

**Assessment 2 (required) - Content Knowledge in Special Education**  
Section IV – Evidence for Meeting Standards  
***Special Education Process Work Sample***

---

### **1. Description of the assessment and use in the program**

This assessment replaces Assessment 2, *Grades for Core Courses*, from the original PB SPED NCATE/SPA report. In the previous report this assessment was labeled Assessment 7.

This change was suggested by SPA reviewers. In the previous report this assessment was named the *IEP Work Sample* and was renamed here in the response to conditions as the *Special Education Process Work Sample* to accurately represent this assessment. See original report for the specific description of how this assessment is used in the program as this remains unchanged.

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

This assessment requires candidates to apply the set of CEC Standards to authentic tasks that comprise key responsibilities of special educators while drawing direct parallels to the special education process as stipulated by IDEA. The series of tasks require competence across the standards with different steps emphasizing different standards. The prominent standards that are targeted per task are designated on the rubrics, even though student performance across the assignments requires mastery of others as well. This is a significant assessment for our program and is intended to cover many aspects related to the content knowledge as well as skills across several standards. Other assessments in the program specifically target certain assessments. Assessment 2 was reformatted and refined to more accurately and descriptively assess Standard 6. The accompanying rubric was more descriptively developed, and descriptions of how the assessment aligns to standards were rewritten below. This assessment which targets standards 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8, is the same assessment used in the Undergraduate Special Education program.

#### **Standards Targeted by Assessment 2**

##### *Standard 1: Foundations*

Assessment 2 provides evidence that candidates adhere to the steps and process of IDEA: assuring due process; adopting practices to support its implementation; wrestling with issues of definition and identification; and acquiring an understanding of rights and responsibilities of students, parents, and teachers. Developing an IEP and the related matrix of services also provides documentation of appreciation of how the continuum of services offers a range of opportunities and needs to be tailored to individual students.

##### *Standard 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners*

The *Special Education Process Work Sample* requires s to demonstrate understanding of typical and atypical growth and development and their educational implications as they plan assessment to determine what data are needed to describe the student comprehensively. The way in which IEP plans and recommendations distinguish between specially-designed instruction and access to general education reflect candidates' competence determining similarities and differences among individuals with and without exceptional learning needs and figuring out the necessary accommodations.

##### *Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences*

The ways in which candidates analyze and report assessment data and describe student profiles and present levels of performance are indicators of how they see the impact of exceptional needs on academic competence, attitudes toward learning, and responsiveness to instruction and interventions. The objectivity and sensitivity with which candidates report on student status serve as evidence of their acknowledgement of differing approaches students take to learn and unbiased treatment of the circumstances that surround their lives (ex. cultural, economic, family constellation, etc.). The way in which such status reports provide clear justification for requiring various strategies to address student needs is also evaluated through this work sample.

#### 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 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 with reference to a student's primary language and style as well as the impact of language used in learning and testing situations.

#### Standard 7: *Instructional Planning*

The treatment of goals and objectives/ benchmarks is seen as evidence of candidates' competence in creating longitudinal individualized educational plans; applying curriculum design, task analysis, references to scope and sequences and curricular standards, and instructional content and strategies. Making distinctions between modification to general education and focuses for specifically-designed instruction is also considered substantiation of comparing student needs to curricular standards.

#### Standard 8: *Assessment*

A number of artifacts in this work sample reveal candidates' facility with gathering pertinent background information; designing individualized assessment plans, analyzing and interpreting results of instruments administered; integrating findings into a profile of the learner and articulation of present levels of performance to justify eligibility, instruction, and program needs; and identification of tools to document student progress once the IEP is implemented. Assessment planning is viewed as verification that candidates use pre-referral (response to intervention)/ referral and other background data, legal requirements, and awareness of the use and limitations of formal and informal instruments to make and justify their selections of tools to outline individualized assessment to guide them through educational evaluation of the student in the area(s) of concern. Approaches to documenting and monitoring student progress that are identified on the IEP substantiate candidates' commitment to ongoing assessment and development of individualized assessments. Further, recommendations for accommodations to state-wide testing are evaluated for consistency with monitoring techniques and evidence of effective assessment to verify student growth.

