<p>7. Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice. Special educators develop long-range individualized instructional plans anchored in both general and special curricula. In addition, special educators systematically translate these individualized plans into carefully selected shorter-range goals and objectives taking into consideration an individual's abilities and needs, the learning environment, and a myriad of cultural and linguistic factors. Individualized instructional plans emphasize explicit modeling and efficient guided practice to assure acquisition and fluency through maintenance and generalization. Understanding of these factors as well as the implications of an individual's exceptional condition, guides the special educator's selection, adaptation, and creation of materials, and the use of powerful instructional variables. Instructional plans are modified based on ongoing analysis of the individual's learning progress. Moreover, special educators facilitate this instructional planning in a collaborative context including the individuals with exceptionalities, families, professional colleagues, and personnel from other agencies as appropriate. Special educators also develop a variety of individualized transition plans, such as transitions from preschool to elementary school and from secondary settings to a variety of postsecondary work and learning contexts. Special educators are comfortable using appropriate technologies to support</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input type="checkbox"/> #3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 <input type="checkbox"/> #8 </p>

CEC STANDARD	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
<p>instructional planning and individualized instruction.</p> <p>Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.</p>	
<p>8. Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and special educators use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions. Special educators use the results of assessments to help identify exceptional learning needs and to develop and implement individualized instructional programs, as well as to adjust instruction in response to ongoing learning progress. Special educators understand the legal policies and ethical principles of measurement and assessment related to referral, eligibility, program planning, instruction, and placement for individuals with ELN, including those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Special educators understand measurement theory and practices for addressing issues of validity, reliability, norms, bias, and interpretation of assessment results. In addition, special educators understand the appropriate use and limitations of various types of assessments. Special educators collaborate with families and other colleagues to assure non-biased, meaningful assessments and decision-making. Special educators conduct formal and informal assessments of behavior, learning, achievement, and environments to design learning experiences that support the growth and development of individuals with ELN. Special educators use assessment information to identify supports and adaptations</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 <input type="checkbox"/> #8 </p>

CEC STANDARD	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
<p>required for individuals with ELN to access the general curriculum and to participate in school, system, and statewide assessment programs. Special educators regularly monitor the progress of individuals with ELN in general and special curricula. Special educators use appropriate technologies to support their assessments.</p> <p>Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.</p>	
<p>9. Professional and Ethical Practice. Special educators are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards. Special educators practice in multiple roles and complex situations across wide age and developmental ranges. Their practice requires ongoing attention to legal matters along with serious professional and ethical considerations. Special educators engage in professional activities and participate in learning communities that benefit individuals with ELN, their families, colleagues, and their own professional growth. Special educators view themselves as lifelong learners and regularly reflect on and adjust their practice. Special educators are aware of how their own and others attitudes, behaviors, and ways of communicating can influence their practice. Special educators understand that culture and language can interact with exceptionalities, and are sensitive to the many aspects of diversity of individuals with ELN and their families. Special educators actively plan and engage in activities that foster their professional growth and keep them current with evidence-based best practices. Special educators know their own limits of practice and practice within them.</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #2 <input type="checkbox"/> #3 <input type="checkbox"/> #4 <input type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #8 </p>

CEC STANDARD	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
<p>Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.</p>	
<p>10. Collaboration. Special educators routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with ELN are addressed throughout schooling. Moreover, special educators embrace their special role as advocate for individuals with ELN. Special educators promote and advocate the learning and well being of individuals with ELN across a wide range of settings and a range of different learning experiences. Special educators are viewed as specialists by a myriad of people who actively seek their collaboration to effectively include and teach individuals with ELN. Special educators are a resource to their colleagues in understanding the laws and policies relevant to Individuals with ELN. Special educators use collaboration to facilitate the successful transitions of individuals with ELN across settings and services.</p> <p>Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input type="checkbox"/> #3 <input type="checkbox"/> #4 <input type="checkbox"/> #5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #8 </p>

SECTION IV

Evidence for Meeting Standards

Program Assessment

Candidates receive a schedule to submit specific assignments by course and type of assessment to an electronic assessment system, Chalk and Wire. Data are collected at specific gateways in the program of study. Each of the eight assessments is included in the table of Contents for the Program's assessment system. It is designated as the CEC Portfolio in the electronic data collection system. Candidates submit documents to the electronic portfolio in Chalk and Wire. Candidate evidence is evaluated using common rubrics developed by program faculty in Chalk and Wire. Artifacts are submitted to program advisors for the Program Assessment Table of Contents. The candidates submit their exit portfolios to the three members of a supervisory committee at the program's end. Results from Chalk and Wire are generated and used to improve the program.

Assessment 1 Content Knowledge: Licensure and Professional Examinations

Teachers seeking endorsement in special education must complete specific PRAXIS II tests for graduation. During the evaluation years, all candidates took Praxis II 0351. This test, Special Education Knowledge-Based Core Principles of the passing score is 150. The state mandated that all candidates take Praxis II 0354 with a passing score of 151. Both examinations determine whether candidates possess specific knowledge regarding the legal, historical aspects of special education in addition to the specific principles related to delivering special education services. The examination also evaluates whether candidates possess **foundational and core knowledge** related to the CEC standards for the beginning special educator. This test is required by the state for licensure and must be successfully passed before the candidate can be recommended for licensure or graduate from the program of study. Prior to the mandated change in the 2011-2012 academic year, candidates were required to complete a Praxis II examination required for their specific level (P-4 or 4-12). All candidates were required to submit both the Knowledge based Core Assessment and their specialty assessment to the Assessment system to demonstrate knowledge and skill in their respective areas. The state policy changed in 2010 and candidates were only required to take one Praxis II examination for both emphasis areas. The core knowledge assessment assesses candidate knowledge of the **development and characteristics of learners**. Candidates in each of the two emphasis areas take specialty examinations for those emphasis areas. Data are reported for academic years 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 for Examinations 0351 and 0354. The examinations contain evidence based items codified by the Educational Testing Service as critical knowledge and skills. **Appendix B: Table 1 and Table 1a** presents licensure examinations by emphasis and cut-off scores. Candidates demonstrate knowledge and skill through completion of PRAXIS 0351 and 0354 and in their Specialty area. These scores meet NCATE Standards: Standard 1a: Content knowledge for Teacher Candidates, Standard 1c; Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for teacher candidates, CEC Standard 9: Professional and Ethical Practice.

Candidates enter scores from most recent Praxis II 0354 examination. Scores below 151 are Unacceptable. Scores of 151 and above are Acceptable. Scores above the 75th percentile (actual score varies from year to year) are Target. Candidates with scores above 75th percentile provide documentation. Refer to **Appendix A: Table 1** for Praxis II Evaluation requirements.

Appendix B, Assessment 1: Table 2 Praxis II Examination Foundational Knowledge for the academic year presents the data for the common licensure examination, of all program candidates. These data quantify foundational knowledge as well as specialized content related to development and characteristics of learners. Praxis II examinations and specialty areas test foundational knowledge as well as knowledge of the characteristics of learners with disabilities. Candidates must meet a minimum standard to complete the program. These examinations meet CEC Standards 1 and 2 and NCATE Standard 1. In the 2009-2010, 2 candidates completed Praxis II 0351. The scores reflect that the two candidates who completed scored well above the required minimum score. In the 2010-2011 academic year, 4 candidates completed the Praxis II 00351. The scores reflect that candidates exceeded the minimum score requirement of 150. The mean score for the academic year was 161.75 and the lowest was 155. In 2011-2012 academic year, 13 candidates completed examination 0354. The data show that candidates, again performed well above minimum requirements. The average score was 172.64, well above the require the minimum 151. **Appendix B, Assessment 1: Table 3: Scoring Guide for Praxis II Examination**, provide the criteria used in the Assessment System to assess the levels at which candidates perform on the Praxis II Examinations. The candidates in the 2011-2012 academic year performed at proficient and target levels 100% of the scores presented.

Past examination of the sub categories reveals that the program has an area of concern in Delivery of Services. The four exiters in 2010-2011 whose scores were available indicate that performances were at average and expected levels with the exception of the aforementioned subcategory. With the change to Praxis II 0354, observation of the subcategories reveals that candidates score either slightly above or minimally below the minimum average performance as reported by ETS.

Overall, the candidates in the Special Education program met the minimum requirements in the Knowledge based Core Principles codified by ETS as a requirement for beginning Special Educators. The scores on this examination indicate that candidates gained strengths in "Legal and Societal Issues," a direct result of including additional content in current coursework regarding legal issues. The program has revised the program of study to include a course specifically related to disability law. The program faculty investigated why Delivery of Services is a persistent area of weakness in terms of the content shown in the examination. A commensurate competency is noted in the Core Knowledge and Applications (Test 0354) Praxis II Assessment "Planning and Instruction,

“ that candidates perform at or above minimum average performance as indicated by ETS.

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

Assessment 2 is a performance assessment usually required during the **Intermediate Gate**. This assessment focuses on **Professional and Ethical** practice. Candidates must demonstrate in their presentation that they know the needs of learners with disabilities and the legal requirements for service delivery. Data are collected on a professional presentation as part of program coursework. Candidates must develop and present special education content targeted for general education audiences, other professionals, or individuals unfamiliar with disability, the special education process, or legal issues in special education. These presentations necessitate that candidates interpret the literature, communicate its critical importance to the practice of the profession and consider communicating with diverse audiences (cultures). The scoring rubric for completing the task includes ensuring accurate information as well as measures for electronic presentation of the document.

In 2009-2010, the data show that candidates performed at acceptable and target levels on the majority of the criteria. Twenty nine percent failed to use graphics and the notes pages as directed and 57% failed to provide referential credit for graphics on slides. In 2010-2011, the data show that candidate performance is acceptable and above. Moreover, it appears that two (2) candidates performed unacceptably on more than one element of the presentation and four (4) candidates performed unacceptably on the criterion of providing credit for graphics and other content on the presentation. A great concern is that over half of the candidates who submitted failed to provide credit “on the electronic slide” for graphics, an element that candidates failed to attempt on the scoring rubric. The data for 2011-2012 show that candidates continue to perform at acceptable and target levels. Additionally, providing the credit for graphics on the presentation slides is an area of improvement for all reporting academic years. Candidate instructions on the scoring rubric are clear; however, emphasis must be given greater depth of instruction regarding copyright infringement and fair use. Appendix C, Assessment 2, Table 4 presents the scale for assessing the professional presentation. Appendix C, Assessment 2, Table 5 presents professional presentation data by for three consecutive academic years.

PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS

Assessment 3: Evaluation of Lesson Plan. All candidates must demonstrate competency in designing an implementing instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of students with disabilities 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 has to show 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. Inherent in instructional planning is the assessment component. Candidates complete activities both in methods courses and in field/practicum experiences to meet this goal. The common scoring rubric designed by the program faculty adheres to specific CEC standards 4, Instructional Strategies, and Skill 3: "Select, adapt, and use instructional strategies and materials according to characteristics of the individual with exceptional learning needs"; all of Competency 5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions and Competency 7, Instructional Planning. Appendix C, Assessment 3, Table 6: Scoring Guide for Lesson Plan presents the criteria for evaluating the performance. Appendix C, Assessment 3, Table 7: Lesson Plan Performance Percentages: Academic Years 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 shows the results of candidate performance on this assessment. These data show that candidates score primarily Target on the scoring rubric, a **good improvement between academic years**. Multiple areas of concern are revealed in these data. It appears that one or two of the students performed at unacceptable levels for writing goals, formatting the lesson, adapting for learners with differences, and evaluating learning. A pattern emerged in the critical skill of writing objectives, clearly detailing adaptations for learners with disabilities, and evaluation. Performances were acceptable (33% and 67%) in areas specifically targeted in professional practice in special education. Candidates require direct instruction in task analysis which facilitates objective writing. The data for 2011-2012 show that candidates perform at acceptable to target levels. Candidates who perform at unacceptable levels are offered opportunities to revise the assignment, individually. They may revise the assignment, but are not required to resubmit to the Assessment System.

Assessment 4: Evaluation of Teaching.

Key to the practice of special education is the development and maintenance of educational environments. Assessment is an integral attribute of such maintenance. CEC Standard 5: Learning environments and social interactions, Standard 6, Language, and Standard 8, Assessment highlights that special educator must have skill in fostering environments that value diversity and develop individuals with exceptional learning needs to live productively in a diverse world. This is accomplished through ensuring that environments foster those skills. Educators attend to student language and promote communication skills. Assessment supports each of those pillars. The performance assessment targeted by the Program is the Field Experience Teaching Observation. This observation illustrates the art of teaching, managing the learning environment, and the dispositions which accompany effective teaching for learners with disabilities. Using this assessment, the program evaluates if the candidate has knowledge of and can address **individual learning differences, manage a learning environment, engage in instructional strategies to meet individual learning differences and assess student learning.**

Appendix C, Assessment 4, Table 8: Scoring Guide for Field Experience

Teaching Evaluation presents the criteria for evaluating teaching performance.

Appendix C contains Assessment 4, Table 9 Field Experience Teaching Evaluation Criteria by Academic Year 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012. The data for 2009-2010, show candidates perform at acceptable and target levels; The data for the 2010-2011 data show that the majority of candidates perform at the Acceptable and Target levels. Candidates have at minimum three (3) observations throughout the practicum experience semester. The data for 2011-2012 show candidates perform at acceptable and target levels. Notably, candidates must demonstrate progress from the first observation to the final. The program coordinator identified two areas that required attention during the 2010-2011 reporting year. One was in the allocation of instructional time. Candidates should devote more time to the instructional process and become more aware of strategies and their selection of instructional strategies. The second is higher level thinking or extending the learning. Subsequent attention to these aspects of pedagogy has resulted in the two candidates performance improving in the areas identified as needing attention.

It appears that most candidates provided those assessments favorably. Although there are some concerns with aligning the instruction to the required skill and professional dispositions. Candidates who perform unacceptably, are given one to one feedback and correction and are allowed to resubmit for course grades. Candidates are not required to resubmit improved performance observations.

EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING

Assessment 5 The fifth assessment is a performance assessment by rubric, a case study, typically required in the field experience/capstone gate. Program standards require that candidates can show an effect on student learning. Candidates must provide evidence that they can design instruction based upon assessment. Using assessment data to assure appropriate progress toward learning objectives is necessary. To that end, candidates develop instructional 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 intervening on those concerns. The assignment calls for candidates to address individual learning differences, plan and deliver instruction, identify effective instructional strategies, assess the learning environment, assure that the subject's language issues are resolved and assess intervention. Program candidates have multiple opportunities to engage in field activities to demonstrate those skills.

