

Assessment 2 (required) - Content Knowledge in Special Education

Section IV – Evidence for Meeting Standards

Documenting the Special Education Process/ Individualized Education Program (IEP) Development - Work Sample

1. Description of the assessment and use in the program

No changes.

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

While the standards targeted by Assessment 2 remain the same, the description of the alignment with Standard 6 Language has been expanded to explain the pivotal role it plays in the Special Education Process. Given the feedback received with regard to the Language standard, revisions were made to the rubrics. In addition, clarification was made with regard to how candidates provide evidence of Standard 10 Collaboration when writing the IEP document.

Standard 6: *Language*

Candidates' understanding of typical and atypical language development is key to their developing assessment plans and tasks that offer students opportunities to demonstrate competence and challenges across academic and social areas. The ways that candidates connect student language to reading, writing, mathematics, or social competence are considered indicators that they understand the relationships among oral language patterns and patterns of errors or barriers to learning. They are expected to embed language elements into their analyses of assessment data and hypotheses to account for student difficulties. How candidates account for the challenges students face is examined by the candidates' reference to the student's primary language and style as well as the impact of language on learning and testing situations.

Standard 10: *Collaboration*

A primary expectation for completing the IEP is for candidates to write the document using language that is readily understood by the intended audience, including parents, classroom teachers, the student (when appropriate), paraprofessionals, and related service providers. The written document is evidence of respect for the full audience for whom it is written, a basis for establishing follow-up collaborative activities with other team members.

3. A brief analysis of the data findings.

Findings from Assessment 2, *Documenting the Special Education Process/ Individualized Education Program (IEP) Development - Work Sample*, indicate that 100% of the candidates in 2006-2007 and 84.5% in 2007-2008 met or exceeded expectations for the competencies identified as necessary to proceed through the special education process that results in constructive educational plans for individual students. In 2007-2008, there were individual candidates who struggled to design substantial assessment plans; select effective assessment tools that yielded data to analyze and from which to draw hypotheses, and/ or write up results in coherent and comprehensive manner. While the *N* is relatively small and tends to distort

the percentage of candidates in need of improvement, the data do confirm the importance of establishing a solid assessment plan as fundamental to the process. In spite of candidate struggles, which may also reflect issues with writing effectively, there seems to be sufficient understanding of school-age students and curriculum to generate an educational plan within expected competence.

The data provide evidence of candidates' evolving understanding of students as readers, writers, mathematicians as they planned assessment, collected and analyzed data related to student performance in area(s) of concern, and integrated results to generate narratives/student profiles and present levels of performance. The data show that the overall percentage of methods/practicum candidates met or exceeded expectations as they developed the elements of the individualized education plan (goals, objectives, monitoring strategies, teaching approaches, access to general education), demonstrating competence in understanding the characteristics of learners, instructional approaches, long-term planning, and service delivery in order to develop constructive IEPs.

Candidates who were in need of improvement have a basic knowledge of characteristics of learners, individual learning differences, language (skills pre- or co-requisite with those required of the academic area being assessed), but have not synthesized information sufficiently to develop a well-justified and organized assessment plan (7.7% - 2007-2008) or detailed accounting for the challenges the student is having in making gains in the area(s) of concern (15.4% - 2007-2008). Some of the candidates struggled to put their ideas in written language (15.4% - 2007-2008) that conveys student strengths and needs that are understandable by the audience of the IEP (Standard 10). Other candidates proposed general instructional plans, having limited understanding of how to modify instructional strategies (5.4%).

4. Interpretation of how data provides evidence that CEC standards have been met.

Since this is one of two large scale assessments in the program, it is intended to be broad in nature and targets both content knowledge and skills. Each subtask of this assessment provides evidence of the ways in which candidates understand the unfolding nature of the special education process (Standard 1); ways they approach, implement, and analyze the collection of assessment data (Standards 2, 3, 6, 8); how they use data to justify and define goals and objectives, teaching approaches, access to general education (Standards 4, 5, 7); and how they define service delivery options (Standard 1) as elements of individualized educational plans (IEPs).

