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GENERAL DIRECTIONS

The following directions are designed to assist institutions as they complete this program report. To complete the report, institutions must provide data from multiple assessments that, taken as a whole, will demonstrate candidate mastery of the Kansas standards. These data will also be used to answer the following questions. Reviewers expect these prompts to be answered by the report.

- Have candidates mastered the necessary knowledge for the subjects they will teach or the jobs they will perform?
- Do candidates meet state licensure requirements?
- Do candidates understand teaching and learning and can they plan their teaching?
- Can candidates apply their knowledge in classrooms and schools?
- Are candidates effective in promoting student learning?

To that end, the program report form includes the following sections:

I. **Contextual Information** – provides the opportunity for institutions to present general information to help reviewers understand the program.

II. **Assessments and Related Data** – provides the opportunity for institutions to submit multiple assessments, scoring guides or criteria, and assessment data as evidence that standards are being met.

III. **Standards Assessment Chart** – provides the opportunity for institutions to indicate which of the assessments are being used to determine if candidates meet program standards.

IV. **Evidence for Meeting Standards** – provides the opportunity for institutions to discuss the assessments and assessment data in terms of standards.

V. **Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance** – provides the opportunity for institutions to indicate how faculty are using the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, and skills; and effects on student learning.

Page limits are specified for each of the narrative responses required in Sections IV and V of the report, with each page approximately equivalent to one text page of single-spaced, 12-point type. Each attachment required in Sections I and IV of the report should be kept to a maximum of five text pages. Although attachments longer than five pages will be accepted electronically, staff will require institutions to revise reports submitted with lengthy attachments.

Except for the required attachments, institutional responses can be entered directly onto the form. Specific directions are included at the beginning of each section.
SECTION I—CONTEXT

Complete the following contextual information:

A program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for all candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles and hours of credit per course. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet--maximum of five text pages.) NEW PROGRAMS MUST SUBMIT SYLLABI IN THE DOCUMENT WAREHOUSE AND IN A FOLDER ON THE CD.

1. Chart with the number of candidates and completers. (Title-Chart with Candidate Information)¹ (response limited to 6 pages, not including charts)

1. Program of Study:
Provide the following contextual information:

- Description of the relationship of the program to the unit’s conceptual framework.

The advanced program in Adaptive Special Education at Emporia State University is tied directly to the Teachers College conceptual framework. Consequently, the mission of the adaptive special education faculty is to develop The Professional, who provides service to society; applies interdisciplinary scholarly knowledge; engages in effective practice; responds to uncertainty and change; relies on self-reflection; and belongs to professional community.

Our graduates provide service to society by moving beyond their own personal knowledge and experiences to develop a greater understanding of the personal knowledge and experiences of each student with special needs with whom they work. In collaboration with each student’s parents, our graduates develop individual education programs. These programs result from both parent information and unbiased assessment data. Parent information provides the context within which to interpret the assessment data. Through this process our graduates develop a greater understanding of each student’s unique set of learning strengths and challenges. Our graduates use this understanding to identify, implement, and evaluate educational strategies that support the learning of each student in the least restrictive educational environment. Further, they adhere to the legal provisions and ethical standards that apply to special education while doing this.

Our graduates apply interdisciplinary scholarly knowledge. They exhibit knowledge of the philosophical, historical, social, and theoretical foundations of special education. In addition, they exhibit knowledge of subject matter content and content-specific pedagogy. Our graduates use this knowledge to meet the needs of students with special needs. More specifically, our graduates demonstrate the ability to determine and assess what students with special needs need to know and do to succeed both in school and after graduation. Our graduates believe that it is important to think critically about content, curriculum, planning, teaching and learning pedagogy, innovative technology (i.e., including assistive/adaptive technology), and assessment when educating students with special needs. They believe that this requires the integration of multiple kinds of knowledge.

Our graduates engage in theory-based effective practice and decision making. Our graduates exhibit

¹ KSDE uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program’s requirements.
knowledge of on-going developments in classroom management and assessment. They exhibit knowledge of a repertoire of teaching and learning strategies that help students with special needs learn how to learn effectively. In addition, our candidates demonstrate the ability to use creative planning and curriculum integration to insure that each student with special needs has access to the general education curriculum and engages in learning activities in the least restrictive education environment. Moreover, our graduates engage in ongoing assessment of their educational practices. They modify their assumptions and teaching actions as needed to improve student learning outcomes. And finally, they engage in life-long learning to expand their repertoire of teaching skills as well as to keep current with special education research.

Our graduates respond to uncertainty and change caused by different needs of students and a changing world with new technologies that appear at an unprecedented rate. Our graduates exhibit knowledge of new assistive/adaptive technologies and their educational benefits for students with special needs. They use this technology to support the learning of students with special needs. In addition, our graduates exhibit knowledge of research-supported behavior management strategies for students with special needs. They exhibit knowledge regarding the creation of individual behavior intervention plans based on the personal knowledge and experiences of the student. Our graduates use individual behavior intervention plans along with effective communication to develop and maintain an effective learning environment that challenges students with special needs to learn and help these students succeed.