Appendix D. Assessment 5, Table 10 Scoring Guide for Case Studies, in Appendix D contains is criteria for this performance assessment. **Appendix D. Assessment 5, Table 11 Case Study 1, Percent Performance by Criteria by Year** data are presented. These data evaluates candidate proficiency in assessing for the purposes of instruction and in adjusting instruction to meet the individualized needs of learners with disabilities. The criteria for these assessments specifically hones in on candidate ability to

identify student needs, conduct assessments for the purposes of identifying goals and objectives, and provide guidance for their own or others' instruction of students with disabilities. Additionally, candidates must demonstrate skills in written and oral expression in order to assure general education teachers are provided with the optimal information by which to instruct students in the general education content. These activities meet CEC Standard 3 which focuses on individual learning differences and Standard 8, Assessment.

The data in Appendix D, Table 11 illustrates that candidates' performance for 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012. The 2009-2010 data show XXX. The 2010-2011 data show to performance to be Acceptable to Target. The most recent data show performance data show that candidates continue to perform at acceptable to target levels. These data indicate that candidates know and can develop assessments to identify student needs and provide recommendations for instruction with disabilities. A closer inspection of these data from a different perspective indicates that candidates had difficulty in Professional Pedagogical performance. The case study presented in *the Exit Portfolio* requires that candidates *explain* what the assessment data mean in terms of curriculum and instructional design. This alerted the program faculty that attention should be given to the analytical aspect of student learning assessment. This is noted in Appendix D, Assessment 5, Table 12 Pedagogical Professional Knowledge Skills and Dispositions Average Scores for All Candidates provides an additional observation of candidate performance in this area. Two tables are presented that inform program decisions and candidate outcomes. Table 12a shows the data that alerted faculty to improve pedagogy around the concept of data analysis in the 2008-2009 academic year. Table 12b shows outcomes for all candidates on the same criteria that show an improvement in performance on the case study in the 2010-2011 academic year. The criterion, Recommendations: Evidence based and Complete show a performance level of 100% for responders in the 2011-2012 reporting period as noted in Table 12.

ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT

Assessment 6. The Council for Exceptional Children standards includes assuring that the special educator develops skills in collaborating with other professionals. This skill is essential in insuring that candidates can effectively communicate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. Candidates must engage in activities that are culturally responsive that will assure that the needs of diverse learners with disabilities are met in a variety of settings. 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 in order 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 document which relies on collaboration, which is the IEP. The facsimile IEP plan must align with assessment and guide **instructional** planning. **Foundational** knowledge is crucial for the candidate to complete federal and

state required forms to conclude the assignment. Appendix E, Assessment 6, Table 13 Scoring Guide for Facsimile IEP presents the criteria used to score the performance.

Appendix E, Assessment 6, Table 14 Facsimile IEP Percent Scores by Criteria presents data for the facsimile IEP by academic year. Its title is "facsimile;" however, the candidate has the option to complete the activity with an actual student, given human subjects' clearance. Four years ago, stakeholder feedback has indicated that candidates were ill-prepared to accurately complete the IEP document. In response, Program faculty included specific instruction in IEP design and implementation; providing inservice training by the state adopted electronic IEP software SEAS Web. CEC standard 10, Collaboration is represented in the IEP performance. The data for all reporting years show that candidates performed at acceptable and target levels. The 2010-2011 data for one candidate. The data show that this candidate's performance is at the Target level. However, the extremely small number for this assessment does not prompt the program faculty to make any firm conclusions about candidate ability in this area. The 2011-2012 data show an area of concern regarding the development of assessment based objectives and conceptualization of mastery criterion for two of the six candidates submitting for that reporting year.

ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT 7. 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 which guide their practice and its adjustment. Candidate reflection is required throughout field activities to 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 Portfolio of Scholarship, the candidate must submit an overall reflection of preservice skill development. This reflection must detail evidence of professional growth as well as self-evaluation to guide further professional development.

Appendix E, Assessment 7, Table 15 Scoring Guide for Reflective Educator presents the criteria for scoring for candidates' as reflective educators. Appendix E, Assessment 7, Table 16 Assessment of the Reflective Educator presents data on candidates' reflective evaluation of preservice practice. Performance in these data aligns with CEC standard 9, Professional and Ethical Practices. These data show that candidates engaged, in particular, evidence of growth. The numbers of candidates reflected on the data are duplicate assessments from three (3) assessors. Data area presented for 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012. The data for 2009-2010 show that candidates perform at acceptable and target levels; however one of the five submitters seemed unclear about evaluating performance using the standards. The 2010-2011 data show that candidates continue to be reflective although one candidate appears to have lacked depth in evaluating their performance. The 2011-2012 data

experienced a stunning reversal of competency for using standards as a means of reflecting on performance with an 86% Unacceptable performance. That translates to four of the five candidates being unable to articulate the competencies in their reflections. These data also meet the College of Education's conceptual framework related to Leaders in Learning as evidenced in reflective educator practices.

ASSESSMENT 8. A final assessment is the professional development plan. This plan is developed in the professional gate and informs the program about the professional development opportunities related to both philosophical foundations as well as professional performance indicators in CEC. Candidates are required to demonstrate overall knowledge about legal requirements as a professional educator, and to detail the collaborative efforts required to maintain a special educational professional.

Professional and ethical practices are among the lynchpins of special education preparation. This assessment meets CEC Standard 1, Foundations and Standard 9 Professional and Ethical Practices. The Council for Exceptional Children Standard 9 states, "Special educators practice in multiple roles and complex situations across wide age and developmental ranges. Their practice requires ongoing attention to legal matters along with serious professional and ethical considerations." Program faculty elected to focus on this assessment as the program seeks to develop teacher leaders who can communicate the legal requirements of special education to others. To that end, the candidate must actively engage in activities that promote ongoing professional growth while remaining current with evidence-based practices. Specific criteria for assessing the professional development plan are located in **Appendix E, Assessment 8, and Table 17 Scoring Guide for Professional Development Plan.**

The professional development plan represents knowledge and skill in CEC Standard 1, Foundations and Standard 9, Professional and Ethical Practice. Data for the professional development plan is located in Appendix E, Assessment 8, and Table 18 Scores for Professional Development Plan for academic years 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 academic years. These data show that candidates know the processes for improving professional skills and have a plan for maintaining professional skills.

SECTION V

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Available data illustrate that candidates perform at proficient and above levels on performance indicators required by the Council for Exceptional Children and NCATE. Performance by Criterion scores indicate that the majority of candidates are performing the knowledge and skill competencies at acceptable to target levels.

Content knowledge is evaluated using the state mandated assessments. Since candidates are required to present passing Praxis II scores prior to graduation, acceptable and target performance and a few of retakes show candidates have acquired professional knowledge as codified by ETS. Content knowledge also is assessed through professional activities which demonstrate the candidate's ability to convey specific knowledge of laws, practice and requirements for special education service delivery. The data show that candidates can communicate special education content to other professionals. Additionally, the assessments show that candidates are aware of ways to ensure that other professionals learn ways to intervene with students with exceptional learning needs in the general education content (see Assessment 2: Professional presentation and Assessment 6, Facsimile IEP) These data will be used to assure continued application of methods to maintain candidate performance.

One area of improvement in the three reporting years is in the Pedagogical Professional standard in which candidates had performed below acceptable on the Case Study. Subsequent inclusion of strategies to improve how candidates interpret assessment data has shown improvement. These activities will continue to be offered in the core course, SPED 7305, and have been added to application assignments during methods courses.

The data indicate that candidate field experience in teaching is at or above target levels. One area of note in the 2010-2011 academic year is that 3 of the 4 students reportedly scored at the acceptable level. These data are not cause for great alarm, however, attention must be given to ensuring that there is consistency in teaching the design of lessons time on teaching, and teaching itself. Fifty percent performed acceptably on levels of thinking skills, i.e., higher level thinking. Improving P-12 abilities in this area is a new focus in the profession. Program faculty will determine how best to implement strategies to support more capacity to support learners in this area. The field experience assessment has been revised. However, candidates in the current report were not assessed on the document. Subsequent candidates will be assessed using the revised evaluation tool. Candidates who perform at unacceptable levels are provided specific feedback, individual consultation, and opportunities to revise the assignment for course credit. The candidate receives individual feedback, additional support in the form of resources and tutoring. They may revise the assignment, but are not required to resubmit to the Assessment System.

No significant changes have occurred given these data. The newly revised program of study is in its initial stages of implementation. Subsequent data collected will reveal how changes have affected student abilities. A more intensive field experience has been designed which will place greater emphasis on a broader range of instructional behaviors. Finally, scoring rubrics have been revised to more strategically assess performance in the practicum experiences.

ATTACHMENT A
Candidate Information

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

Program: SPED		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers⁴
2009-2010	51	7
2010-2011	41	9
2011-2012	34	4

⁴ NCATE uses the Title II definition for *program completers*. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

ATTACHMENT B

Faculty Information

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

Faculty Member Name	Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁵	Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁶	Faculty Rank ⁷	Tenure Track (Yes/No)	Scholarship, ⁸ Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service: ⁹ List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ¹⁰	Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ¹¹
Hune	EdD Special Education, Teacher Preparation University of Kentucky, Lexington	Faculty	Tenured	Yes	Publications Hune, J. B., (2007). Technology application for students with behavioral problems: Preliminary results. SITE Proceedings. Hune, J. B., (2008). Technology application for students with behavioral problems: An analysis of the research.	Special Education Teacher, Early Childhood Resource Special Education Teacher,

⁵ e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska

⁶ e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator

⁷ e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor

⁸ *Scholarship* is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel. Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.

⁹ *Service* includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission.

¹⁰ e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program

¹¹ Briefly describe the nature of recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

					<p>SITE Proceedings</p> <p><u>Advisory board for international/national/regional entity</u> Special Education National Advisory Committee for ETS (nomination)</p> <p>Presentations at International Meeting</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Hune, J. B., (March, 2008). Technology application for students with behavioral problems; Preliminary Results. SITE Roundtable, 2007 2) Technology application for students with behavioral problems: An analysis of the research. SITE Roundtable, 2008 <p>Presentation made at state meeting</p> <p>Price, L. B., & Hune, J. B. (2006, March). Understanding individuals with Asperger's syndrome or high functioning autism in Arkansas. Presented for Lorman Education Services; Little Rock, Arkansas</p> <p>Price, L. B., & Hune, J. B. (2006, June). Understanding individuals with Asperger's syndrome or high functioning autism. Presented to Hope Landing, Eldorado, AR</p> <p>Organized State CEC Pre-Conference Workshop, November 2006</p>	<p>Intermediate Resource</p> <p>Special Education Teacher, Self – Contained EBD</p> <p>Inservice Trainer, LRSD</p> <p>Inservice Trainer, Eldorado School District</p> <p>Inservice Trainer, Dollarway School District</p> <p>Section 504, ADA Workshop, Northeast Arkansas Coop</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>Chair ECCO Head Start Health Education Committee</p> <p>AR CCBD President 2001-2007</p> <p>Minority Teacher Scholars Grant, administrator, 2005-2008. Minimum \$5,000 per grant.</p>	
Bruce Smith	PhD, Educational Psychology with an emphasis in Special Education, UCLA	Associate Dean, COE and Professor of Special Education	Professor	Yes, Tenured	<p>Smith, B. (2007). Classroom management. <i>The Praeger Handbook of American High Schools</i>. Kathryn Borman, Spencer Cahill, and Bridget Cotner (Eds.)(Vol 1, pp. 76-84). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.</p> <p>Smith, B. (2006). The Arkansas Co-Teach Collaborative, AN ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, GRANT, Accepted June 2007, \$35,500.</p> <p>Smith, B. (2006). The HSU/ERZ Co-Teach Collaborative, AN ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, SPECIAL EDUCATION DEAN'S SYMPOSIUM SUBGRANT, Accepted January 2006, \$10,000.</p>	<p>Co-Teaching (with Kathy Balkman and Georgine Steinmiller). (November 27, 2007). Workshop for Elementary and Secondary Teachers, Arkansas Co-Teach Collaborative, HSU, Arkadelphia, AR</p> <p>Co-Teaching (with Kathy Balkman and Paulette Blacknall). (July, 2007). Workshop for Elementary, Middle, & Secondary Teachers, HSU/ERZ Co-Teach Collaborative, Lakeside, AR</p> <p>Co-Teaching (with Kathy Balkman and Paulette Blacknall). (December 5, 2006). Workshop for Secondary Teachers, HSU/ERZ Co-Teach Collaborative, HSU, Arkadelphia, AR</p> <p>Co-Teaching (with Kathy Balkman and Paulette Blacknall). (November 1, 2006). Workshop for Secondary Teachers,</p>

						<p>HSU/ERZ Co-Teach Collaborative, HSU, Arkadelphia, AR</p> <p>Child Development. (July 27, 2007). Workshop for Alternative Licensure Candidates. Southwest Regional Educational Cooperative. Hope, AR.</p> <p>Behavior Management. (June 19, 2007). Workshop for Teacher Development. DeQueen/Mena Educational Coop. DeQueen, AR.</p> <p>Child Development. (June 15, 2007). Workshop for Teacher Development. DeQueen/Mena Educational Coop. DeQueen, AR.</p> <p>Student Motivation. (June 9, 2007). Workshop for Teacher Development. Dawson Educational Coop. Arkadelphia, AR.</p> <p>Behavior Management. (June 8, 2007). Workshop for Teacher Development. Dawson Educational Coop. Arkadelphia, AR.</p> <p>Child Development. (June 7, 2007). Workshop for Teacher Development. Dawson Educational Coop. Arkadelphia, AR.</p> <p>Behavior Management.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>(June 8, 2006). Workshop for Teacher Development. Dawson Educational Coop. Arkadelphia, AR.</p> <p>Child Development. (June 7, 2006). Workshop for Teacher Development. Dawson Educational Coop. Arkadelphia, AR.</p>
Rascheel Hastings ,	<p>Ed. D., Special Education 2002–2006 Ball State University Muncie, IN</p>	Faculty	Assistant Professor	Yes	<p>Hastings, R. S. (2006). <i>Assessing Time-Away and Teachers Perceptions of Its Effectiveness on Girls with Behavioral Problems</i>. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ball State University, Muncie, IN.</p> <p>Hastings, R. S. (2004). Curriculum Adaptations for Persons with Special Needs and Students in the Regular Schools Setting. In A. A. Shumeiko & V. P. Balov, <i>The Far East: Science, Education. XXI Century: Materials of the 2nd International Scientific-Practical Conference</i> (V.3, pp.89-92). Komsomolsk-on-Amur, Russia: Komsomolsk-on-Amur State University of Pedagogy.</p>	<p>Helpful Hints for Teachers of Students with Asperger’s Syndrome. 21st Annual Indiana Emotional Handicapped Conference, Nashville, IN (May 2003)</p> <p>Asperger’s Syndrome/Guidelines for Teachers. 8th Annual Student Symposium/Ball State University, Muncie, IN (March 2003)</p>

Attachment C
Programs of Study

OLD PROGRAM

Programs of Study

Bulletin date:

Degree Sought: M.Ed.-SPED

**Advancement to Candidacy
UALR Graduate School
Master of Education in Special Education:
Early Childhood Instructional Specialist**

Student Name _____ Student # _____

Address/Zip _____

Telephone: _____ B Date Submitted _____ Admission Status ___Reg. _____

Requirements for the degree include a minimum of 36 credit hours plus a Portfolio of Scholarship. Students must satisfy Graduation Requirements stated in the Academic Rules and Regulations section of the Graduate Bulletin and additional requirements found under the College of Education. The University reserves the right to modify policies and programs of study by supplying students written notice of the change.