### **Other Standards Addressed by Assessment 2**

#### Standard 4: *Instructional Strategies*

The pre-service teacher is required to select, adapt, and use instructional strategies in order to identify the conditions under which goals and objectives/ benchmarks are achieved and outline what constitutes specially-designed and/ or alternative instruction provided under the guise of special education services. In addition, the pre-service teacher's facility with modifications, accommodations/ strategies to facilitate access

to general education is evaluated through this task. When appropriate, the ways in which candidates establish guidelines for transitions is examined. The extent to which they comprehend academic content is evident and thus evaluated with regard to identifying and creating assessment tools; analyzing student performance; structuring the sequence of goals and objectives; and comparing student present levels with requirements of general education to determine access.

#### Standard 5: *Learning Environments and Social Interactions*

How candidates take into account the demands of learning environments in evaluating student participation and progress, justifying placements for instruction; and providing rationale for modifications are evident in the way they conduct assessments; analyze results; report assessment data on the IEP; and describe matching student needs with specific types of settings.

#### Standard 9: *Professional and Ethical Practice*

The IEP is viewed as a source for evaluating candidates' treatment of student challenges in a non-biased, objective manner; conveying a positive, pro-active view of needs and program proposals. Given the *nature* of the work sample, it is important that candidates maintain confidentiality, reflect on their own performance, and state goals for growth.

#### 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, consisting of: parents, classroom teachers, the student, 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 data findings**

Findings from Assessment 2, *Special Education Process Work Sample* include 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 data and are organized by each component of the assessment including an overall assessment score for both years. Final averages are provided for the component data.

Findings from Assessment 2, *Special Education Process Work Sample*, show that 100% of PB SPED candidates met or exceeded expectations on all 6 major components of this assessment. Findings were mixed across all of the components of the assessment although the areas with the lowest ratings included Part II: Collect, Chart, and Analyze Assessment Data and Part III: Write Goals and Objectives. The Part III component of the assessment which includes the accommodations, modifications, assistive technology and other related service delivery and instruction components dropped slightly in the ratings as fewer students appeared to exceed expectations on this assessment component. On most components, the individual component data and overall data revealed improvement in scores from 06-07 to 07-08. In 06-07, 50% of candidates exceeded expectations on this assessment and in 07-08 62% exceeded expectations on this assessment. See attached data tables for Assessment 2.

### **4. Interpretation of how data provide evidence for meeting standards**

This assessment was implemented in 2006-2007. It is a strong assessment tool that has been used in the KSC program for several years. 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. Assessment 2, in the previous set of assessments for the program, was based on grades and it was suggested that grades be removed and the *IEP work sample*, renamed *Special Education Process Work Sample*, be moved to the Assessment 2 position. This move was initiated in the 2006-2007.

The assessment appears strong in relation to the assessment of a candidate's ability to meet content knowledge requirements for Standards 1-3 as well as content knowledge and skills requirements for Standards 6, 7, and 8. Each component of this assessment builds on others and is instituted at the beginning of the Internship I field experience.

Candidates receive multiple sets of feedback on this assessment from a KSC Supervisor as well as a Cooperating Professional to submit a final product for evaluation by KSC Supervisor. The data shows that candidates responded well to ongoing feedback across components of the assessment as a majority of candidates met or exceeded expectations. The assessment was refined to more descriptively assess various components and more specifically address Standard 6 by embedding aspects of this standard in the assessment and more explicitly describing where this standard is assessed. After review of the data and based on qualitative review of this assessment, it appears that although the work sample addresses this standard, it may be important to look into the design of an additional targeted assessment for Standard 6. A new assessment will help to provide foundational knowledge about Standard 6 thereby strengthening how this Standard is addressed.