The layers of this assessment represent candidates' understanding of both the roles and tasks involved in meeting the regulations of legislation/ IDEA and delivering special education services (Standard 1). The evidence for Standard 1 is thus accumulated throughout the assessment; rather than designating it for each aspect of the assessment in the rubrics, it is more helpful to evaluate performance across the tasks. The data gathered across the semesters indicate that most candidates meet or exceed expectations as they plan to gather assessment data to generate IEP documents, demonstrating the application of knowledge about characteristics of learners, individual learning differences, and the impact of language (Standards 2, 3, 6) as they evaluate individual student academic and social needs (Standard 8). They further demonstrate competence in planning, conducting, and analyzing assessment data (Standard 8) to develop acceptable IEPs that represent long term planning based on understanding the student, instructional strategies, and learning environments (Standards 4, 5, 7)) and figuring out optimal services/ conditions for delivering instruction (Standard 1). Candidate performances on different subtasks also provide insights into individual thinking, problem solving, writing proficiency, and planning. While the data point to individual candidates struggling with particular steps in the special education process, they have sought support to

meet expectations for the primary tasks involved; choosing not to revise an earlier step, but building on feedback to make needed adjustments to complete the overall process within expectations. The data indicate strength in meeting competencies; anecdotal information indicates that candidates work to revise work or amend their course of action to help them develop IEPs. The opportunity to engage individually with faculty to enhance their work helps to account for what contributes to candidates' learning and developing competence. Additional factors supporting candidates include: a) the provision of model work samples as illustrations; b) flexibility in the use of class time for re-teaching or conducting workshops in the computer lab with peer editing sessions; and/ or c) individuals making use of office hours to review concepts and revise work.

5. ATTACHMENT (A)
Assessment 2 (required) - Content Knowledge in Special Education
Assessment Tool or Description of the Assignment
Documenting the Special Education Process/ IEP Development

There are no changes in the content of the assignment with the exception of designating the primary CEC Standards targeted by the sub-tasks of the assessment. These references are included on rubrics and the Scoring Chart. Course work and supplemental worksheets leading to the assignments also make direct reference to a text book¹ used in the program that is co-authored by Professor Evie Gleckel.

¹ Gleckel, E. & Koretz, E. (2008). *Collaborative individualized education process: RSVP to IDEA*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

ATTACHMENT B
Assessment 2 (required) - Content Knowledge in Special Education
REVISED Scoring Guides for the Assessment
Documenting the Special Education Process/ IEP Development

The set of rubrics for this assessment were revised to identify the primary CEC Standards targeted (response to CEC feedback). In addition, there are some descriptors in the rubric added to explain how language plays a key role in the assessment and analysis of student performance, accounting for challenges students experience, and the design of learning experiences. The revised rubrics help to further refine the description of the assignments candidates receive and the expectations for performance. The revised rubrics follow.

REVISED SPECIAL EDUCATION PROCESS WORK SAMPLE

PART I: PLAN ASSESSMENT

CANDIDATE'S NAME _____ DATE _____

COMPLETED BY: _____

DIRECTIONS: EXAMINE EACH ASPECT OF THE ***PART I: PLAN ASSESSMENT*** COMPONENT OF THIS WORK SAMPLE AND PROVIDE AN INDIVIDUAL RATING (1, 2, OR 3) FOR EACH SECTION IN PART I. THEN PROVIDE AN OVERALL RATING (1, 2, OR 3) FOR PART I, TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION EACH OF YOUR INDIVIDUAL RATINGS. CHECK BOXES IN FIRST COLUMN IF YOU HAVE SPECIFIC CONCERNS.

Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria	1 Needs Improvement	2 Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p>STANDARD 2 CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNERS STANDARD 3 INDIVIDUAL LEARNING DIFFERENCES</p> <p>What Know...</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Reads student file or referral documentation and summarizes key issues, looking at student performance, participation, and progress with reference to the demands of (general education) learning experiences and environment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Extracts information about the student as a reader, writer, or mathematician and organizes descriptive information by category (skill clusters, formats for performance, strategic thinking, context for participation, investment)</p>	<p>Includes information relevant to the area(s) of concern without using framework to organize it</p>	<p>Includes information relevant to the area(s) of concern, placing it in some of the framework categories, reflecting a general understanding of how to examine and account for student struggles</p>	<p>Includes information relevant to the area(s) of concern, placing it in the appropriate categories; reflecting a comprehensive understanding of how to examine and account for student struggles</p>
<p>STANDARD 2 CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNERS STANDARD 3 INDIVIDUAL LEARNING DIFFERENCES STANDARD 6 LANGUAGE</p> <p>What Want to Learn...</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Raises questions that build on what is known and gaps in information to describe the student in the area(s) of concern</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Organizes questions according to categories that help to sort through factors that impact learning, participation, and progress (ex. skill clusters, formats for performance, strategic thinking, context for participation, investment)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Uses open-ended questions to guide & justify the selection of assessment strategies</p>	<p>Asks general questions about the area of concern that gives limited direction for assessment</p>	<p>Asks a combination of open-ended and yes-no questions that generally corresponds with categories and provides some direction for assessment; addressing some relationships among instruction, student language and developmental status, and environment</p>	<p>Asks open-ended questions to correspond with the categories of information and provides a clear direction for assessment; taking into account the impact of instructional approaches used and demands placed, student language and developmental status, and environmental factors</p>

Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria	1 Needs Improvement	2 Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p align="center">STANDARD 8 ASSESSMENT</p> <p>How find out</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Includes identification of observations, informal tasks/ activities (surveys and probes) and interviews with teacher and/ or student, indicating understanding of how tools generate different types of data <input type="checkbox"/> Identifies assessments to directly address each question or set of questions raised <input type="checkbox"/> Selects assessments that give student opportunity to demonstrate her competence and challenges in the area(s) of concern <input type="checkbox"/> Diversifies assessment approaches to allow for isolate how student skills, language, responsiveness to tasks, environment, and situations give a view of performance, competence, and challenges 	Identifies a limited number of tools to assess the student in the area of concern	Identifies a set of assessment strategies that begin to expand understanding of the student	Identifies a set of assessment strategies that proposes to systematically sample student performance and skills with reference to the area of concern across categories, settings, materials and in response to the set of questions
<p align="center">STANDARD 8 ASSESSMENT</p> <p>The Know-Want-How Assessment Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Proposes a set of assessment strategies to gather information about a referred student, using existing information and documentation, identified concerns, and corresponding questions to justify selection of assessments <input type="checkbox"/> Makes clear connections among Know-Want-How columns so it is apparent why proposed assessment approaches are identified and how they promise to yield instructionally relevant data to eventually guide planning <input type="checkbox"/> Is organized to indicate how existing information, questions, and assessment approaches are grounded to enhance understanding the student (skills, strategies, and responsiveness to learning/ social situations) and learning demands, classroom expectations, and instructional materials, arrangements, and environments. <input type="checkbox"/> Conveys evidence of a comprehensive approach to collecting assessment data which looks at overall performance in the area(s) of concern along with specific academic, social, and language skills and strategies and possible contributing factors 	Lists ideas for assessments, based on identification of learning and/ or behavioral/ social concerns and general questions	Outlines a set of assessment strategies based on what is known (file information and/ or referral information and documentation) and questions that justify organizing information and ideas generally and giving a sense of potential curriculum factors that may contribute	Establishes a systematic approach to assessment, connecting what is known information to questions to assessment strategies, using a set of categories to organize

OVERALL RATING FOR PART I: PLAN ASSESSMENT (1, 2, OR 3): _____

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION COMMENTS: (USE BACK OF THIS FORM IF NECESSARY)

SUMMARIZE CANDIDATE'S STRENGTHS

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROCESS WORK SAMPLE

PART II: COLLECT, CHART, AND ANALYZE ASSESSMENT

CANDIDATE'S NAME _____ DATE _____

COMPLETED BY: _____

DIRECTIONS: EXAMINE EACH ASPECT OF THE PART II: COLLECT, CHART, AND ANALYZE ASSESSMENT COMPONENT OF THIS WORK SAMPLE AND PROVIDE AN INDIVIDUAL RATING (1, 2, OR 3) FOR EACH SECTION IN PART II. THEN PROVIDE AN OVERALL RATING (1, 2, OR 3) FOR PART I TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION EACH OF YOUR INDIVIDUAL RATINGS. CHECK BOXES IN FIRST COLUMN IF YOU HAVE SPECIFIC CONCERNS.

Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria	1 Needs Improvement	2 Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p align="center">STANDARD 8 ASSESSMENT</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Develop and access tasks and tools to use as assessments with the student, based on available information regarding challenges and persistent questions (Assessment Plan)</p>	<p>Chooses survey and probe level tools that have minimal connection to the <u>Know-Want-How</u> assessment plan and provide pieces of information regarding who the student is in the area(s) of concern, focusing primarily on academic or social skills without reference to task demands or potential impact of environment</p>	<p>Pulls together a set of survey and probe level tools that address <i>some</i> areas of the <u>Know-Want-How</u> assessment plan, which provide <i>some</i> opportunities to examine who the student is in the area(s) of concern; taking into account some task demands and/ or some environmental factors</p>	<p>Organizes a set of survey and probe level tools that correspond with the <u>Know-Want-How</u> assessment plan, which provide opportunities to examine who the student is in the area(s) of concern systematically and thoroughly; taking into account different task demands (ex. formats, levels, response requirements, language complexities, etc.) and environmental factors (ex. individual vs. group, timed vs. untimed, etc.)</p>
<p align="center">STANDARD 8 ASSESSMENT</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Administer assessment tasks; describing student execution of tasks, documenting responses, collecting observation data, and recording pertinent interview information/ conversation.</p>	<p>Gathers assessment data, collecting student work with scant notes of observations, student comments, variables impacting performance</p>	<p>Collects student responses to assessment tasks, identifying some of what transpired, student responses, variables impacting performance</p>	<p>Collects student responses to assessment tasks, identifying what transpired, student responses, variables impacting performance; tracking what transpires during assessment</p>

Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria	1 Needs Improvement	2 Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p align="center">STANDARD 3 INDIVIDUAL LEARNING DIFFERENCES STANDARD 4 INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES STANDARD 6 LANGUAGE STANDARD 8 ASSESSMENT</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Analyze performance and organize results through charting and application of criteria that is relevant to area(s) of concern, figuring out what patterns of competence and errors exist under what conditions with reference to academic skill hierarchies, language, and social skills along with the demands of tasks and situations</p>	Reviews student work, noting some errors and evidence of competence, missing out on the details that come from clustering similar errors, looking across comparable tasks, or evaluation of various skills and situations	Develops criteria for analyzing student responses and incorporates into chart; entering information about student performance, focusing on relationship to academic, language, and/ or social demands and attending to some aspects of task and situational structures	Develops charting devices to correspond with each assessment tool and criteria for evaluating performance; using descriptive phrases for capturing student competence and errors against corresponding academic, language, and/ or social demands and qualities of tasks and situations
<p align="center">STANDARD 2 CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNERS STANDARD 3 INDIVIDUAL LEARNING DIFFERENCES STANDARD 6 LANGUAGE STANDARD 8 ASSESSMENT</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Collate data to describe the student as a learner, cross-referencing what contributes to or interferes with successes in the area(s) of concern and discerning how levels, formats and qualities of tasks optimize and/ or detract from performance and/ or products.</p>	Examines student performance per tool, and offers broad generalizations to account for variations in competence and struggles	Examines student performance across tools, using general criteria to account for task and environmental demands making references to aspects of student academic and social skills, strategies and/ or language in situations	Examines student performance across tools, using common criteria to account for the impact of task and environmental demands with reference to what the student brings to academic and/ or social situation (skills, strategies, language)
<p align="center">STANDARD 2 CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNERS STANDARD 3 INDIVIDUAL LEARNING DIFFERENCES STANDARD 6 LANGUAGE</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Hypothesize what contributes to student patterns of errors, challenges, and successes using evidence of skills (academic, social, language), strategies, and thinking documented through assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Establish student needs; the basis for identifying focuses for instruction and potential teaching strategies that will support student progress.</p>	Makes general statements about student competence and struggles. Uses student performance on probes and surveys to indicate directions for instruction	Provides some ways to account for student competence and struggles, drawing on data collected. Uses student performance on probes and surveys to indicate some areas of instruction that require attention	Provides ways to account for student competence and struggles, drawing on data collected as examples and making connections of evidence to use student performance on probes and surveys to indicate what skills/ skill clusters require attention and what approaches are preferable

OVERALL RATING FOR PART II: COLLECT, CHART, AND ANALYZE (1, 2, OR 3): _____

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION COMMENTS: (USE BACK OF THIS FORM IF NECESSARY)

SUMMARIZE CANDIDATE'S STRENGTHS

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROCESS WORK SAMPLE

**PART III, A: WRITE THE IEP
PROFILE AND PRESENT LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE**

CANDIDATE'S NAME _____ DATE _____

COMPLETED BY: _____

DIRECTIONS: EXAMINE EACH ASPECT OF THE *PART III: WRITE THE IEP* COMPONENT OF THIS WORK SAMPLE AND PROVIDE AN INDIVIDUAL RATING (1, 2, OR 3) FOR EACH SECTION IN PART III. THEN PROVIDE AN OVERALL RATING (1, 2, OR 3) FOR PART I TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION EACH OF YOUR INDIVIDUAL RATINGS. CHECK BOXES IN FIRST COLUMN IF YOU HAVE SPECIFIC CONCERNS.