=====

In the space to the left of the course number, enter the number of credits of each course not completed. Enter a grade to show credits for a course already completed. Enter a T for transfer credits or an S for approved Substitutions (a Transfer of Credit Request or an Approved Substitution Form must accompany this form).

Early Childhood Instructional Specialist (18 Hours)

- ___ SPED 5312 Medical Problems
- ___ SPED 7341 ECSE Assessment/Intervention I
- ___ SPED 7342 ECSE Assessment/Intervention II
- _ _ ECED 7343 Families, Early Development & Disabilities
- ___ SPED 7344 Collaborative Partnerships
- ___ AUSP 7393 Infant/Toddler Communication

Special Education Core Courses (15 Hours)

- ___ EDFN 7303 Intro to Ed. Research
- _ _ SPED 7301 Foundations of Special Ed.
- ___ SPED 7302 Technology in Special Ed.
- _ _ SPED 7305 Managing the Learning Env.
- ___ SPED 7309 Seminar in Special Education

Field or Clinical Experiences (3 Hours)

- ___ SPED 7141 ECSE Clinical Experience I
- ___ SPED 7142 ECSE Clinical Experience II
- _ _ SPED 7144 Collaboration in the Field

Approved Program Substitutions

=====

Deficiencies: The following courses or their equivalents must be completed prior to enrollment in SPED 7341 Assessment/Intervention I

- ___ EDFN 4302 Assessment in Early Childhood OR ___ EDFN 7171 Assessment: Measure/Proced.

=====

Notes: _____

=====

Student _____ Date _____

Program Advisor _____ Date _____

COE Associate Dean _____ Date _____

Graduate Dean _____ Date _____

=====

Copies: Student, Advisor, COE Associate Dean, Graduate Dean Revised May 2002

NEW PROGRAM

Bulletin date: _____ Degree Sought: M.Ed.-SPED

Advancement to Candidacy
UALR Graduate School
Master of Education in Special Education:
Early Childhood Instructional Specialist B-4

Student Name _____ Student # _____

Address/Zip _____

Telephone: _____ H _____ B Date Submitted _____ Admission Status _____

Requirements for the degree include a minimum of 36 credit hours plus a Portfolio of Scholarship. Students must satisfy Graduation Requirements stated in the Academic Rules and Regulations section of the Graduate Bulletin and additional requirements found under the College of Education. The University reserves the right to modify policies and programs of study by supplying students written notice of the change.

=====

In the space to the left of the course number, enter the number of credits of each course not completed. Enter a grade to show credits for a course already completed. Enter a T for transfer credits or an S for approved Substitutions (a Transfer of Credit Request or an Approved Substitution Form must accompany this form).

Special Education Core Courses (24 hours)

- _____ SPED 7301 Foundations of Special Ed.
- _____ SPED 7302 Technology in Special Ed.
- _____ SPED 7305 Managing the Learning Evn.

Instructional Specialist B-4 Emphasis (9 hours)

- _____ SPED 5312 Medical Problems
- _____ SPED 7342 ECSE Assessment/Intervention
- _____ SPED 7350 ECSE Practicum II

- _____ SPED 7343 Disability Law
- _____ SPED 7351 Assessment in Special Education
- _____ SPED 7390 Assessment in SPED Practicum
- _____ EDFN 7303 Intro. to Ed. Research
- _____ SPED 7309 Seminar in Special Education

Approved Program Substitutions

=====
Deficiencies: The following courses or their equivalents must be completed prior to enrollment in SPED 7341 Assessment/Intervention I

_____EDFN 4302 Assessment in Early Childhood OR _____EDFN 7171 Assessment: Measure/Proced.

=====
Notes:

=====
Student _____ Date _____

Program Advisor _____ Date _____

COE Associate Dean _____ Date _____

Graduate Dean _____ Date _____

=====

Copies: Student, Advisor, COE Associate Dean, Graduate Dean

DRAFT Feb. 11, 2010

Degree: M.Ed.

OLD PROGRAM
Advancement to Candidacy
UALR Graduate School

***Masters of Education in Special Education:
Instructional Specialist 4-12***

Student Name: _____ Student ID: _____

Address: _____

Phone Nos. _____ Admission Status: _____

Requirements for the Degree include a minimum of 36 hrs. plus a portfolio presentation.

Special Education Core (15 hrs.)

- _____ SPED 7301 Foundations in Special Education
- _____ SPED 7302 Technology and Special Education
- _____ SPED 7305 Managing the Learning Environment.
- _____ SPED 7309 Seminar in Special Education
- _____ EDFN 7303 Introduction to Research

Instructional Spec. Core (21 hrs.)

- ___ SPED 7206 Families and Individuals with Disabilities
- ___ SPED 7344 Collaborative Partnerships
- ___ SPED 7351 Assessment and Instructional Design I
- ___ SPED 7352 Assessment and Instructional Design II
- ___ SPED 7353 Transition and Life Adjustment

- ___SPED 7292 Field Experience I
- ___SPED 7295 Field Experience II
- ___SPED 7296 Field Experience III
- ___SPED 7154 Physical and Health Management

Approved Program Substitutions

_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

Student _____

Date _____

Advisor _____

Date _____

COE Associate Dean _____

Date _____

Graduate Dean _____

Date _____

NEW PROGRAM

Bulletin date:

Degree Sought: M.Ed.-SPED

Advancement to Candidacy
UALR Graduate School
Master of Education in Special Education:
Instructional Specialist 4-12

Student Name _____ Student # _____

Address/Zip _____

Telephone: _____ H _____ B Date Submitted _____ Admission Status _____

Requirements for the degree include a minimum of 36 credit hours plus a Portfolio of Scholarship. Students must satisfy Graduation Requirements stated in the Academic Rules and Regulations section of the Graduate Bulletin and additional requirements found under the College of Education. The University reserves the right to modify policies and programs of study by supplying students written notice of the change.

=====

In the space to the left of the course number, enter the number of credits of each course not completed. Enter a grade to show credits for a course already completed. Enter a T for transfer credits or an S for approved Substitutions (a Transfer of Credit Request or an Approved Substitution Form must accompany this form).

Special Education Core Courses (24 hours)

- _____ SPED 7301 Foundations of Special Ed.
- _____ SPED 7302 Technology in Special Ed.
- _____ SPED 7305 Managing the Learning Evn.
- _____ SPED 7343 Disability Law
- _____ SPED 7351 Assessment in Special Education
- _____ SPED 7390 Assessment in SPED Practicum
- _____ EDFN 7303 Intro. to Ed. Research
- _____ SPED 7309 Seminar in Special Education

Instructional Specialist 4-12 Emphasis (9 hours)

- _____ SPED 7352 Assessment & Instr. Des. II
- _____ SPED 7395 Assessment & Instr. Des. II Pract.
- _____ SPED 7353 Transition and Life Adjustment

Approved Program Substitutions

=====

Deficiencies: Candidates must present proof of teaching in the core academic subjects via the teaching license. Candidates may be required to take courses in teaching reading and math if proof is not submitted or unsubstantiated, for example, P.E. w/o core content

Notes:

=====

Student _____ Date _____

Program Advisor _____ Date _____

COE Associate Dean _____ Date _____

Graduate Dean _____

Date _____

=====
Copies: Student, Advisor, COE Associate Dean, Graduate Dean

=====
DRAFT Feb. 11, 2010

APPENDIX A

EXERPT

Instructional Specialist 4-12
Field Experience Handbook

SECTION VI
SPECIALIZATION AREA:
INSTRUCTIONAL SPECIALIST 4-12
PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS
THE UALR EDUCATION
FIELD EXPERIENCES:
4-12 EDUCATIONAL SPECIALIST

SECOND PRACTICUM**INSTRUCTIONAL SPECIALIST 4-12****OBJECTIVES FOR SECOND FIELD EXPERIENCE****Course Description**

Candidates will engage in specific implementation of strategies for students with various learning problems in field sites. Course activities will focus on instruction, instructional design, learners and the instructional environment. Candidates will utilize various informal assessments and analyze them for their utility in the pre-referral, referral, and evaluation and IEP development process. Prerequisites: Successful completion of SPED 7351 and SPED 7350. It is suggested that this course be taken concurrently with SPED 7352.

OBJECTIVES:**Special Education Standard #3: Individual Learning Differences****The candidate will**

1. Adopt professional/instructional behaviors to ameliorate the effects that an exceptional condition(s) may have on an individual's life.
2. Address the impact of learners' academic and social abilities, attitudes, interests, and values on instruction and career development. with exceptional learning needs, family, and schooling
3. Modify instruction to address the variations in beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures and their effects on relationships among individuals

Special Education Standard #4: Instructional Strategies**Skills:**

Teach individuals to use self-assessment, problem solving, and other cognitive strategies to meet their needs. (SE, C; ARP3; CC4S2)

Select, adapt, and use instructional strategies and materials according to characteristics of the individual with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP3; CC4S3)

Use strategies to facilitate maintenance and generalization of skills across learning environments. (SE; ARP3; CC4S4)

Use strategies to facilitate integration into various settings. (SE; ARP3; CC4S1)

Special Education Standard #5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions

Create a safe, equitable, positive, and supportive learning environment in which diversities are valued. (SE; ARP4; CC5S1)

Identify realistic expectations for personal and social behavior in various settings. (SE; ARP4; CC5S2)

Identify supports needed for integration into various program placements. (SE; ARP4; CC5S3)

Design learning environments that encourage active participation in individual and group activities. (SE; ARP4; CC5S4)

Modify the learning environment to manage behaviors. (SE; ARP4; CC5S5)

Use performance data and information from all stakeholders to make or suggest modifications in learning environments. (SE; ARP4; CC5S6)

Establish and maintain rapport with individuals with and without exceptional learning needs. (SE, C; ARP4; CC5S7)

Use effective and varied behavior management strategies. (SE; ARP4; CC5S10)

Use the least intensive behavior management strategy consistent with the needs of the individual with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP4; CC5S11)

Design and manage daily routines. (SE; ARP4; CC5S12)

Organize, develop, and sustain learning environments that support positive intracultural and intercultural experiences. (SE; ARP4; CC5S13)

Structure, direct, and support the activities of paraeducators, volunteers, and tutors

Special Education Standard #6: Communication

Effects of cultural and linguistic differences on growth and development. (SE; ARP4; CC6K1)

Use communication strategies and resources to facilitate understanding of subject matter for students whose primary language is not the dominant language. (SE, C; ARP4; CC6S2)

Special Education Standard #7: Instructional Planning

Identify and prioritize areas of the general curriculum and accommodations for individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S1)

Develop and implement comprehensive, longitudinal individualized programs in collaboration with team members. (SE; C; ARP 2; CC7S2)

Use functional assessments to develop intervention plans. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S4)

Sequence, implement, and evaluate individualized learning objectives. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S6)

Develop and select instructional content, resources, and strategies that respond to cultural, linguistic, and gender differences. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S8)

Incorporate and implement instructional and assistive technology into the educational program. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S9)

Prepare lesson plans. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S10)

Prepare and organize materials to implement daily lesson plans. (SE)

Special Education Standard #8: Assessment

Develop or modify individualized assessment strategies. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S4)

Interpret information from formal and informal assessments. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S5)

Use assessment information in making eligibility, program, and placement decisions for individuals with exceptional learning needs, including those from culturally and/or linguistically diverse backgrounds. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S6)

Report assessment results to all stakeholders using effective communication skills. (SE; C; ARP 2; CC8S7)

Evaluate instruction and monitor progress of individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S8)

Develop or modify individualized assessment strategies. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S9)

Create and maintain records. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S10)

Special Education Standard #9: Professional and Ethical Practice

Demonstrate commitment to developing the highest education and quality-of-life potential of individuals with exceptional learning needs. (PD; ARP 5; CC9S5)

Demonstrate sensitivity for the culture, language, religion, gender, disability, socio-economic status, and sexual orientation of individuals. (SE, PD; ARP 5; CC9S6)

Practice within one's skill limit and obtain assistance as needed. (SE, CPD; ARP 5; CC9S7)

Use verbal, nonverbal, and written language effectively. (C; ARP 5; CC9S8)

Special Education Standard 10: Collaboration

Maintain confidential communication about individuals with exceptional learning needs. (C; ARP 5; CC10S1)

Collaborate with families and others in assessment of individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10S2)

Foster respectful and beneficial relationships between families and professionals. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10S3)

Collaborate with school personnel and community members in integrating individuals with exceptional learning needs into various settings. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10S6)

Use group problem solving skills to develop, implement and evaluate collaborative activities. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10S7)

Model techniques and coach others in the use of instructional methods and accommodations. (C; PD; ARP 5; CC10S8)

Observe, evaluate and provide feedback to paraeducators. (C; PD; ARP 5; CC10S11)

TASKS FOR PRACTICUM 2

The field experience contract lists the following types of activities that should be included in this experience. The candidate should use each of these experiences to learn teaching and classroom management skills or to understand students. If the pre-professional is assigned to two classrooms, the time will be evenly split between the two sites.