Additionally, the aggregate data provided here will help us to examine ways to improve how we build special education content knowledge and skills throughout our program and will help to inform the future curriculum development of graduate level special education certification programs at KSC. In the PB SPED program, it was clear that Part III of this assessment needed to be redesigned so the program adopted the entire assessment from the undergraduate program for Part III in 2008-2009. 2007-2008 data reflect some of these changes and in 2008-2009 full implementation of Part III changes will be carried out (see data Section IV, Assessment 7, Attachments A-C of the original report). The reflection component of the original assessment was dropped as all candidates provide a reflection on aspects of this assessment for their portfolio, and it seemed to duplicate efforts.

## Assessment Tool or Description of the Assessment

*Special Education Process Work Sample*

## Instructions for Candidates

## THE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROCESS WORK SAMPLE

This assignment is designed to give practicum students direct experience with the series of tasks that move through the special education process and lead to and include writing an effective IEP. Practicum students are required to complete and write up the process, one step at a time. By submitting each step, practicum students will receive ongoing feedback, gaining an understanding of the thought processes involved in a systematic approach to the assessment and decisions that lead to writing IEPs. This set of assignments supports practicum students as they develop their own writing styles for professional communications.

The primary resource to assist candidates is provided through the model *Responsive Steps, Voices and Practices* (RSVP) found in the course text\*. The model and book defines the IEP as a product of a process and a way of thinking; which involves assessment planning, conducting the assessments, and related activities; the results of which are written into IEP documents. Each of the components below is described specifically in the RSVP text, which includes examples. Refer to the book for specific guidelines when analyzing a student's file, raising assessment questions, selecting assessment strategies, collecting data for the IEP, and writing each component required in the document.

**Part I. Plan Assessment** (CEC Standards 1, 2, 3, 6, 8)

Construct an assessment plan that...

- 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
- 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
- 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.
- conveys evidence of a comprehensive approach to collecting assessment data which looks at overall performance in the area(s) of concern along with specific skills and strategies and possible contributing factors

Step 1: Start with What you Know - Organize the information you gathered about the student from her/ his file and your interview with your cooperating teacher including any information you have about student responsiveness to intervention that results from efforts made during the pre-referral stage. Present the description of the learner (strengths, problem/ concern) in the K (know) column of the assessment plan.

Step 2: Determine What Want to Learn – Given your understanding about the area(s) of concern (reading, writing, mathematics and grade –level expectations, curriculum, and standards) and existing information about the student, generate a list questions to direct assessment. These questions are to reflect gaps in information concerning the skills the student has per relevant cluster, Place them in the W (want to learn) column of the assessment plan.

Step 3: Propose How to Find Out - Identify strategies for gathering assessment data. Include the approaches in the H (how find out) column of the assessment plan.

Step 4: Map Out Schedule - Identify times for conducting assessments.

## **Part II. Collect, Chart, and Analyze Assessment Data** (CEC Standards 1, 2, 3, 8)

Conduct assessments and evaluate findings systematically in order to build a comprehensive picture of the student in the area(s) of concern, define present levels of performance, identify factors impacting learning and behaving, and justify needs. (CEC Standards 2, 3, 4, 6, 8)

Step 1: Develop or select informal and formal assessment tools - Figure out what materials you need to implement your proposed assessment plan and access or develop the tools.

Step 2: Prepare to conduct assessments - Create and maintain file folder(s) to keep assessment instruments, answer forms, analysis charts, and student work organized.

Step 3: Conduct assessments - Administer selected tools, collecting data by recording student responses and tracking performance as he or she working/ behaving and making notes of observations.

Step 4: Chart and analyze student performance data - Analyze each data source individually and write up, attaching brief summaries of what each assessment strategy indicates.

## **Part III (Stages IV & V): Write the IEP** – (CEC Standards 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8)

Report Assessment Findings and Plan Instruction (The IEP has two primary focuses – the first is the synthesis of assessment data to describe the student and identify needs in order to justify the second part, which consists of program plans – individualized curriculum framework, instructional plans, and service delivery. (CEC Standards)

**Step 1: Report the integration of assessment data** - Integrate the data into a narrative to *describe the student in the area(s) of concern and account for challenges*: a) profile/ learning style/ impact of disability, the student's approach to learning, participating, responding to the demands of instruction as well as interests and sense of self; and b) present levels of performance, identifying the student's skills in academic and social area(s).