Part III: Write the Present Level of Performance Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria	1 Needs Improvement	2 Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p>STANDARD 2 CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNERS STANDARD 3 INDIVIDUAL LEARNING DIFFERENCES STANDARD 4 INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES STANDARD 6 LANGUAGE</p> <p>Write a narrative that responds to:</p> <p>How does the <u>PROFILE/ LEARNING STYLE</u> section provide an overview of who the student is as reader, writer, mathematician, participant in the learning environment, and/ or member of the classroom community? How does the narrative describe the quality of student performance and patterns of errors and struggles as a response to different learning conditions? How does the description account for challenges the student experiences and indicate needs?</p> <p>How does the narrative ...</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> present both the challenges and successes the student has with participating in related reading, math, written language, content area instruction and/ or independent and group activities</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> elaborate the impact instructional materials, learning environment, teacher input, and/ or incentives have on student performance as a reader, writer, mathematician, participant</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> identify how language and personal experiences (background knowledge) affect performance and progress</p>	<p>Presents information regarding student in general terms, focusing on areas of difficulty without acknowledging successes, factors impacting learning and behaving</p>	<p>Offers a description of the student in the area of concern, accounting for some of the issues with which s/he struggles and competence s/he demonstrates; calling some attention to qualities of instruction, environment, and qualities the student brings to the learning situation (ex. strategies, language, etc.)</p>	<p>Conveys a clear description of the student in the area of concern, taking into account what the student does with reference to different features of learning materials, approaches, settings; and recognizing the impact of curriculum demands in conjunction with student language, culture, and processing language, etc.)</p>
<p>Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria</p>	<p>1 Needs Improvement</p>	<p>2 Meets Expectations</p>	<p>3 Exceeds Expectations</p>
<p><i>continued</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> characterize how the student approaches books,</p>	<p>Examines student</p>	<p>Examines student</p>	<p>Examines student</p>

<p>writing process, problem solving, and/ or participation in related activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> describe how the student performs when demands change (ex. dictate vs. write story, read silently vs. orally vs. read to, calculate equations by rote vs. using counters vs. in head) <input type="checkbox"/> indicate the strategies the student uses when challenged (ex. ways asks for help or relies on teacher prompts, deciphers unfamiliar words, uses prewriting or editing tools, figures out problems or equations) <p>convey how student attitude or self perception relate to performance in the area(s) of concern</p>	<p>performance per tool, and offers broad generalizations to account for variations in competence and struggles</p>	<p>performance across tools, using general criteria to account for task and environmental demands making references to aspects of student academic and social skills, strategies and/ or language in situations</p>	<p>performance across tools, using common criteria to account for the impact of task and environmental demands with reference to what the student brings to academic and/ or social situation (skills, strategies, language)</p>
<p>STANDARD 2 CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNERS STANDARD 3 INDIVIDUAL LEARNING DIFFERENCES STANDARD 4 INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES STANDARD 6 LANGUAGE</p> <p>Do the PRESENT LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE identify the student's skill repertoires per cluster? How are competencies described? In what way are these descriptions ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> organized according to categories/ skill clusters that collectively define what the student does as a reader (ex. fluency, word recognition, retell), writer (ex. prewriting, drafting, spelling), mathematician (ex. addition of single digits, word problems)? <input type="checkbox"/> an articulation of specific skills mastered and the corresponding conditions/ task demands (ex. in isolation vs. context, when prompted) under which these are evidenced? <input type="checkbox"/> clarifications of how well the student is familiar with the skills, is at an independent level, and/ or applies them to authentic situations (ex. reading a book, writing a story or report, solving a math problem)? <input type="checkbox"/> indications of starting point(s) for instruction? <input type="checkbox"/> inclusive of student developmental status and language in relation to the designated area(s) of concern? <input type="checkbox"/> connected with grade level equivalents ONLY when referenced with specific instructional materials and demands and to make links with general education? 	<p>Provides a broad overview of student skills with regard to the area of concern, offering grade levels as reference points with limited accounting for impact of specific skills on performance</p>	<p>Provides constructive information regarding key skill clusters, with some specifics summarized or omitted so the starting points for instruction are indicated, but could be clearer</p>	<p>Provides constructive information regarding relevant skill clusters, offering details relative to specific skills to substantiate clear starting points for instruction</p>