Foundations

1. Collect/assess information about the school programs and the cascade of services available for learners with a range of disabilities

Individual Learning Differences

2. Write educational profiles for learners with various exceptionalities

Assessment, diagnosis and evaluation

3. Administer and analyze outcomes of various assessments according to the unique needs of the learner
5. Develop a portfolio assessment and assessment rubrics with research-based foundations

Instructional content and practice

4. Access/evaluate district curriculum and products related to state curriculum frameworks and the implementation thereof
5. Work with students through small group and individual interaction.
6. Teach at least four lessons utilizing teaching strategies based upon assessments, student profiles and supporting data.
 - a. For each lesson, the candidate will prepare written plans, including a post-test, in consultation with the clinical supervisor.
 - b. Evaluate each lesson taught, including those not observed by the university supervisor
7. Produce a protocol for adapting and/or modifying curriculum through an actual student or a case study
8. Produce a set of materials to support learners throughout the general curriculum, resources, supports, etc., including technology applications appropriate for assessed learning needs
9. Write an instructional plan including technology-related applications

Learning Environments and Social Interactions

10. Access information and develop programming for students with severe cognitive or physical disabilities
11. Develop activities with learners in tutoring or special activities
 - a. Observe cooperative learning activities
 - b. Develop and assess a peer tutoring activity and report effectiveness

12. Develop an program using alternative teaching arrangements
 - a. Observe various co-teaching arrangements and report effectiveness
 - b. Develop in co-teaching arrangements and report planning process, implementation and outcomes
13. Write lesson plans
14. Develop and implement an individualized plan to enhance social skills
15. Evaluate the outcomes of student instructional management strategies

Communication

16. Develop professional behavior to address communication skills of 4-12 students and human relations skills appropriate for a teacher

Instructional Planning

17. Assess the features of the general education curriculum and develop strategies to train others regarding its adaptations for diverse learners with disabilities
18. Prepare lesson plans

Assessment

19. Write assessment reports
20. Collect and analyze data
21. Make instructional modifications using assessment data

Professional and Ethical Practice

22. Develop records for individuals with disabilities including strategies to maintain privacy and confidentiality

Collaboration

Collaborate with families and others in assessment of individuals with exceptional learning needs.

CAREER GUIDANCE

Anyone, candidate, clinical supervisor, or university supervisor who sees evidence that teaching may not be a wise career choice for a particular pre-professional or that a pre-professional has weaknesses that need to be remedied, should request a concern conference as soon as the problem becomes apparent. Please call Dr. Jennifer Buie Hune or Dr. Margaret Robinson, vision studies) at 569-3124 as soon as the problem is detected.

Special Education Program Common Core

Common Curricular

**CEC Ten: Common Core
Knowledge and Skills Statements****Special Education Standard #1: Foundations****Knowledge:**

1. Models, theories, and philosophies that form the basis for special education practice. (SE; ARP1; CC1K1)
2. Laws, policies, and ethical principles regarding behavior management planning and implementation. (SE; ARP1; CC1K2)
3. Relationship of special education to the organization and function of educational agencies. (SE; ARP1; CC1K3)
4. Rights and responsibilities of students, parents, teachers, and other professionals, and schools related to exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP1; CC1K4)
5. Issues in definition and identification of individuals with exceptional learning needs, including those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. (SE; ARP1; CC1K5)
6. Issues, assurances and due process rights related to assessment, eligibility, and placement within a continuum of services. (SE; ARP1; CC1K6)
7. Family systems and the role of families in the educational process. (SE; ARP1; CC1K7)
8. Historical points of view and contribution of culturally diverse groups. (SE; ARP1; CC1K8)
9. Impact of the dominant culture on shaping schools and the individuals who study and work in them. (SE; ARP1; CC1K9)
10. Potential impact of differences in values, languages, and customs that can exist between the home and school. (SE; ARP1; CC1K10)

Skills:

1. Articulate personal philosophy of special education. (SE, C; ARP1; CC1S1)

Special Education Standard #2: Development and Characteristics of Learners**Knowledge:**

1. Typical and atypical human growth and development. (SE; ARP3; CC2K1)
2. Educational implications of characteristics of various exceptionalities. (SE; ARP3; CC2K2)
3. Characteristics and effects of the cultural and environmental milieu of the individual with exceptional learning needs and the family. (SE; ARP3; CC2K3)
4. Family systems and the role of families in supporting development. (SE; ARP3; CC2K4)
5. Similarities and differences of individuals with and without exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP3; CC2K5)

6. Similarities and differences among individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP3; CC2K6)
7. Effects of various medications on individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP3; CC2K7)

Special Education Standard #3: Individual Learning Differences

Knowledge:

4. Effects an exceptional condition(s) can have on an individual's life. (SE; ARP3; CC3K1)
5. Impact of learners' academic and social abilities, attitudes, interests, and values on instruction and career development. (SE; ARP3; CC3K2)
6. Variations in beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures and their effects on relationships among individuals with exceptional learning needs, family, and schooling. (SE; ARP3; CC3K3)
7. Cultural perspectives influencing the relationships among families, schools and communities as related to instruction. (SE; ARP3; CC3K4)
8. Differing ways of learning of individuals with exceptional learning needs including those from culturally diverse backgrounds and strategies for addressing these differences. (SE; ARP3; CC3K5)

Special Education Standard #4: Instructional Strategies

Skills:

1. Use strategies to facilitate integration into various settings. (SE; ARP3; CC4S1)
2. Teach individuals to use self-assessment, problem solving, and other cognitive strategies to meet their needs. (SE, C; ARP3; CC4S2)
3. Select, adapt, and use instructional strategies and materials according to characteristics of the individual with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP3; CC4S3)
4. Use strategies to facilitate maintenance and generalization of skills across learning environments. (SE; ARP3; CC4S4)
5. Use procedures to increase the individual's self-awareness, self-management, self-control, self-reliance, and self-esteem. (SE, C; ARP3; CC4S5)
6. Use strategies that promote successful transitions for individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP3; CC4S6)

Special Education Standard #5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions

Knowledge:

1. Demands of learning environments. (SE; ARP4; CC5K1)
2. Basic classroom management theories and strategies for individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP4; CC5K2)
3. Effective management of teaching and learning. (SE; ARP4; CC5K3)
4. Teacher attitudes and behaviors that influence behavior of individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP4; CC5K4)
5. Social skills needed for educational and other environments. (SE; ARP4; CC5K5)
6. Strategies for crisis prevention and intervention. (SE; ARP4; CC5K6)

7. Strategies for preparing individuals to live harmoniously and productively in a culturally diverse world. (SE; ARP4; CC5K7)
8. Ways to create learning environments that allow individuals to retain and appreciate their own and each others' respective language and cultural heritage. (SE; ARP4; CC5K8)
9. Ways specific cultures are negatively stereotyped. (SE; ARP4; CC5K9)
10. Strategies used by diverse populations to cope with a legacy of former and continuing racism (SE; ARP4; CC5K10)

Skills:

1. Create a safe, equitable, positive, and supportive learning environment in which diversities are valued. (SE; ARP4; CC5S1)
2. Identify realistic expectations for personal and social behavior in various settings. (SE; ARP4; CC5S2)
3. Identify supports needed for integration into various program placements. (SE; ARP4; CC5S3)
4. Design learning environments that encourage active participation in individual and group activities. (SE; ARP4; CC5S4)
5. Modify the learning environment to manage behaviors. (SE; ARP4; CC5S5)
6. Use performance data and information from all stakeholders to make or suggest modifications in learning environments. (SE; ARP4; CC5S6)
7. Establish and maintain rapport with individuals with and without exceptional learning needs. (SE, C; ARP4; CC5S7)
8. Teach self-advocacy. (SE; ARP4; CC5S8)
9. Create an environment that encourages self-advocacy and increased independence. (SE; ARP4; CC5S9)
10. Use effective and varied behavior management strategies. (SE; ARP4; CC5S10)
11. Use the least intensive behavior management strategy consistent with the needs of the individual with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP4; CC5S11)
12. Design and manage daily routines. (SE; ARP4; CC5S12)
13. Organize, develop, and sustain learning environments that support positive intracultural and intercultural experiences. (SE; ARP4; CC5S13)
14. Mediate controversial intercultural issues among students within the learning environment in ways that enhance any culture, group, or person. (SE, C; ARP4; CC5S14)
15. Structure, direct, and support the activities of paraeducators, volunteers, and tutors. (SE, C, PD; ARP4; CC5S15)
16. Use universal precautions. (SE; ARP4; CC5S16)

Special Education Standard #6: Communication

Knowledge:

1. Effects of cultural and linguistic differences on growth and development. (SE; ARP4; CC6K1)
2. Characteristics of one's own culture and use of language and the ways in which these can differ from other cultures and uses of languages. (SE; ARP4; CC6K2)
3. Ways of behaving and communicating among cultures that can lead to misinterpretation and misunderstanding. (SE; ARP4; CC6K3)
4. Augmentative and assistive communication strategies. (SE; ARP4; CC6K4)

Skills:

1. Use strategies to support and enhance communication skills of individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE, C; ARP4; CC6S1)
2. Use communication strategies and resources to facilitate understanding of subject matter for students whose primary language is not the dominant language. (SE, C; ARP4; CC6S2)

Special Education Standard #7: Instructional Planning**Knowledge:**

1. Theories and research that form the basis of curriculum development and instructional practice. (SE; ARP 2; CC7K1)
2. Scope and sequences of general and special curricula. (SE; ARP 2; CC7K2)
3. National, state or provincial, and local curricula standards. (SE; ARP 2; CC7K3)
4. Technology for planning and managing the teaching and learning environment. (SE; ARP 2; CC7K4)
5. Roles and responsibilities of the paraeducator related to instruction, intervention, and direct service. (SE; ARP 2; CC7K5)

Skills:

1. Identify and prioritize areas of the general curriculum and accommodations for individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S1)
2. Develop and implement comprehensive, longitudinal individualized programs in collaboration with team members. (SE; C; ARP 2; CC7S2)
3. Involve the individual and family in setting instructional goals and monitoring progress. (SE; C; ARP 2; CC7S3)
4. Use functional assessments to develop intervention plans. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S4)
5. Use task analysis. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S5)
6. Sequence, implement, and evaluate individualized learning objectives. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S6)
7. Integrate affective, social, and life skills with academic curricula. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S7)
8. Develop and select instructional content, resources, and strategies that respond to cultural, linguistic, and gender differences. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S8)
9. Incorporate and implement instructional and assistive technology into the educational program. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S9)
10. Prepare lesson plans. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S10)
11. Prepare and organize materials to implement daily lesson plans. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S11)
12. Use instructional time effectively. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S12)
13. Make responsive adjustments to instruction based on continual observations. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S13)
14. Prepare individuals to exhibit self-enhancing behavior in response to societal attitudes and actions. (SE; ARP 2; CC7S14)

Special Education Standard #8: Assessment**Knowledge:**

1. Basic terminology used in assessment. (SE; ARP 2; CC8K1)
2. Legal provisions and ethical principles regarding assessment of individuals. (SE; ARP 2; CC8K2)

3. Screening, pre-referral, referral, and classification procedures. (SE; ARP 2; CC8K3)
4. Use and limitations of assessment instruments. (SE; ARP 2; CC8K4)
5. National, state or provincial, and local accommodations and modifications. (SE; ARP 2; CC8K5)

Skills:

1. Gather relevant background information. (SE, C; ARP 2; CC8S1)
2. Administer nonbiased formal and informal assessments. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S2)
3. Use technology to conduct assessments. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S3)
4. Develop or modify individualized assessment strategies. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S4)
5. Interpret information from formal and informal assessments. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S5)
6. Use assessment information in making eligibility, program, and placement decisions for individuals with exceptional learning needs, including those from culturally and/or linguistically diverse backgrounds. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S6)
7. Report assessment results to all stakeholders using effective communication skills. (SE; C; ARP 2; CC8S7)
8. Evaluate instruction and monitor progress of individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S8)
9. Develop or modify individualized assessment strategies. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S9)
10. Create and maintain records. (SE; ARP 2; CC8S10)

Special Education Standard #9: Professional and Ethical Practice

Knowledge:

1. Personal cultural biases and differences that affect one's teaching. (PD; ARP 5; CC9K1)
2. Importance of the teacher serving as a model for individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE; ARP 5; CC9K2)
3. Continuum of lifelong professional development. (PD; ARP 5; CC9K3)
4. Methods to remain current regarding research-validated practice. (PD; ARP 5; CC9K4)

Skills:

1. Practice within the CEC Code of Ethics and other standards of the profession. (SE, PD; ARP 5; CC9S1)
2. Uphold high standards of competence and integrity and exercise sound judgment in the practice of the professional. (PD; ARP 5; CC9S2)
3. Act ethically in advocating for appropriate services. (PD; ARP 5; CC9S3)
4. Conduct professional activities in compliance with applicable laws and policies. (SE; PD; ARP 5; CC9S4)
5. Demonstrate commitment to developing the highest education and quality-of-life potential of individuals with exceptional learning needs. (PD; ARP 5; CC9S5)
6. Demonstrate sensitivity for the culture, language, religion, gender, disability, socio-economic status, and sexual orientation of individuals. (SE, PD; ARP 5; CC9S6)
7. Practice within one's skill limit and obtain assistance as needed. (SE, CPD; ARP 5; CC9S7)
8. Use verbal, nonverbal, and written language effectively. (C; ARP 5; CC9S8)
9. Conduct self-evaluation of instruction. (SE; PD; ARP 5; CC9S9)

10. Access information on exceptionalities. (SE, PD; ARP 5; CC9S10)
11. Reflect on one's practice to improve instruction and guide professional growth. (PD; ARP 5; CC9S11)
12. Engage in professional activities that benefit individuals with exceptional learning needs, their families, and one's colleagues. (PD; ARP 5; CC9S12)

Special Education Standard #10: Collaboration

Knowledge:

1. Models and strategies of consultation and collaboration. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10K1)
2. Roles of individuals with exceptional learning needs, families, and school and community personnel in planning of an individualized program. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10K2)
3. Concerns of families of individuals with exceptional learning needs and strategies to help address these concerns. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10K3)
4. Culturally responsive factors that promote effective communication and collaboration with individuals with exceptional learning needs, families, school personnel, and community members. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10K4)

Skills:

1. Maintain confidential communication about individuals with exceptional learning needs. (C; ARP 5; CC10S1)
2. Collaborate with families and others in assessment of individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10S2)
3. Foster respectful and beneficial relationships between families and professionals. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10S3)
4. Assist individuals with exceptional learning needs and their families in becoming active participants in the educational team. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10S4)
5. Plan and conduct collaborative conferences with individuals with exceptional learning needs and their families. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10S5)
6. Collaborate with school personnel and community members in integrating individuals with exceptional learning needs into various settings. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10S6)
7. Use group problem solving skills to develop, implement and evaluate collaborative activities. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10S7)
8. Model techniques and coach others in the use of instructional methods and accommodations. (C; PD; ARP 5; CC10S8)
9. Communicate with school personnel about the characteristics and needs of individuals with exceptional learning needs. (SE; C; ARP 5; CC10S9)
10. Communicate effectively with families of individuals with exceptional learning needs from diverse backgrounds. (C; ARP 5; CC10S10)
11. Observe, evaluate and provide feedback to paraeducators. (C; PD; ARP 5; CC10S11)

REVISED
Program Data Collection Matrix
 Assessment Data Points and Portfolio Items
 CANDIDATE FORM

Use this matrix to identify where documents are to be submitted for Chalk and Wire. Scoring for a given document should only be requested from your supervising professor, and only one time. Course locations are SUGGESTIONS. The candidate may find more relevant and/or suitable documents in another product developed in a different course. This matrix primarily provides directions for the Special Education Program Assessment (CEC). **ALAB is not perfectly aligned with CEC and is provided to show when and where candidates are to upload documents.**