**Step 2: Write the Goals, objectives/ benchmarks, and evaluation/ monitoring strategies** - Use assessment data as the basis for constructing an individualized curriculum framework. Articulate: a) *goals* to establish instructional/ behavioral priorities, b) *objectives/ benchmarks* to create the progression from entry-level skills (PLOPs) to goal achievement, and c) *evaluation/ monitoring strategies* to set up how evidence to document student progress will be collected throughout implementation of plan. If appropriate, given student age, include measurable postsecondary goals in the relevant transition areas of ex. goal setting, self-determination, employment-related skills,

independent living, etc.

**Step 3: Write the plan for instruction** – Describe the types of instructional strategies, approaches, activities, and materials that will optimize learning and address the area(s) of concern; responding to assessment results. Identify the types of learning and social situations that are conducive for him or her to access to the general education curriculum. Explain what qualities of general education learning and/ or social situations will be adjusted or modified to promote and ensure the student's effective participation and progress. Identify what constitutes specially-designed and direct instruction in the area(s) of concern. Use assessment data as the basis for developing accommodations and modification including considering assistive technology as an option. Address transition plans, when appropriate, to include four-year course of study, vocational/ employment experiences, related services, community opportunities, and preparation for post-school school and/ or adult living to address student academic and functional instruction needs.

**Step 4: Define Program Components** - Design the matrix of services, indicating who, when, where, and how student receives specially-designed instruction and gains access to general education; ensuring that goals, objectives/ benchmarks are addressed.

### **Portfolio Considerations:**

As you review your experience documenting the special education process and preparing the IEP, reflect on what you have learned about yourself as a special educator: How did your understanding of IDEA, typical and atypical development, individual differences, the academic or social content area(s), assessment, curriculum design and instructional planning, and coordinating services support your work across the related tasks? Consider how your work is evidence of specific competencies (refer to the rubrics, CEC Standards, and the Role Model), objectivity with viewing and understanding the student, and what you continue to work on to enhance your own proficiency. As you consider the challenges of the task, think about what you do to improve your facility with the thinking, decision making, problem solving, practices, and writing that supports your work and will improve your work in the future.

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

**Scoring Guide for Assessment**

***Special Education Process Work sample***

---

The set of rubrics for this assessment are designed to support candidates as they move through the special education process as both practicum/ methods students and again as student teachers. The rubrics refine the description of the assignments candidates receive and set expectations for performance. Self-assessment requires candidates to reflect on their own performance and revisit the interrelationships among the identified tasks and their understanding of the different content areas to inform their practice. The rubrics used follow.



**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
<b>STANDARDS 1, 2, 3</b>			
<b>What Know...</b> <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 <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)	Includes information relevant to the area(s) of concern without using framework to organize it	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	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
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			
<b>STANDARDS 1, 2, 3, 6</b>			
<b>What Want to Learn...</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Raises questions that build on what is known <u>and</u> gaps in information to describe the student in the area(s) of concern <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) <input type="checkbox"/> Uses open-ended questions to guide & justify the selection of assessment strategies	Asks general questions about the area of concern that gives limited direction for assessment	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	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

<b>Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>1 Needs Improvement</b>	<b>2 Meets Expectations</b>	<b>3 Exceeds Expectations</b>
<p align="center"><b>STANDARD 8</b></p> <p><b>How find out</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Includes identification of observations, informal tasks/ activities (<b>surveys and probes</b>) and interviews with teacher and/ or student, indicating understanding of how tools generate different types of data</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Identifies assessments to directly address each question or set of questions raised</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Selects assessments that give student opportunity to demonstrate her competence and challenges in the area(s) of concern</li> <li><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</li> </ul>	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
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			
<p align="center"><b>STANDARD 8</b></p> <p><b>The Know-Want-How Assessment Plan:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><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</li> <li><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</li> <li><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.</li> <li><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</li> </ul>	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
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			