OVERALL RATING FOR PART III, A, PROFILE & PLOP: (1, 2, OR 3): _____

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION COMMENTS: (USE BACK OF THIS FORM IF NECESSARY)

SUMMARIZE CANDIDATE'S STRENGTHS

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROCESS WORK SAMPLE

**PART III, B: WRITE THE IEP
GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND MONITOR PROGRESS**

CANDIDATE'S NAME _____ DATE _____

COMPLETED BY: _____

DIRECTIONS: EXAMINE EACH ASPECT OF THE PART III: GOALS, OBJECTIVES, MONITORING PROGRESS COMPONENT OF THIS WORK SAMPLE AND PROVIDE AN INDIVIDUAL RATING (1, 2, OR 3) FOR EACH SECTION IN PART III. THEN PROVIDE AN OVERALL RATING (1, 2, OR 3) FOR PART I TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION EACH OF YOUR INDIVIDUAL RATINGS. CHECK BOXES IN FIRST COLUMN IF YOU HAVE SPECIFIC CONCERNS.

PART III: Goals, Objectives, Monitoring Progress Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria	1 Needs Improvement	2 Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p align="center">STANDARD 4 INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES STANDARD 5 LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS STANDARD 7 INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING STANDARD 8 ASSESSMENT</p> <p>How do GOAL STATEMENTS ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> directly address the present levels of performance? <input type="checkbox"/> convey priorities for the student's program and set direction(s)/ parameters for instruction in terms of each skill cluster warranting attention that will addressed? <input type="checkbox"/> state the general outcomes of instruction in measurable terms and indicate targets for instruction? <input type="checkbox"/> include an expected level of mastery and conditions for performance? 	<p>Provides an overview for instruction, broadly stated</p>	<p>Sets direction for instruction; giving a broad focus, making some connection to PLOP, making general area(s) of need, and/ or establishing criteria for mastery</p>	<p>Sets focused direction for instruction, making a specific connection with PLOP, honing in on area(s) of need, and establishing criteria for mastery</p>
<p>How do OBJECTIVES/ BENCHMARKS ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> begin at the "next step" that comes after the present levels of performance/ entry-level skills? <input type="checkbox"/> establish skill sequences that progress toward each of the goals? <input type="checkbox"/> articulate the skills and actions the student will demonstrate? <input type="checkbox"/> identify the conditions (tasks or activities) under which the student will perform/ behave? <input type="checkbox"/> define criteria for reaching mastery of the specific skills? 	<p>Suggests some steps for attaining goals; missing sequence, specificity of desired outcomes, and criteria for mastery</p>	<p>Provides a set of steps for attaining goals; indicating some of the skills needed, identifying the conditions under which student will perform, and/ or elaborating the criteria for judging mastery</p>	<p>Specifies a sequence of steps for attaining goals; using the PLOP as the starting point and indicating particular skills to be acquired, identifying the conditions under which student will perform, and elaborating the criteria for judging mastery</p>

Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria	1 Needs Improvement	2 Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p>How do MONITORING STRATEGIES ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> reflect the criteria for mastery set by the specific objectives/ benchmarks? <input type="checkbox"/> specify the types of evaluative strategies to be used? <input type="checkbox"/> identify the frequency of measurement? <input type="checkbox"/> directly reflect instruction provided? <input type="checkbox"/> document descriptive accounts of performance, error patterns, behaviors? <input type="checkbox"/> count number of correct items or appropriate behaviors? <input type="checkbox"/> provide substantial data to judge student progress <u>and</u> the effectiveness of the educational plan (specific components or overall program)? 	<p>Strategies for documenting student progress are omitted, general, or not coordinated with intended outcomes of instruction defined by goals and objectives</p>	<p>Strategies for documenting student progress are identified and have some relationship with intended outcomes of instruction defined by goals and objectives</p>	<p>Strategies for documenting student progress are specified, correlate directly with intended outcomes defined by goals and objectives and apply criteria set</p>