Gates/Courses	ALAB TOC	SPED CEC TOC	Artifact	Artifact Description	Assessor and Date
1.Entry/Admission				Candidates will submit documents reporting GPA, license, or other admission status.	
End of First Semester	1.1 GPA	1. GPA at entry	Entry Transcripts, GPA at Entry	Candidates will upload verification of GPA electronically or in PDF format to the program. Upload to aLab.	
	1.2 Teaching License		Scan Teaching License	Candidates will submit a scanned copy of their teaching license. Upload to aLab	
	1.3 Interview		Scan Admission letter, Pending letter, SPED does not conduct interviews	The candidate will submit a copy of their admission letter as documentation of regular, pending, or conditional status (Content Knowledge)	
SPED 7301	3.4 Philosophy aLAB Philosophy/Administrative Platform		Philosophy of Special Education, Entry	The candidate will submit an initial philosophy and a philosophy at the conclusion of their program of study	
2. Intermediate Gate				In this section, candidates will submit documents from coursework.	
End of Second Semester	2.1 aLAB GPA at 12 hrs.	2.1 Program of Study	Upload transcript from BOSS	After 12 Course Credits	

SPED 7305	3.2 Case Study (ALAB)		Assessment report/ or ABA Case study	Case study of application of intervention with behavioral or academic concern	
SPED 7302	3.5 ISTE Matrix		ISTE Matrix	Upload Matrix of technology use in course work	
	3.6 aLAB Theory			SPED DOES NOT HAVE A THEORY PAPER (NA is available)	
3.Field Experience/Capstone				Candidates will submit documents demonstrating CEC Standards related to Pedagogical/Professional Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions. Additionally, the candidate will submit evidence documenting effects on student learning.	
SPED 7351				Multiple ASSESSMENT documents in this course are usable for the EXIT Portfolio	
SPED 7390				Multiple ASSESSMENT documents in this course are usable for the EXIT Portfolio	
Instructional Specialist 4-12					
				Candidates will submit documents that demonstrate competencies in assessment and interpretation of assessment results.	
SPED 7352	*3.1 Alab Planning: Unit, School Improvement, Counseling	*3.1 Lesson Plan^		Lessons or units of study; planning unit, intervention plans _More than one may be submitted	
SPED 7395 (Practicum)	*4.3 aLAB Clinical Practice/Field Experience	3.2 Facsimile IEP ^ 3.3 *Teaching evaluation ^ 3.4 Case Study CEC ^ 3.5 Reflective Summary^		-Candidates will submit a facsimile IEP, using state/district approved forms. The candidate will develop the IEP based upon assessment information and effective and empirical pedagogical methods. (Content Knowledge, Pedagogical/Professional KSD) -Field Experience Evaluation final evaluations OR Clinical Field Experience	

				<p>Evaluations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Written case studies must demonstrate professional skill in documenting historical data, observational data, academic data, as well as knowledge of the effect of disability learning. (Content Knowledge) -Reflect on competencies gained in field/other program work. 	
SPED 7353				Multiple documents in this course are usable for the EXIT Portfolio	
Instructional Specialist B-4					
SPED 7342 (ECSE)	*3.1 Alab Planning: Unit, School Improvement, Counseling	*3.1 Lesson Plan^		Lessons or units of study; planning unit, intervention plans _More than one may be submitted	
SPED 7350 (ECSE Practicum)	*4.3 aLAB Clinical Practice/Field Experience	<p>3.4 Facsimile IEP / IFSP/IPP^</p> <p>3.5 *Teaching evaluation ^</p> <p>3.4 Case Study CEC ^</p> <p>3.5 Reflective Summary^</p>		<p>Candidates will submit a facsimile IEP, using state/district approved forms. The candidate will develop the IEP based upon assessment information and effective and empirical pedagogical methods. (Content Knowledge, Pedagogical/Professional KSD)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Field Experience Evaluation final evaluations OR Clinical Field Experience Evaluations - Written case studies must demonstrate professional skill in documenting historical data, observational data, academic data, as well as knowledge of the effect of disability learning. (Content Knowledge) -Reflect on competencies gained in field/other program work. 	
SPED 5312				Multiple documents in this course are usable for the EXIT Portfolio	
AUSP 7397				Multiple documents in this course are usable for the EXIT Portfolio	
SPED 7343				Multiple documents in this course are usable for the EXIT Portfolio	

EDFN 7303	3.3 Research Project Paper			Submit both paper and score from EDFN 7303	
4. Exit/Professional					
SPED 7309 Seminar Semester	*4.1 GPA at Exit	*4.5 GPA at Exit		Submit copy of Transcript from BOSS	
	4.2 Portfolio/Comprehensive Exam	4.1 Philosophy at Exit		Candidates will submit an initial philosophy and a philosophy at the conclusion of their program of study. (Content Knowledge	
		4.2 Professional Development Plan ^		Candidates will submit a plan detailing ways in which continuing education and professional development will be undertaken (Pedagogical/Professional KSD)	
		4.3 Praxis II 0354^		Submit scanned copy of praxis exams with subsection scores	
		4.4 Professional Presentation ^		The candidate will submit evidence of professional presentations of informal, training, or research in multimedia, electronic or other formats. (Pedagogical/Professional KSD)	
5. Post Graduate Seminar Semester		5.1 Candidate Survey		Upload a screen shot of completed exit survey.	
		5.2 Employer Survey		Upload a screen shot of completed exit survey	

*=Place in both ALAB and the CEC Portfolios; ^=CEC Requirement

Appendix B

Assessment 1

Table 1: Praxis II Required Examinations

Table 1 Required Praxis II Examinations

Emphasis Area	Test Number	Passing Score	Test Number	Passing Score
IS: P-4	351	150	690	610
IS: 4-12	351	150	352	141

Table 1a: Revised Praxis Examination

Table 1 Required Praxis II Examinations

Emphasis Area	Test Number	Passing Score
IS: P-4	0354	151
IS: 4-12	0354	151

Table 2: Praxis II Examination Foundational Knowledge

Year of Examination:	2009-2010*	2010-2011*	2011-2012**
Number of Examinees	2	4	13
Highest Observed Score	162	169	187
Lowest Observed Score	152	155	159
Average Performance Range	157	161.75	172.64

***Praxis 0351 ** Praxis 0354**

Table 3 Presents the scoring guide for the Knowledge based Core Principle examinations. This table is the scoring rubric used to determine candidate proficiency.

Assessment 1

Table 3 Scoring Guide for Praxis II Examination

	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Examination			
0351: Knowledge-based Core Principles	3 Score of 175 and above	2 Score from 151 to 174.	1 Score 150 and below.
Score on PRAXIS Specialty Area Exam	3 Scores above the average performance range.	2 Scores at the mandated state cut-off or within average performance range.	1 Scores below the mandated state cut-off.

APPENDIX C
Assessment 2 Data
Assessment 3 Data

Table 6 presents the scoring guide used to assess professional presentations.
Assessment 2

Table 4: Scoring Guide for Professional Presentation

	Unacceptable 1	Proficient 2	Exemplary 3
Criterion			
Organization Using Electronic Media: Slide Format	Electronic media is not used.	On 30% or more of the slides, subject is not given or text is lengthy.	All, or nearly all, slides include subject and brief points.
Organization Using Electronic Media: Notes Pages	Notes Page option is not used; no explanatory information is shared with classmates through this medium.	Notes Page is used to some extent, although up to 70% of slides are not adequately supported by information on Notes Page.	Notes Page option is used to provide expanded discussion on brief points, for 70% or more of the slides.
Organization Using Electronic Media: Font Size and Style	Less than 70% of the slides are easily read by a typical viewer at a typical classroom distance.	From 70% to 90% of the slides are easily read by a typical viewer at a typical classroom distance	90% or more of the slides are easily read by a typical viewer at a typical classroom distance.
Organization Using Electronic Media: Graphics	Fewer than three graphic or audible items are included	Three to five graphic or audible items are included.	Six or more graphic or audible items are included.
Organization Using Electronic Media: Credit	Credit is not given on slide for each source (including personal material).		Credit is given on slide for each source (including personal material).
Accuracy, Completeness of Information: Accuracy	No report, or report lacks substantive information.	10% of information conflicts with current, reputable sources.	Information is accurate--conforms to current, reputable sources.
Accuracy, Completeness of Information: Appropriate and Adequate	No report, or report addresses two or fewer important topics adequately.	More than two recommended topics are addressed adequately, but one or more important topics are omitted	Appropriate topics related to presentation subject are adequately covered. Inappropriate topics have not been

		or addressed inadequately, or inappropriate topics are included.	included.
Accuracy, Completeness of Information: Reference Page	Reference page not present.	Reference page present but does not conform to APA 5th Edition.	Reference page conforms to APA 5th Edition.
Presentation: Organization	No or minimal evidence of organization of topics for clarity.	Report is well organized; audience is able to follow main points.	
Presentation: Communication Skills, Voice and Pace	Candidate demonstrates neither of the characteristics listed.	Candidate demonstrates one of the characteristics listed.	Candidate demonstrates both of the characteristics listed
Presentation: Communication Skills, Language E.g., Candidate uses effective communication skills: Adjusts language to audience to facilitate communication Uses person-first language	Candidate demonstrates neither of the characteristics listed.	Candidate demonstrates one of the characteristics listed.	Candidate demonstrates both of the characteristics listed.
Presentation: Communication Skills. E.g., Candidate uses effective communication skills: Uses appropriate grammar Uses correct pronunciation of key terms	Candidate demonstrates neither of the characteristics listed.	Candidate demonstrates one of the characteristics listed.	Candidate demonstrates both of the characteristics listed.
Presentation:	Candidate	Candidate	Candidate

Communication Skills, Focus and Audience Questions; Candidate uses effective communication skills: Remains on topic during the presentation Responds appropriately to audience questions	demonstrates neither of the characteristics listed.	demonstrates one of the characteristics listed.	demonstrates both of the characteristics listed.
Presentation: Time Guidelines	Presentation is 50% shorter or longer than allowed time.	Presentation is 20% shorter or longer than allowed time.	Presentation falls within allowed time.

Assessment 2

Table 5: Professional Presentation Data by Year.

Academic Year: 2009-2010			
N=7			
Criteria	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Organization Using Electronic Media: Slide Format		29%	71%
Organization: Notes Pages	29%	14%	57%
Organization: Font Size and Style		57%	43%
Organization: Graphics	29%	43%	29%
Organization: Credit	57%		43%
Accuracy, Completeness of Information: Accuracy			100%
Accuracy Completeness of Information: Complete			100%
Accuracy, Completeness of Information: Reference Page	14%	43%	53%
Presentation: Organization			100%
Presentation:			100%

Communication Skills Voice and Pace			
Presentation: Communication Language			100%
Presentation: Communication Skills, Grammar and Pronunciation		14%	86%
Presentation: Communication Skills Focus and Audience Questions		14%	86%
Presentation: Time Guidelines			100%

Academic Year: 2010-2011			
N=2			
Criteria	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Organization Using Electronic Media: Slide Format	0	50%	50%
Organization: Notes Pages	100%	0	0
Organization: Font Size and Style	0	50%	50%
Organization: Graphics	0	50%	50%
Organization: Credit	50%	0	50%
Accuracy, Completeness of Information: Accuracy	0	0	100%
Accuracy Completeness of Information: Complete			100%
Accuracy, Completeness of Information: Reference Page			100%
Presentation: Organization			100%
Presentation: Communication Skills Voice and Pace			100%

Presentation: Communication Language			100%
Presentation: Communication Skills, Grammar and Pronunciation			100%
Presentation: Communication Skills Focus and Audience Questions			100%
Presentation: Time Guidelines			100%

Academic Year: 2011-2012			
N=3			
Criteria	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Organization Using Electronic Media: Slide Format			100%
Organization: Notes Pages	33.7		67.3
Organization: Font Size and Style			100%
Organization: Graphics	33.3	33.3	33.3
Organization: Credit	100%		
Accuracy, Completeness of Information: Accuracy		33.3%	66.7%
Accuracy Completeness of Information: Complete		33.3%	66.7%
Accuracy, Completeness of Information: Reference Page		33.3%	66.7%
Presentation: Organization			100%
Presentation: Communication Skills		33.7	67.3
Presentation: Time Guidelines			100%

Assessment 3

Table 6 Scoring Guide for Lesson Plan

SPED/CEC Lesson Plan**Field Experience/Capstone Gate**

NCATE Standards: 1.1, Content knowledge for teacher candidates 1.7, Student learning for teacher candidates 4.1 Design, implementation and evaluation of curriculum and experiences 4.4. Experience working with diverse students in P-12 schools CEC Standards: Standard 2, Development and characteristics of learners Standard 3, Individual learning differences Standard 4, Instructional Strategies Standard 7, Instructional Planning

Criterion 1	Timeliness and Stylistic Elements: Submission	
Common description:	Expectations are that the assignment will be turned on or before the due date.	
Weighting in summary scores:	1	
Level 1	Unsatisfactory Plan submitted 2 or more days late.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Plan submitted within one day of due date.	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary Plan submitted on or before due date.	Score:3.0

Criterion 2	Timeliness and Stylistic Elements: Format	
Common description:	Format is well organized and easy to follow; each part is identifiable	
Weighting in summary scores:	1	
Level 1	Unsatisfactory Document is disorganized; individual components are difficult to locate or identify.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Exemplary Document is well organized.	Score:3.0

Criterion 3	Timeliness and Stylistic Elements: Writing	
Common description:	Writing is clear and precise.	
Weighting in summary scores:	2	
Level 1	Unsatisfactory Written expression lacks clarity.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient	Score:2.0

Level 3	For the most part, written expression is clear but one area lacks clarity. Exemplary Writing is clear and precise.	Score:3.0
<hr/>		
Criterion 4	Timeliness and Stylistic Elements: Spelling and Punctuation	
Common description:	Correct spelling and punctuation, and grammar are observed.	
Weighting in summary scores:	1	
Level 1	Unacceptable Six or more errors in spelling, writing and grammar	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Up to five errors in spelling, writing or grammar	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary No errors in spelling, writing, or grammar	Score:3.0
<hr/>		
Criterion 5	Lesson Design: Subject/ Content area	
Common description:	Subject/Content area identified	
Weighting in summary scores:	1	
Level 1	Unsatisfactory Subject/content area is not identified	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Subject/content area is identified	Score:3.0
<hr/>		
Criterion 6	Lesson Design: Rationale for Target Skill	
Common description:	Candidate must demonstrate that instruction is based upon assessment or specific curricular scope and sequence.	
Weighting in summary scores:	2	
Level 1	Unacceptable There is no apparent rationale for the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Acceptable Rationale for the lesson is stated but is not based upon assessment, standards or scope and sequence	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary Rationale for the lesson is stated and is based upon assessment, standards or scope and sequence	Score:3.0
<hr/>		

Criterion 7

Common description:

Weighting in summary scores:

Level 1

Level 2

Lesson Design: Goal

A long term, measurable goal is stated for the lesson.