**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"><b>STANDARD 8</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Develop and access</b> 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 <b><u>Know-Want-How</u></b> 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 <b><u>Know-Want-How</u></b> 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 <b><u>Know-Want-How</u></b> 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>
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			
<p align="center"><b>STANDARD 8 ASSESSMENT</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Administer</b> 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>
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			

Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria	1 Needs Improvement	2 Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p align="center"><b>STANDARDS 1, 2, 3, 8</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Analyze performance</b> 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
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			
<p align="center"><b>STANDARD 8</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Collate data</b> 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)
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			
<p align="center"><b>STANDARDS 2, 3, 6</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Hypothesize</b> 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"/> <b>Establish student needs</b>; 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
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			

**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 align="center"><b>STANDARDS 1, 2, 3, 6</b></p> <p><b>Write a narrative that responds to:</b></p> <p><b>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?</b></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</p>

Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria	1 Needs Improvement	2 Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p><i>continued</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> characterize how the student approaches books, writing process, problem solving, and/ or participation in related activities</li> <li><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)</li> <li><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) convey how student attitude or self perception relate to performance in the area(s) of concern</li> </ul>	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)
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>STANDARDS 2, 3, 4, 6</b></p> <p><b>Do the PRESENT LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE</b> 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"> <li><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)?</li> <li><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?</li> <li><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)?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> indications of starting point(s) for instruction?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> inclusive of student developmental status and language in relation to the designated area(s) of concern?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> connected with grade level equivalents ONLY when referenced with specific instructional materials and demands and to make links with general education?</li> </ul>	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	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	Provides constructive information regarding relevant skill clusters, offering details relative to specific skills to substantiate clear starting points for instruction
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			

**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"><b>STANDARDS 7, 8</b></p> <p><b>How do GOAL STATEMENTS ...</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> directly address the present levels of performance?</p> <p><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?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> state the general outcomes of instruction in measurable terms and indicate targets for instruction?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> include an expected level of mastery and conditions for performance?</p>	<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>
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			
<p><b>How do OBJECTIVES/ BENCHMARKS ...</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> begin at the "next step" that comes after the present levels of performance/ entry-level skills?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> establish skill sequences that progress toward each of the goals?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> articulate the skills and actions the student will demonstrate?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> identify the conditions (tasks or activities) under which the student will perform/ behave?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> define criteria for reaching mastery of the specific skills?</p>	<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>
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			

Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria	1 Needs Improvement	2 Meets Expectations	3 Exceeds Expectations
<p><b>How do MONITORING STRATEGIES ...</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> reflect the criteria for mastery set by the specific objectives/ benchmarks?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> specify the types of evaluative strategies to be used?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> identify the frequency of measurement?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> directly reflect instruction provided?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> document descriptive accounts of performance, error patterns, behaviors?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> count number of correct items or appropriate behaviors?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> provide substantial data to judge student progress <u>and</u> the effectiveness of the educational plan (specific components or overall program)?</li> </ul>	<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>
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			

**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.**

<b>PART III: Design Curriculum, Plan Instruction (Accommodations/ Modifications/Assistive Technology), and Identify Program Components</b>  <b>Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>1</b> <b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Meets Expectations</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Exceeds Expectations</b>
<p align="center"><b>STANDARDS 1, 2, 3, 7</b></p> <p>How does <b>DIRECT INSTRUCTION/</b> Alternative Teaching Approaches and Materials (Special Education)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> designate types of instructional approaches, materials, activities, conditions that promise to support student growth in the area(s) of concern?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> address direct instruction of the identified goals and objectives?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> reflect the descriptions provided in the profile/ assessment report?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> prepare the student to participate in the next Least Restrictive Environment?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> consider assistive technology approaches</li> </ul>	<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>
<p align="center"><b>SECTION RATING</b></p>			