OVERALL RATING FOR PART III, GOALS, OBJECTIVES, MONITORING PROGRESS: (1, 2, OR 3): _____

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION COMMENTS: (USE BACK OF THIS FORM IF NECESSARY)

SUMMARIZE CANDIDATE'S STRENGTHS

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROCESS WORK SAMPLE

PART III, C: WRITE THE IEP

DESIGN CURRICULUM, PLAN INSTRUCTION (ACCOMMODATIONS/MODIFICATIONS/ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY),
AND IDENTIFY PROGRAM COMPONENTS

CANDIDATE'S NAME _____ DATE _____

COMPLETED BY: _____

DIRECTIONS: EXAMINE EACH ASPECT OF THE PART III: DESIGN CURRICULUM, PLAN INSTRUCTION (ACCOMMODATIONS/ MODIFICATIONS/ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY), AND IDENTIFY PROGRAM COMPONENTS COMPONENT OF THIS WORK SAMPLE AND PROVIDE AN INDIVIDUAL RATING (1, 2, OR 3) FOR EACH SECTION IN PART III. THEN PROVIDE AN OVERALL RATING (1, 2, OR 3) FOR PART I TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION EACH OF YOUR INDIVIDUAL RATINGS. CHECK BOXES IN FIRST COLUMN IF YOU HAVE SPECIFIC CONCERNS.

PART III: Design Curriculum, Plan Instruction (Accommodations/ Modifications/Assistive Technology), and Identify Program Components Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria	1 Needs Improvement	2 Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p align="center"> STANDARD 1 FOUNDATIONS STANDARD 2 CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNERS STANDARD 4 INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES STANDARD 7 INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING </p> <p>How does DIRECT INSTRUCTION/ Alternative Teaching Approaches and Materials (Special Education)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> designate types of instructional approaches, materials, activities, conditions that promise to support student growth in the area(s) of concern? <input type="checkbox"/> address direct instruction of the identified goals and objectives? <input type="checkbox"/> reflect the descriptions provided in the profile/ assessment report? <input type="checkbox"/> prepare the student to participate in the next Least Restrictive Environment? <input type="checkbox"/> consider assistive technology approaches 	<p>Indicates general approaches to instruction</p>	<p>Provides some guidelines for the design of instructional strategies, materials, and/ or approaches related to area(s) of need</p>	<p>Provides guidelines for the design of instructional strategies, materials, and approaches that correspond with stated goals and objectives/ benchmarks and reflect student description</p>

PART III: Design Curriculum, Plan Instruction (Accommodations/ Modifications/Assistive Technology), and Identify Program Components Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria	1 Needs Improvement	2 Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p>How does ACCESS TO GENERAL EDUCATION (mainstreaming/ inclusion) include attention to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> alternatives to/ or modification strategies for classroom materials approaches and environmental arrangements? <input type="checkbox"/> suggestions for cueing devices, time & task management techniques, study & cognitive strategies that would enhance student performance? <input type="checkbox"/> positive behavior supports and strategies for classroom? <input type="checkbox"/> design of groupings for instruction that incorporate skill needed? <input type="checkbox"/> substantiate need for modified and/ or alternative classroom, district, and state-wide testing? 	<p>Indicates when student will participate in the general education curriculum</p>	<p>Indicates a set of modifications to use to support student involvement in the general education curriculum, identifying ideas for adjusting assignments, materials, and/ or environments</p>	<p>Indicates a specific set of modifications to use to support student active engagement in the general education curriculum, identifying particular ideas for adjusting assignments, instructional materials, and/ or learning environments to accommodate student needs</p>
<p>How do modifications/ accommodations to support ACCESS TO GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM provide constructive ideas that indicate:</p> <p>Ways to modify or adapt instructional strategies and materials so the student participates in classroom activities even with challenges in area(s) of concern. How will the student...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> gain introductory information (ex. from lecture, text, activity)? <input type="checkbox"/> practice skills or information (ex. through assigned readings, writing tasks, calculations)? <input type="checkbox"/> show what learned (ex. through essays, discussion)? <p>Types of supportive conditions which help the student to...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> organize and manage time (scheduling)? <input type="checkbox"/> attend to the pace of lessons? <input type="checkbox"/> tolerate frustration? <input type="checkbox"/> maintain on-task behavior (support task completion)? <input type="checkbox"/> respond to teacher direction? <input type="checkbox"/> enhance or engage in peer interaction? <input type="checkbox"/> be independent in daily activity? <input type="checkbox"/> be an active part of group activities? <input type="checkbox"/> find learning spaces in which to work productively? <input type="checkbox"/> seek systematic feedback and incentives? <p>see ties with own interests in the learning context?</p>	<p>Indicates when student will participate in the general education curriculum</p>	<p>Indicates a set of modifications to use to support student involvement in the general education curriculum, identifying ideas for adjusting assignments, materials, and/ or environments</p>	<p>Indicates a specific set of modifications to use to support student active engagement in the general education curriculum, identifying particular ideas for adjusting assignments, instructional materials, and/ or learning environments to accommodate student needs</p>