1

Unacceptable

Score:1.0

No goals are presented, goal is not long term or global in nature, or goal is presented as a short term objective

Proficient

Score:3.0

Goal is long range and presented in measurable terms.

Criterion 8

Common description:

Weighting in summary scores:

Level 1

Level 2

Level 3

Lesson Design: Objective

An objective is written that is a component skill of the long term goal. The objective is expressed as a behavior that is observable and measurable, and includes the learner, condition, behavior, and criteria.

2

Unacceptable

Score:1.0

The objective is not a component skill of the long term goal, OR the target behavior is not described in terms that are observable and measurable, AND one component of the objective is missing or written incorrectly.

Proficient

Score:2.0

Objective is a component skill of the long term goal. The target behavior is described in terms that are observable and measurable, but one component of the objective is missing or written incorrectly, OR all of the components are included, but the behavior is not described in terms that are observable and measurable.

Exemplary

Score:3.0

Objective is a component skill of the long term goal; all components are present; and the behavior is described in terms that are observable and measurable.

Criterion 9

Common description:

Weighting in summary scores:

Level 1

Lesson Design: Appropriateness

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 consideration of the students age, communication skills and needs, strengths and weaknesses, and current level of performance.

5

Unacceptable

Score:1.0

The lesson design is not appropriate for the skill being

	taught and does not reflect the characteristics of the student.	
	Proficient	Score:2.0
Level 2	For the most part, the lesson design is appropriate for the skill and the target population; however, it contains one element that is inappropriate.	
	Proficient	Score:3.0
Level 3	The lesson design is appropriate for the skill and the target population.	

Criterion 10**Lesson Design: Adaptations**

Common description:	The lesson has written statements of appropriate ways to adapt or modify delivery for students with differing abilities.	
Weighting in summary scores:	2	
	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
Level 1	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).	
	Exemplary	Score:2.0
Level 2	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.	
	Exemplary	Score:3.0
Level 3	The lesson has written statements of appropriate ways to adapt or modify delivery for students with differing abilities; no logical accommodation is omitted.	

Criterion 11**Lesson Design: Extensions of Learning**

Common description:	The lesson has statements addressing higher order thinking skills, when appropriate, OR the lesson has statements addressing generalization of learning.	
Weighting in summary scores:	1	
	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
Level 1	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.	

	Proficient	Score:2.0
Level 2	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.	
	Exemplary	Score:3.0
Level 3	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.	

Criterion 12**Lesson Design: Student Products**

Common description:

The lesson plan has specific descriptions of the process or product resulting from the instruction.

Weighting in summary scores:

1

Level 1

Unacceptable

Score:1.0

The lesson plan has no descriptions of the process or product resulting from the instruction.

Level 2

Proficient

Score:2.0

The lesson plan has descriptions of the process or product resulting from the instruction, however, the student outcomes are not appropriate for the lesson taught.

Level 3

Exemplary

Score:3.0

The lesson plan has specific descriptions of the process or product resulting from the instruction.

Criterion 13**Lesson Design: Evaluation**

Common description:

Lesson plan includes a description of an appropriate and effective evaluation or data collection process.

Weighting in summary scores:

5

Level 1

Unacceptable

Score:1.0

There is no description of an evaluation or data collection component; OR, a description is provided of an evaluation or data collection process, but the process described is inappropriate or inadequate to meet the need for data collection, or the process is incorrectly described.

Level 2

Proficient

Score:2.0

Lesson plan includes a description of an evaluation or data collection process, however, the process of data collection selected is inefficient, given the type of data that is

required.

Exemplary

Score:3.0

Level 3

Lesson plan includes a description of an appropriate and effective evaluation or data collection process.

Assessment 3

Table 7 Lesson Plan Performance Percentages: Academic Year 2008-2009

Academic Year 2009-2010			
N=3			
Criteria	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Submission	0%	0%	100%
Format	0%	0%	100%
Writing	0%	0%	100%
Spelling and Punctuation	0%	0%	100%
Content Area	0%	0%	100%
Rationale	0%	0%	100%
Goal	0%	0%	100%
Objective	0%	67%	33%
Appropriateness	0%	0%	100%
Adaptations	0%	67%	33%
Extensions of Learning	0%	0%	100%
Student Products	0%	33%	67%
Evaluation	0%	67%	33%

Academic Year 2010-2011			
N=7			
Criteria	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Submission	0%	0%	100%
Format	0%	0%	100%
Writing	0%	29%	71%
Spelling and Punctuation	0%	0%	86%
Content Area	0%	0%	100%
Rationale	0%	14%	86%
Goal	0%	0%	100%
Objective	0%	71%	29%
Appropriateness	0%	0%	100%
Adaptations	0%	29%	71%
Extensions of Learning	0%	29%	71%
Student Products	0%	14%	86%
Evaluation	0%	43%	57%

	0%		
	0%		

Academic Year 2011-2012			
N=2			
Criteria	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Submission	0%	0%	100%
Format	0%	0%	100%
Writing	0%	50%	50%
Spelling and Punctuation	0%	0%	100%
Content Area	0%	0%	100%
Rationale	0%	50%	50%
Goal	0%	0%	100%
Objective	0%	50%	50%
Appropriateness	0%	0%	100%
Adaptations	0%	0%	100%
Extensions of Learning	0%	100%	0%
Student Products	0%	50%	50%
Evaluation	0%	50%	50%

Assessment 4

Table 8 Scoring Guide for Teaching Evaluation**SPED/CEC Teaching Evaluation
Field Experience/Intermediate**

The Field Experience allows candidates the opportunity to demonstrate a broad spectrum of knowledge and skills, to work with diverse students and faculty, and to demonstrate adherence to ethical practice. CEC Standards: Standard 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences Standard 4: Instructional Strategies Standard 5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions Standard 6: Communication Standard 7: Instructional Planning Standard 8: Assessment Standard 9: Professional and Ethical Practice Standard 10: Collaboration NCATE Standards: Standard 1.1: Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates Standard 1.2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates Standard 1.4: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates Standard 1.6: Dispositions for All Candidates Standard 1.7: Student Learning for Teacher Candidates Standard 3.1: Collaboration between Unit and School Partners Standard 3.2: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experience and Clinical Practice Standard 3.3: Candidates Development of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help All Students Learn Standard 4.1: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences Standard 4.2: Experience Working with Diverse Faculty Standard 4.4: Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P–12 Schools

Criterion 1**Instructional Strategies: Design of Lesson**

Common description: Candidate developed a meaningful learning experience to facilitate learning for all students. The lesson addressed individual student needs, was student-centered, and drew on students' background knowledge and interests. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 3

Level 1	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
	Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	

Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:3.0

Criterion 2**Instructional Strategies: Allocation of Time**

Common description: Candidate allocated instructional time to teaching. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 2

Level 1	Unacceptable Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:3.0

Criterion 3**Instructional Strategies: Instructional Focus**

Common description: Candidate informed student(s) initially of lesson sequencing and desired outcomes. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 1

Level 1	Unacceptable Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:2.0

Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:3.0
---------	---	-----------

Criterion 4**Instructional Strategies: Use of Scaffolding**

Common description: Candidate used scaffolding to facilitate learning. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 1

Level 1	Unacceptable Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:3.0

Criterion 5**Instructional Strategies: Levels of Thinking Skills**

Common description: Candidates discourse reflected application of Bloom's Taxonomy, encouraged higher order thinking skills as appropriate within the lesson. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 1

Level 1	Unacceptable Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during	Score:3.0

the lesson.

Criterion 6

Instructional Strategies: Student Engagement

Common description:

Candidate successfully engaged all student(s) in learning. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 2

Level 1	Unacceptable Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:3.0

Criterion 7

Instructional Strategies: Practice and Feedback

Common description:

Candidate provided opportunities for student(s) to practice and apply what they were learning, and provided improvement-oriented feedback. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 2

Level 1	Unacceptable Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:3.0

Criterion 8**Instructional Strategies: Formative Assessments**

Common description:

Candidate used a variety of informal assessments to assess and analyze student learning, and made appropriate adjustments to instruction. Candidate checks for student understanding. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 2

Level 1	Unacceptable Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:3.0

Criterion 9**Managing the Learning Environment: Cohesive Community**

Common description:

Candidate created a cohesive and caring learning community, in which student interaction was fairly distributed; students with exceptionalities and those from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups were valued. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 2

Level 1	Unacceptable Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:2.0

Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:3.0
---------	---	-----------

Criterion 10**Managing the Learning Environment: Group Learning**

Common description: Candidate used individual, paired, or collaborative group learning activities as appropriate. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 1

Level 1	Unacceptable Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:3.0

Criterion 11**Managing the Learning Environment: Classroom Management**

Common description: Candidate practiced effective classroom management. Candidate adjusts antecedents and contingent consequences to influence student behavior. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 3

Level 1	Unacceptable Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the	Score:2.0

	lesson.	
Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:3.0

Criterion 12**Communication: Appropriate for Students**

Common description: Candidate communicated in a clear and precise manner that was appropriate for the communication style and level of the student(s). Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 1

	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
Level 1	Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	
	Proficient	Score:2.0
Level 2	Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	
	Exemplary	Score:3.0
Level 3	Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	

Criterion 13**Professionalism/Dispositions: Ethical Standards**

Common description: Candidate adheres to professional ethical standards at all times. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 1

	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
Level 1	Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	
	Proficient	Score:2.0
Level 2	Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	
	Exemplary	Score:3.0
Level 3	Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	

Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Criterion 14

Professionalism/Dispositions: Respect for Students

Common description: Candidate demonstrated respect for personal and cultural individuality of student(s), including those with exceptionalities or from different ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 2

Level 1	Unacceptable Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:3.0

Criterion 15

Professionalism/Dispositions: Demeanor

Common description: Candidate used professional demeanor in dress, language, courtesy, and promptness. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 1

Level 1	Unacceptable Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:2.0

Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:3.0
---------	---	-----------

Criterion 16**Professionalism/Dispositions: Reflections**

Common description: Candidates post-lesson reflections demonstrate professional knowledge aligned with research-based practices. Scoring: Unacceptable: Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson. Proficient: Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson. Exemplary: Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.

Weighting in summary scores: 1

Level 1	Unacceptable Skill exhibited in less than 50% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Skill exhibited in 50% to 90% of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary Skill exhibited in 90% or more of opportunities during the lesson.	Score:3.0

Assessment 4

Table 9 Field Experience Teaching Evaluation Criteria by Academic Year

Academic Year 2009-2010			
N=5			
Criteria			
	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Design of Lesson	20%	60%	20%
Allocation of Time		40%	60%
Instructional Focus	20%	60%	20%
Use of Scaffolding	20%	40%	40%
Levels of Thinking Skills	20%	60%	20%
Student Engagement	20%	60%	20%
Practice and Feedback	40%	40%	20%
Formative Assessments	20%	60%	20%

Cohesive Community	20%	20%	60%
Group Learning	20%	60%	20%
Classroom Management	20%	20%	60%
Communication: Appropriate for Students	20%	40%	40%
Professionalism/Dispositions: Ethical Standards	20%		80%
Professionalism/Dispositions: Respect for Students	20%	20%	60%
Demeanor	20%	20%	60%
Lesson Reflections	20%	60%	20%

Academic Year 2010-2011			
N=4			
Criteria			
	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Design of Lesson		75%	25%
Allocation of Time		50%	50%
Instructional Focus		50%	50%
Use of Scaffolding			100%
Levels of Thinking Skills		50%	50%
Student Engagement		25%	75%
Practice and Feedback		25%	75%
Formative Assessments		25%	75%
Cohesive Community		25%	75%
Group Learning		25%	75%
Classroom Management			100%
Communication: Appropriate for Students			100%
Professionalism/Dispositions: Ethical Standards			100%
Professionalism/Dispositions: Respect for Students			100%
Demeanor			100%
Lesson Reflections			100%

Academic Year 2011-2012			
N=7			
Criteria			
	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Design of Lesson	0%	57%	43%
Allocation of Time	0%	57%	43%
Instructional Focus	0%	43%	57%
Use of Scaffolding	0%	43%	57%
Levels of Thinking Skills	0%	57%	43%
Student Engagement	0%	0%	100%
Practice and Feedback	0%	14%	86%
Formative Assessments	0%	29%	71%
Cohesive Community	0%	29%	71%
Group Learning	0%	57%	43%
Classroom Management	0%	14%	86%
Communication: Appropriate for Students	0%	14%	86%
Professionalism/Dispositions: Ethical Standards	0%	0%	100%
Professionalism/Dispositions: Respect for Students	0%	0%	100%
Demeanor	0%	0%	100%
Lesson Reflections	0%	0%	100%

Appendix D
Assessment 5
Assessment 6

Assessment 5

Table 10: Scoring Guide for Case Studies

SPED/CEC Case Study One Field Experience/Intermediate Gate

Candidates will complete several Case Studies throughout their program of study. Case Studies provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge and skill in many areas of professional expertise. Case Studies may focus on a single area, such as a Technology Needs Assessment or a Behavior Intervention Plan. Case studies address the following: CEC Standards: Standard 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences Standard 7: Instructional Planning Standard 8: Assessment NCATE Standards: Standard 1.2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates Standard 1.4: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates Standard 1.6: Dispositions for All Candidates Standard 1.7: Student Learning for Teacher Candidates Standard 3.3: Candidates Development of Knowledge, Skills, and dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Criterion 1

Common description:

Weighting in summary scores:

Level 1

Level 2

Level 3

Report Standards: Timeliness

Case Study is to be turned in on schedule.

1

Unacceptable

Score:1.0

Case Study is turned in 3 or more days late.

Acceptable

Score:2.0

Case Study is turned in 1 or 2 days late.

Proficient

Score:3.0

Case Study is turned in on due date.

Criterion 2

Common description:

Weighting in summary scores:

Level 1

Report Standards: Confidentiality

Throughout the Case Study, confidentiality of the student and professional peers is to be observed. The candidate has signed a Confidentiality Statement attesting to their knowledge of this requirement.

1

Unacceptable

Score:1.0

Confidentiality is breached in any manner in the Case Study.

Level 2	Proficient Confidentiality of the student and professional peers is maintained throughout the Case Study.	Score:3.0
---------	--	-----------

Criterion 3**Report Standards: Stylistic Elements--Clarity**

Common description:

Throughout the Case Study, written expression is accurate, clear, and professional in tone.