<b>PART III: Design Curriculum, Plan Instruction (Accommodations/ Modifications/Assistive Technology), and Identify Program Components</b>  <b>Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>1</b> <b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Meets Expectations</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Exceeds Expectations</b>
<p>How does <b>ACCESS TO GENERAL EDUCATION</b> (mainstreaming/ inclusion) include attention to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> alternatives to/ or modification strategies for classroom materials approaches and environmental arrangements?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> suggestions for cueing devices, time &amp; task management techniques, study &amp; cognitive strategies that would enhance student performance?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> positive behavior supports and strategies for classroom?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> design of groupings for instruction that incorporate skill needed?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> substantiate need for modified and/ or alternative classroom, district, and state-wide testing?</li> </ul>	<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>
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			
<p>How do modifications/ accommodations to support <b>ACCESS TO GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM</b> 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"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>gain introductory information</b> (ex. from lecture, text, activity)?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>practice skills or information</b> (ex. through assigned readings, writing tasks, calculations)?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>show what learned</b> (ex. through essays, discussion)?</li> </ul> <p>Types of supportive conditions which help the student to...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> organize and manage time (scheduling)?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> attend to the pace of lessons?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> tolerate frustration?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> maintain on-task behavior (support task completion)?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> respond to teacher direction?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> enhance or engage in peer interaction?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> be independent in daily activity?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> be an active part of group activities?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> find learning spaces in which to work productively?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> seek systematic feedback and incentives?</li> </ul> <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>
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			

<b>PART III: Design Curriculum, Plan Instruction (Accommodations/ Modifications/Assistive Technology), and Identify Program Components</b>  <b>Self Assessment and Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>1</b> <b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Meets Expectations</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Exceeds Expectations</b>
<p>How does the SPECIAL EDUCATION <b>SERVICE DELIVERY PLAN/ CHART</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> relate the nature of services the student and general education teacher will receive (remedial, supportive, integrated, consultative)?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> address goals with respect to the concept of LRE and access to general education?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> specify logistics of service delivery (location, hours, frequency and personnel)?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> indicate student eligibility status (code or program prototype)?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> identify consultation activities between classroom and SPED teacher to insure continuity of program, ongoing evaluation of progress and continued mutual support?</li> </ul>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>
<b>SECTION RATING</b>			

**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**

**Data for Assessment 2: SPED Process  
Work Sample  
ATTACHMENT C  
2006-2007; 2007-2008**

**Number of Candidates Who Completed Assessment 2**

2006-2007 Candidates, N=	8
2007-2008 Candidates, N=	8
Total Candidates	16

**Assessment 2: Data Summary**

For each component of the assessment, scores are reported by number of candidates and corresponding percentages.  
For each year an average is provided for each component.

Component of Assessment	Needs Improvement (1)		Meets Expectations (2)		Exceeds Expectations (3)		Average							
	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08						
Part I Assessment Plan CEC Standards 1, 2, 3, 6, 8	0	0%	0	0%	4	50%	5	63%	4	50%	3	37%	2.50	2.63
Part II Collect, Chart, and Analyze Assessment Data CEC Standard 1, 2, 3, 8	0	0%	0	0%	6	75%	4	50%	2	25%	4	50%	2.25	2.50
Part III, A. Write the Present Levels of Performance CEC Standards 1, 2, 3, 6	0	0%	0	0%	4	50%	4	50%	4	50%	4	50%	2.5	2.56
Part III, B. Write the Goals and Objectives CEC 7, 8	0	0%	0	0%	5	63%	3	38%	3	37%	5	62%	2.38	2.63
Part III, C. Write Accommodations, Modifications, and Assistive Technology CEC 1, 2, 3, 7	0	0%	0	0%	2	25%	3	38%	6	75%	5	62%	2.75	2.63
Part IV. Reflection on IEP Work Sample CEC Standards 9,10	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	38%	8	100%	5	62%	3.00	2.63

**Summary of Overall Assessment 2 Scores**

A minimum overall score of 12 is a passing score for Assessment 2. Candidates can range from 0-18 points on their overall score for the work sample. Overall scores are reported in the following ranges by percentage and number of candidates in each of the three categories.

Year	0-11		12-15		16-18	
	Needs Improvement (1)		Meets Expectations (2)		Exceeds Expectations (3)	
2006-2007	0	0%	4	50%	4	50%
2007-2008	0	0%	3	38%	5	62%
Total	0	0%	7	44%	9	56%