PART III: Design Curriculum, Plan Instruction (Accommodations/ Modifications/Assistive Technology), and Identify Program Components Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria	1 Needs Improvement	2 Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
STANDARD 1 FOUNDATIONS How does the SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICE DELIVERY PLAN/ CHART: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> relate the nature of services the student and general education teacher will receive (remedial, supportive, integrated, consultative)? <input type="checkbox"/> address goals with respect to the concept of LRE and access to general education? <input type="checkbox"/> specify logistics of service delivery (location, hours, frequency and personnel)? <input type="checkbox"/> indicate student eligibility status (code or program prototype)? <input type="checkbox"/> identify consultation activities between classroom and SPED teacher to insure continuity of program, ongoing evaluation of progress and continued mutual support? 	Completes the service matrix with times assigned, but no clear avenues for connecting general and special education and reliance on para-professionals to exceed responsibilities	Designs a system for creating times and complement-tary experiences by allocating time, services, location, groupings that serve student and connections between general and special education	Designs a system for creating times and complement-tary experiences by allocating time, services, location, groupings to serve student and make connections among general and special education and related service providers

OVERALL RATING FOR PART III, DESIGN CURRICULUM, PLAN INSTRUCTION (ACCOMODATIONS/ MODIFICATIONS/ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY), AND IDENTIFY PROGRAM COMPONENTS: (1, 2, OR 3):

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION COMMENTS: (USE BACK OF THIS FORM IF NECESSARY)

SUMMARIZE CANDIDATE’S STRENGTHS

ATTACHMENT 5 C
Assessment 2 (required) - Content Knowledge in Special Education
Data Derived from Assessment
Documenting the Special Education Process/ IEP Development

SUMMATIVE SCORING FORM
FOR COLLECTING PROGRAM DATA

The revisions to the Scoring Form for *Documenting the Special Education Process/ IEP Development* highlight key standards targeted by each component of this assessment. In the original report, the intent was an intent to separate out data to examine each standard – this has been eliminated.

Number of Candidates 2006-2007 N = 17 2007-2008 N = 13	Assessment # 2 IEP - Undergraduate											
	N I AY 06-07		N I AY 07-08		M E AY 06-07		M E AY 07-08		E E AY 06-07		E E AY 07-08	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Standards 2, 3, 6, 8 Develop Assess. Plan	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	11	64.7%	10	76.9%	6	35.3%	2	15.4%
Standard 8 Develop/Access Tools	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	16	94.1%	12	92.3%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%
Standards 3, 4, 6, 8 Analyze Perform.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	76.5%	10	76.9%	4	23.5%	3	23.1%
Standards 2, 3, 6, 8 Collate Data	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	94.1%	10	76.9%	1	5.9%	3	23.1%
Standards 2, 3, 6 Hypotheses/Needs	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	14	82.4%	8	61.5%	3	17.6%	4	30.8%
Standards 2, 3, 4, 6 IEP Profile and PLOP Report Assess Data	0	0.0%	2	15.4%	16	94.1%	7	53.8%	1	5.9%	4	30.8%
Standards 4, 5, 7, 8 Goals & Objectives Design Curriculum	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	64.7%	11	84.6%	6	35.3%	2	15.4%
Standards 1, 2, 4, 7 TeachApp & Access Plan Instruction	1	5.9%	1	7.7%	8	47.1%	9	84.6%	8	47.1%	3	23.1%
Standard 1 Service Plan Ident. Program Components	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	15	88.2%	11	84.6%	2	11.8%	1	7.7%