Weighting in summary scores:

1

Level 1

Unacceptable
Writing is inaccurate, is difficult to understand, leads readers to inaccurate or vague understanding, or lacks professionalism in tone.

Score:1.0

Level 2

Acceptable
Writing is predominantly accurate, clear, and professional in tone, but there may be up to two instances of unclear expression. Professional tone is maintained.

Score:2.0

Level 3

Proficient
Writing is accurate, clear, and professional in tone throughout the Case Study.

Score:3.0

Criterion 4**Report Standards: Stylistic Elements--Vocabulary**

Common description:

Professionals in Special Education are familiar with a vocabulary, including acronyms, that individuals outside of the field do know use or understand. Throughout the report, vocabulary and acronyms not understandable to a general audience are explained.

Weighting in summary scores:

1

Level 1

Unacceptable
Vocabulary and acronyms not understandable to a general audience are used but not explained.

Score:2.0

Level 2

Proficient
Vocabulary and acronyms not understandable to a general audience are clearly explained.

Score:3.0

Criterion 5**Report Standards: Stylistic Elements--Organization**

Common description:

The Case Study is well organized, with various

	components easily identified (report subheadings, notebook dividers, etc., as appropriate).
Weighting in summary scores:	1
Level 1	Unacceptable Score:1.0 The Case Study is not well organized; various sections are difficult to locate or identify.
Level 2	Proficient Score:2.0 For the most part, the Case Study is well organized; one component is difficult to locate or identify.
Level 3	Exemplary Score:3.0 The Case Study is well organized.

Criterion 6

Report Standards: Stylistic Elements-- Mechanics

Common description:	Throughout the Case Study, spelling, punctuation, and grammar are correct.
Weighting in summary scores:	1
Level 1	Unacceptable Score:1.0 An unacceptable number of spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors are identified.
Level 2	Acceptable Score:2.0 Throughout the Case Study, no more than two errors each in spelling, punctuation, and grammar are identified.
Level 3	Proficient Score:3.0 Throughout the Case Study, no more than one error each in spelling, punctuation, and grammar is identified.

Criterion 7

Assessment Effectiveness: Background Information

Common description:	Background Information includes medical, educational, behavioral, and psychosocial information, as appropriate for a given student. Information may be gathered through school records, interviews with parents, teachers, and when appropriate, the student. Observations of the student may be included. Source and date for each component must be provided.
Weighting in summary scores:	5

Level 1	Unacceptable Background Information lacks thoroughness; no or scanty information is provided.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Acceptable One or more sections, either medical, educational, behavioral, or psychosocial information, are sufficiently thorough, but one section appropriate for the student being studied provides insufficient information; OR, all sections provide sufficient information, but some sources and dates are not provided.	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary All appropriate sections (medical, educational, behavioral, or psychosocial) for the student being studied are present and are sufficiently thorough; all sources and dates are provided.	Score:3.0

Criterion 8**Assessment Effectiveness: Appropriateness for Unique Student**

Common description:	Candidate selects an appropriate assessment instrument or instruments for a unique student OR designs an appropriate assessment for a unique student by selecting activities from an array of options.	
Weighting in summary scores:	3	
Level 1	Unacceptable Assessment is generally inappropriate for the student.	Score:1.0
Level 2	Proficient Most components of the assessment are appropriate for the student; up to 20% of components may be inappropriate.	Score:2.0
Level 3	Exemplary All components of assessment are appropriate for the student.	Score:3.0

Criterion 9**Assessment Effectiveness: Correct Procedures**

Common description:	Correct assessment procedures are followed throughout the assessment process, as shown by written documentation.
---------------------	--

Weighting in summary scores:	3	
Level 1	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
	Incorrect procedures are followed in two or more components of assessment, or the complete assessment.	
Level 2	Proficient	Score:2.0
	Most procedures of the assessment process are followed correctly, as shown by written documentation. Incorrect procedure may be followed in one component of multi-component assessment.	
Level 3	Exemplary	Score:3.0
	Correct assessment procedures are followed throughout the assessment process, as shown by written documentation.	

Criterion 10**Assessment Effectiveness: Effective Narrative Description**

Common description:

A clear and adequate description of the assessment procedures is provided in the report, to enable readers to understand the process.

Weighting in summary scores:

	3	
Level 1	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
	Any description of the assessment procedures is unclear or insufficient; may be missing.	
Level 2	Acceptable	Score:2.0
	A clear but minimal description of the assessment procedures is provided in the report; it lacks thoroughness.	
Level 3	Exemplary	Score:3.0
	A clear and adequate description of the assessment procedures is provided in the report.	

Criterion 11**Assessment Effectiveness: Student Responses**

Common description:

Clear narrative description of the student's responses, both strengths and weaknesses, is provided, rather than giving only a rating or numerical score. Description addresses students state (i.e., tense, focused) as appropriate.

Weighting in summary scores:

	3	
Level 1	Unacceptable	Score:1.0

	Student responses to assessment are not described; or, only a numerical score or rating is provided.
	Proficient Score:2.0
Level 2	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.
	Exemplary Score:3.0
Level 3	Clear narrative description of the student's responses is provided, for all components of the assessment.

Criterion 12**Assessment Effectiveness: Test Protocols**

Common description:	Assessment protocols, teacher-made assessment instruments, and data collection sheets are turned in with assessment report.
Weighting in summary scores:	3
	Unacceptable Score:1.0
Level 1	Assessment protocols, teacher-made assessment instruments, and data collection sheets for all assessment components are not submitted for all assessment components.
	Proficient Score:2.0
Level 2	Assessment protocols, teacher-made assessment instruments, and data collection sheets for most assessment components are turned in with assessment report; those for one component may be missing.
	Exemplary Score:3.0
Level 3	Assessment protocols, teacher-made assessment instruments, and data collection sheets for all assessment components are turned in with assessment report.

Criterion 13**Recommendations: Evidence-Based and Complete**

Common description:	Recommendations that follow the assessment must be based on Background Information or the outcome of the assessment. Candidates may not make recommendations based on assumptions or habit--all must be based on the assessments completed or
---------------------	---

	information presented in Background Information. Recommendations must address the spectrum of needs revealed by the assessment process.
Weighting in summary scores:	2
Level 1	Unacceptable Score:1.0 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.
Level 2	Proficient Score:2.0 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.
Level 3	Exemplary Score:3.0 All recommendations are supported by evidence in the report, AND, all significant needs identified by the assessment process are addressed in the recommendations.

Criterion 14

Recommendations: Specific and Reasonable

Common description:	Recommendations must provide specific steps, 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.
Weighting in summary scores:	1
Level 1	Unacceptable Score:1.0 Two or more recommendations are vague or are not reasonably within the capacity of those expected to follow them.
Level 2	Proficient Score:2.0 One recommendation is vague or not reasonably within the capacity of those expected to follow them.
Level 3	Exemplary Score:3.0 All recommendations are precise, and are reasonably within the capacity of those expected to follow them.

Assessment 5

Table 11 Case Study 1 Percent Performance by Criteria by Year

Academic Year 2009-2010			
N=6			
Criteria	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Timeliness			100%
Confidentiality			100%
Stylistic Elements-clarity		17%	83%
Stylistic Elements-Vocabulary			100%
Stylistic Elements-Organization			100%
Stylistic Elements-Mechanics		33%	67%
Assessment Effectiveness-background Information		17%	83%
Assessment Effectiveness: Appropriateness for Unique Student		17%	83%
Assessment Effectiveness: Correct Procedures		17%	83%
Assessment Effectiveness: Effective Narrative description		17%	83%
Assessment Effectiveness: Student Responses		50%	50%
Assessment Effectiveness: Test Protocols		50%	50%
Recommendations: Evidence based and Complete		17%	83%
Recommendations: Specific and Reasonable	17%	33%	50%

Academic Year 2010-2011			
N=			
Criteria	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Timeliness	0%	0%	100%
Confidentiality	0%	0%	100%
Stylistic Elements-clarity	0	25	75
Stylistic Elements-Vocabulary	0%	0%	100%
Stylistic Elements-Organization	0%	25%	75%
Stylistic Elements-Mechanics	0%	25%	75%
Assessment Effectiveness-background Information	0%	25%	75%
Assessment Effectiveness: Appropriateness for Unique Student	0%	25%	75%
Assessment Effectiveness: Correct Procedures	0%	25%	75%
Assessment Effectiveness: Effective Narrative description	0%	25%	75%
Assessment Effectiveness: Student Responses	0%	0%	100%
Assessment Effectiveness: Test Protocols	0%	25%	75%
Recommendations: Evidence based and Complete	0%	50%	50%
Recommendations: Specific and Reasonable	0%	50%	50%







Academic Year 2011-2012			
N=11			
Criteria	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Timeliness	0%	0%	100%
Confidentiality	0%	0%	100%
Stylistic Elements-clarity	0%	66.7%	33.3%
Stylistic Elements-Vocabulary	0%	0%	100%
Stylistic Elements-	0%	33.3%	66.7%

Organization			
Stylistic Elements-Mechanics	0%	33.3%	66.7%
Assessment Effectiveness-background Information	0%	0%	100%
Assessment Effectiveness: Appropriateness for Unique Student	0%	0%	100%
Assessment Effectiveness: Correct Procedures	0%	66.7%	33.3%
Assessment Effectiveness: Effective Narrative description	0%	66.7%	33.3%
Assessment Effectiveness: Student Responses	0%	33.3%	66.7%
Assessment Effectiveness: Test Protocols	0%	66.7%	33.3%
Recommendations: Evidence based and Complete	0%	0%	100%
Recommendations: Specific and Reasonable	0%	66.7%	33.3%

Assessment 5

Table 12 Pedagogical Professional Knowledge Skills and Dispositions Average Score of All Candidates

Academic Year 2008-2009

SPED Exit Portfolio 2005: Pedagogical/Professional-Effects on Student Learning	Individual Learning Differences: CEC Standard 3	7	2.4	
	Lesson Plan #1	7	2.1	
	Lesson Plan #2	7	1.4	
	Instructional Strategies: CEC Standard 4	7	2.3	
	Case Study*	7	1.4	
	Learning Environments and Social Interactions: CEC Standard 5	7	2.3	

	Language: CEC Standard 6	7	2.1	
	Instructional Planning: CEC Standard 7	7	2.2	
	Case Study: Instructional Planning	7	1.3	

Table 12b: Pedagogical Professional Knowledge Skills and Disposition
2010-2011

rubric name	criterion name	number	mean
SPED Exit Portfolio 2005: Pedagogical/Professional-Effects on Student Learning	Case Study	29	2.3
SPED Exit Portfolio 2005: Pedagogical/Professional-Effects on Student Learning	Case Study: Instructional Planning	29	2.3
SPED Exit Portfolio 2005: Pedagogical/Professional-Effects on Student Learning	Individual Learning Differences: CEC Standard 3	29	2.4
SPED Exit Portfolio 2005: Pedagogical/Professional-Effects on Student Learning	Instructional Planning: CEC Standard 7	29	2.6
SPED Exit Portfolio 2005: Pedagogical/Professional-Effects on Student Learning	Instructional Strategies: CEC Standard 4	29	2.6
SPED Exit Portfolio 2005: Pedagogical/Professional-Effects on Student Learning	Language: CEC Standard 6	29	2.3
SPED Exit Portfolio 2005: Pedagogical/Professional-Effects on Student Learning	Learning Environments and Social Interactions: CEC Standard 5	29	2.6
SPED Exit Portfolio 2005: Pedagogical/Professional-Effects on Student Learning	Lesson Plan #1	27	2.7
SPED Exit Portfolio 2005: Pedagogical/Professional-Effects on Student Learning	Lesson Plan #2	29	2.2

Appendix E
Assessment 6
Assessment 7
Assessment 8

Assessment 6**Table 13 Scoring Guide for Facsimile IEP**

Description/

Rationale

**SPED/CEC: Facsimile IEP
Intermediate Gate**

Candidates in the Special Education emphasis areas develop IEPs during their Field Experiences or Clinical Practices that demonstrate their implementation of principles of special education. NCATE Standards: Standard 1.1: Content knowledge for teacher candidates Standard 1.2: Pedagogical content knowledge for teacher candidates Standard 1.4: Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teacher candidates Standard 1.6: Dispositions for all candidates Standard 1.7: Student learning for teacher candidates Standard 3.2: Design, implementation and evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice Standard 3.3: Candidates Development of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help All Students Learn Standard 4.1: Design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences CEC Standards: Standard 2: Development and characteristics of Learners Standard 3: Individual learning differences Standard 4: Instructional strategies Standard 5: Learning environments and social interactions Standard 6: Communication Standard 7: Instructional planning Standard 8: Assessment Standard 9: Professional and ethical practice Standard 10: Collaboration

Criterion 1 Stylistic ElementsCommon
description:

Spelling, punctuation, and written expression meet professional standards.

Weighting in
summary
scores:

1

Level 1

Unacceptable
Neither spelling, punctuation, nor written expression meet standards.
Proficient

Score:1.0

Score:2.0

Level 2

Writing is clear and understandable, but there may be errors of spelling and punctuation.

Level 3

Exemplary
Spelling, punctuation, and written expression meet standards.

Score:3.0

Criterion 2 AR Page #100 Schedule of Services

Common description: Schedule of Services is appropriate to meet identified student needs; all needed related services are identified and scheduled.

Weighting in summary scores: 2

Level 1	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
	Neither Direct nor Related Services are appropriately identified and scheduled.	
Level 2	Proficient	Score:2.0
	Either, but not both, Direct or Related Services are appropriately identified and scheduled.	
Level 3	Exemplary	Score:3.0
	Both Direct and Related Services are appropriately identified and scheduled.	

Criterion 3 AR Page #101 Parental Participation

Common description: Statements about parents are respectful and appropriate.

Weighting in summary scores: 1

Level 1	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
	Statements about parents are either not respectful or are inappropriate.	
Level 2	Exemplary	Score:3.0
	Statements about parents are respectful and appropriate.	

Criterion 4 AR Page #101 Present Level of Performance

Common description: Levels of current performance are correctly described; relevant information is included.

Weighting in summary scores: 2

Level 1	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
	Either levels of current performance are described incorrectly, or relevant information is omitted.	
Level 2	Exemplary	Score:3.0
	Levels of current performance are correctly described; relevant information is included.	

Criterion 5 AR Page #101 Effects of Disability

Common description: Effects of the students disability on involvement in curriculum and activities, and on progress, are clearly stated.

Weighting in summary scores: 2

	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
Level 1	Effects of the students disability on involvement in curriculum and activities, and on progress, are not explained clearly.	
	Exemplary	Score:3.0
Level 2	Effects of the students disability on involvement in curriculum and activities, and on progress, are clearly explained.	

Criterion 6 AR Page #102 Consideration of Special Factors

Common description: As completed, this checklist is aligned with information in the Background Information section of the Case Study and any assessments completed by the candidate.

Weighting in summary scores: 2

	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
Level 1	Checklist responses are not aligned with information in Background Information and assessments.	
	Exemplary	Score:3.0
Level 2	Checklist responses are aligned with information in Background Information and assessments.	

Criterion 7 AR Page #103 Goals and Objectives Based on Data

Common description: Annual goals and short-term objectives are appropriately chosen, based on Background Information and assessments completed by candidate. (Areas revealed as areas of need are adequately addressed by goals and objectives; objectives are NOT written for areas not shown to be of concern.)

Weighting in summary scores: 5

	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
Level 1	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.

Exemplary Score:3.0

Level 2

Annual goals and short-term objectives are based on Background Information, results of assessments, or areas of concern identified by IEP team members.

Criterion 8 AR Page #103 Measurable Objectives

Common description: Objectives are written in terminology that is precise, observable, and measurable.

Weighting in summary scores: 2

Level 1 Unacceptable Score:1.0

Objectives are unclear, or describe behaviors that can not be observed or measured.

Level 2 Exemplary Score:3.0

Objectives are clearly written, and describe behaviors that can be observed and measured.

Criterion 9 AR Page #103 Mastery Criteria

Common description: Mastery criteria level is appropriate for student and objective (70% accuracy is not routinely appropriate).

Weighting in summary scores: 1

Level 1 Unacceptable Score:1.0

Criteria for mastery are routinely set too low or do not reflect functional level of achievement.

Level 2 Exemplary Score:3.0

Criteria for mastery are appropriate for student and reflect a functional level of achievement.

Criterion 10 AR Page #200-203 Instructional Modifications

Common description: Modifications of methods and materials for instruction and testing identified on the IEP provide appropriate support for the student, but do not impinge on development. (For example, oral testing is not recommended unless student lacks functional literacy skills; reading portions of tests are not read aloud or signed.)

Weighting in summary scores:	4	
Level 1	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
	Modifications do not provide adequate support for the student, OR modifications impinge on students development of attainable skills.	
Level 2	Exemplary	Score:3.0
	Modifications identified on the IEP provide appropriate support for the student.	

Criterion 11 AR Page #200-203: Aids and Supports

Common description: Recommendations for equipment reflect actual student need. (Recommendations are not withheld because school system does not currently own the needed equipment.)

Weighting in summary scores:	2	
Level 1	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
	Recommendations for equipment do not reflect actual student need.	
Level 2	Exemplary	Score:3.0
	Recommendations for equipment reflect actual student need.	

Criterion 12 AR Page #104-105 Determination of LRE

Common description: LRE reflects student need, not school system traditions or convenience of school personnel.

Weighting in summary scores:	3	
Level 1	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
	Identified LRE does not reflect identified student needs.	
Level 2	Exemplary	Score:3.0
	Identified LRE reflects identified student needs.	

Criterion 13 AR Page #106 Signature Page for IEP Team

Common description: Although this is a facsimile IEP, it should indicate all team members who would be needed for this student. Names are to be fictional except that of candidate; team members roles are to be accurate.

Weighting in summary	1
----------------------	---

scores:

	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
Level 1	IEP indicates some team members by listing position of appropriate members, but two or more needed members are omitted; OR confidentiality was violated--real names (other than that of candidate) were used.	
	Proficient	Score:2.0
Level 2	IEP indicates most team members who should be present by listing their positions, but at least one needed member is omitted; no real names are used (other than that of candidate) .	
	Exemplary	Score:3.0
Level 3	IEP accurately indicates each team member who should be present by listing position of appropriate members; no real names are used (other than that of candidate).	

Criterion 14 Evidence of Collaboration

Common description: Although this is a facsimile IEP, the candidate should show evidence of an understanding of the value of collaborative partnerships. The IEP should respond to and incorporate the concerns and contributions of parents and all members of the IEP team.

Weighting in summary scores: 2

	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
Level 1	IEP shows no evidence that concerns of parents or other team members were addressed during the development of the IEP.	
	Acceptable	Score:2.0
Level 2	The IEP records concerns of parents and other team members; concerns are not adequately addressed in the IEP.	
	Exemplary	Score:3.0
Level 3	The IEP records both concerns and contributions of parents and other team members; concerns are adequately addressed in the goals and objectives, aids and supports, or other sections of the final document.	

Assessment 6

Table 14 Facsimile IEP Percent Scores by Criteria

Academic Year: 2009-2010			
N=4			
Criterion	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Stylistic Elements	0%	25%	75%
AR Page 100 Schedule of	0%	0%	100%

Services			
AR Page 101 Parental Participation	0%	25%	75%
AR Page 101 Present level of Performance	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 101 Effects of Disability	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 102 Consideration of Special Factors	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 103: Goals and Objectives based on Data	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 103 Measurable Objectives	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 103 Mastery Criteria	0%	0%	100%
AR page 200-203 Instructional Modifications	0%	0%	100%
AR page 200-203: Aids and supports	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 104-105: Determination of LRE	0%	0%	100%
Ar Page 106 Signature Page	25%	25%	50%
Evidence of Collaboration	0%	50%	50%

Academic Year: 2010-2011			
N=1			
Criterion	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Stylistic Elements	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 100 Schedule of Services	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 101 Parental Participation	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 101 Present level of Performance	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 101 Effects of Disability	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 102 Consideration of Special Factors	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 103: Goals and Objectives based on Data	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 103 Measurable Objectives	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 103 Mastery	0%	0%	100%

Criteria			
AR page 200-203 Instructional Modifications	0%	0%	100%
AR page 200-203: Aids and supports	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 104-105: Determination of LRE	0%	0%	100%
Ar Page 106 Signature Page Evidence of Collaboration	0%	0%	100%

Academic Year: 2011-2012			
N=6			
Criterion	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Stylistic Elements	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 100 Schedule of Services	0%	33.3%	66.7%
AR Page 101 Parental Participation	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 101 Present level of Performance	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 101 Effects of Disability	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 102 Consideration of Special Factors	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 103: Goals and Objectives based on Data	16.7%	0%	83.3%
AR Page 103 Measurable Objectives	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 103 Mastery Criteria	16.7%	0%	83.3%
AR page 200-203 Instructional Modifications	0%	0%	100%
AR page 200-203: Aids and supports	0%	0%	100%
AR Page 104-105: Determination of LRE	0%	0%	100%
Ar Page 106 Signature Page Evidence of Collaboration	0%	33.3%	66.7%

Assessment 7

Table 15 Scoring Guide for Reflective Educator

Description/
Rationale**SPED Exit Portfolio 2005: Reflective Summary**

The candidate submits an overall evaluative summary of experiences during course and field studies.

Criterion 1**Reflection**Common
description:

Reflection is submitted.

Weighting in
summary scores:

1

Level 1

Unsatisfactory
Reflection is NOT submitted

Score:1.0

Level 2

Exemplary
Reflection is submitted.

Score:3.0

Criterion 2**Reflection: Evidence of Growth**Common
description:

The reflection contains specific evaluative statements regarding professional growth through matriculation.

Weighting in
summary scores:

1

Level 1

Unacceptable
No evidence of growth is supplied in the reflection. statements are very weak

Score:1.0

Level 2

Exemplary
There is evidence that the candidate has evaluated matriculation and specifies professional remedies or professional outcomes; reflections are rich and contextual.

Score:3.0

Criterion 3**Standards-based Evaluative Statements**Common
description:

Reflection contains evaluative statements that are based upon research and the ten CEC Standards

Weighting in
summary scores:

1

Level 1

Unacceptable
Reflection statements do not reflect research nor CEC Standards.

Score:1.0

Level 2

Proficient

Score:2.0

Reflection contains evaluative statements that are based upon research OR the ten CEC Standards

Exemplary

Score:3.0

Level 3

Reflection contains evaluative statements that are based upon research and the ten CEC Standards

Assessment 7

Table 16 Assessment of the Reflective Educator

Academic Year 2009-2010			
N=20 (5)			
Criterion	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Reflection	0%	0%	100%
Evidence of Growth	0%	0%	100%
Standards based Evaluative Statements	5%	40%	55%

Academic Year 2010-2011			
N=27 (9)			
Criterion	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Reflection	0%	0%	100.0%
Evidence of Growth	0%	0%	100.0%
Standards based Evaluative Statements	0%	66.7%	33.3%

Academic Year 2011-2012			
N=14 (5)			
Criterion	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Reflection	0%	0%	100%
Evidence of Growth	7.1%	0%	92.9%
Standards based Evaluative Statements	85.7	0%	14.3%

Assessment 8

Table 17 Scoring Guide for Professional Development Plan

Description/

Rationale

SPED Professional Development Plan Exit/Professional Gate

Candidate will submit a professional development plan that details the candidates plan for ongoing professional development, following program exit. Plan addresses current strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional standards; provides a mission statement that ongoing development of professional knowledge, planned contributions to the professional community, and personal/professional support; and addresses goals, supports, timelines, and ongoing self-evaluation.

NCATE Standards: Standard 1.1: Content knowledge for teacher candidates Standard 1.4: Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teacher candidates Standard 1.6: Dispositions for all candidates
CEC Standard 9: Professional and Ethical Practice AR Licensure Principles: 1, 5 COE Conceptual Framework: Professional Development

Criterion 1 Candor

Common description:
Weighting in summary scores:

Candidate was candid and both strengths and needs were discussed.

2

Level 1

Unsatisfactory

Score:1.0

Cursory, superficial discussion, or focus on either strengths or needs.

Level 2

Proficient

Score:2.0

Includes both strengths and needs, with sufficient depth and candor.

Level 3

Exemplary

Score:3.0

Includes both strengths and needs, with depth and candor, plus evaluative statements.

Criterion 2 Personal and Professional Characteristics

Common description:

Candidate addresses sufficient spectrum of characteristics of a professional that might include level of knowledge and expertise, experiences with diversity, dispositions, communication skills, and other characteristics as appropriate to the individual.

Weighting in summary scores:

2

Level 1

Unsatisfactory

Score:1.0

	Description of characteristics contains no mention of knowledge, expertise, communication or other characteristics, or focuses on only one or two attributes expected of a professional special educator.
	Proficient Score:2.0
Level 2	Description of characteristics expected of a professional special educator includes a sufficient spectrum, but lacks complete development.
	Exemplary Score:3.0
Level 3	Candidate addresses sufficient spectrum of characteristics of a professional that might include level of knowledge and expertise, experiences with diversity, dispositions, communication skills, and other characteristics as appropriate to the individual.

Criterion 3 Professional Standards

Common description: Weighting in summary scores:	Assessment includes statements related to professional standards of the Arkansas Department of Education and CEC Professional Standards. 2
	Unsatisfactory Score:1.0
Level 1	There is no mention of any professional performance standards in the document or the standards are incorrectly interpreted.
	Proficient Score:2.0
Level 2	Focus is primarily on one performance standard and the interpretation is accurate.
	Exemplary Score:3.0
Level 3	Statements correctly match performance standards of Arkansas, CEC, and all accrediting bodies; the statements are synthesized in the narrative rather than simply provided as a list.

Criterion 4 Personal Mission Statement

Common description: Weighting in summary scores:	The personal mission statement communicates the professional purpose, the intended clients, the importance of the service, and how the candidate intends to meet the needs of diverse populations and/or challenging students. 3
	Unsatisfactory Score:1.0
Level 1	Statement fails to communicate a mission or is a restatement of the philosophy. Statement contains inappropriate statements regarding

	differences or suggests prejudicial perceptions of disability.	
	Proficient	Score:2.0
Level 2	Mission statement is clear and contains appropriate statements of purpose and ways to meet the needs of diverse and challenging students. Some statements may vary from appropriate address of challenging and diverse students.	
	Exemplary	Score:3.0
Level 3	Mission statement is complete and clear, and synthesizes knowledge, skills, and dispositions in describing ways candidate expects to meet the needs of diverse and challenging students.	

Criterion 5 Self-evaluation Plan

Common description:	Plan for how the candidate will remain a reflective practitioner. Plan statements will include when and how the candidate will engage in evaluations of knowledge and teaching behavior as well as ways to reflect on the art of teaching as it contributes to student learning, what is the evidence, and what are appropriate strategies for improvement.	
Weighting in summary scores:	6	
	Unsatisfactory	Score:1.0
Level 1	No self evaluation plan is submitted, or a plan is submitted but is incoherent or ineffective.	
	Proficient	Score:2.0
Level 2	Self evaluation plan is submitted with details of when, how and what the evaluation sequence will include, but plan is unrealistic or ineffective in part.	
	Exemplary	Score:3.0
Level 3	Self evaluation plan is submitted with details of when, how and what the evaluation sequence will include, and plan is clearly sequenced and contains substantive evaluation and improvement features.	

Criterion 6 Professional Support System

Common description:	A plan for professional development and participation in professional behaviors is submitted. The candidates plan should include a way to document participation in professional organizations and ways to contribute to the professional community.	
Weighting in summary scores:	2	

	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
Level 1	The plan is disorganized or has no realistic statements of professional development OR focuses on only one area of professional development.	
	Proficient	Score:2.0
Level 2	The plan is organized but focuses on either professional memberships or contributions to the professional community.	
	Exemplary	Score:3.0
Level 3	The plan includes a timeline for continuing participation in professional organizations and for design and implementation of professional presentations and contributions to the professional community.	

Criterion 7 Writing Skills

Common description: Written expression demonstrates spelling, punctuation, and grammar at a professional level; written expression is coherent, cohesive, and comprehensible.

Weighting in summary scores: 2

	Unsatisfactory	Score:1.0
Level 1	Five or more errors in mechanics or grammar, or written expression is unclear.	
	Proficient	Score:2.0
Level 2	Three to four errors in mechanics or grammar; written expression is consistently clear.	
	Exemplary	Score:3.0
Level 3	One error in mechanics or grammar; written expression is consistently clear.	

Assessment 8

Table 18 Scores for Professional Development Plan

Academic Year 2009-2010			
N=9			
Criterion	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Strengths and Weaknesses	11%	44%	44%
Mission Statement	33%	22%	44%
Goals, Supports, Timelines and Evaluation	11%	33%	56%

Academic Year 2010-2011			
N=2			
Criterion	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Strengths and Weaknesses	0%	0%	100.0%
Mission Statement	0%	0%	100.0%
Goals, Supports, Timelines and Evaluation	0%	0%	100.0%

Academic Year 2011-2012			
N=7			
Criterion	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Strengths and Weaknesses	0%	28.6%	71.4%
Mission Statement	0%	42.9%	57.1%
Goals, Supports, Timelines and Evaluation	0%	42.9%	57.1%