Our graduates rely on self-reflection to evaluate, synthesize information, and make decisions about how to modify teaching practices and appropriately assess student learning. Our graduates exhibit knowledge of theories of human physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development for all children, including those with special needs. They also exhibit knowledge of a variety of assessment strategies including norm-referenced, criterion-referenced, curriculum based measurement assessments and behavioral observation techniques used to diagnose and respond to individual learning needs. In addition, our graduates demonstrate the ability use a variety of instructional strategies and materials to promote learning, critical thinking, and problem solving for students with special needs as well as a variety of assessment techniques to measure student performance and growth. Moreover, our graduates believe that curriculum planning and teaching practices must be meaningful, engaging, and adapted to the needs of all learners including those with special needs.

Our graduates belong to a professional community of educators that work in schools to provide healthy environments for learning and teaching. As such, they exhibit knowledge of professional ethics and standards for special education. Moreover, our graduates adhere to the professional ethics and standards for special education when working with students with special needs. Our graduates believe in collaboration and its benefits for the students, teachers, and administrators in schools. They understand that schools are better places when collaboration occurs. Consequently, our graduates demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively; respond to the ideas and views of others with respect; collaborate with colleagues, parents, community members, and other educators; and learn from other professionals in the field to improve the learning of students with special needs.

The preceding six proficiencies are not only a part of The Teachers College conceptual framework, they are also part of the Code of Ethics for Educators of Persons with Exceptionalities and Standards for Professional Practice espoused by the Council for Exceptional Children, our professional organization. Thus, the special education graduates from The Teachers College at Emporia State University are skilled educators who are prepared with the essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions associated with the field of special education.
The adaptive special education program has a set of eight assessments to evaluate candidate performance and program efficacy. These align with KSDE Adaptive Special Education standards. (Refer to Sections II and III of this report to see this alignment.) In addition, the program area assessments follow The Teachers College assessment system.

The program assessment system includes five decision points: (1) admission to program of study, (2) completion of Practicum I, (3) completion of Practicum II, (4) comprehensive exams, and (5) follow-up of program completers. Since the adaptive special education program includes two practica, admission to and completion of each is treated as a separate decision point. In short, this means our candidates must first meet admission criteria before they can enroll in either Practicum I or Practicum II. In addition, they must complete all practicum assignments achieving a B or better to pass each practicum.

As an advance program, our assessment system has eight assessments that apply specifically to the field of special education. In addition, our assessment system includes five types of assessments: a planning assessment (i.e., Assessment 2: Instructional Planning Project), a field experience assessment (i.e., Assessment 6: Practicum II Portfolio), a student learning assessment (i.e., Assessment 4: Videotaped Lesson Assignment), a disposition assessment (i.e., Assessment 5: Comprehensive Examination), and Praxis II assessments (i.e., The Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge, 0353; The Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities, 0542).

Assessment data for the unit assessments (e.g., Praxis II scores) are maintained by the associate dean. Specific content assessment data (i.e., all other program assessment data) are maintained by the adaptive special education program coordinator. The program coordinator submits an annual assessment report that documents which standards are met and at which levels (i.e., target or acceptable) as well as which standards need improvement (e.g., to move from acceptable to target). The program coordinator shares this report with the adaptive special education faculty once a year. They discuss the report and identify any action needed for program improvement. They then take the action needed to improve the program.

Admission, retention, and exit from the advanced Adaptive Special Education program is a four-level process: program admission, Practicum I, Practicum II, comprehensive examination.

Level 1: Program admission.

The candidate must: (1) Hold a Bachelor’s degree from an accredited college or university. (2) Hold a current teaching license or be eligible for Kansas licensure. (3) Have a minimum grade point average of 2.75 based on a 4.0 scale. This average may be on the total undergraduate record or on the last 60 credit hours. (4) Submit the following items: application, official transcripts, three letters of recommendation, and three completed disposition assessment forms. Candidates with completed folders are then reviewed by the Adaptive Special Education Admissions Committee and either admitted, admitted with provisions, or denied admission.

Level 2: Practicum I

2 This response should clarify how the key assessments used in the program are derived from or informed by the assessment system that the unit will address under KSDE/NCATE Standard 2.
After candidates complete SD 700 Characteristics of Students with Mild to Moderate Disabilities and SD 702 Methods for Students with Mild to Moderate Disabilities with a grade of B or above, they may apply to complete Practicum I. Faculty must approve the application before the candidate can enroll in Practicum I.

Level 3: Practicum II

After candidates complete the majority of the endorsement coursework with a grade of B or above, they may apply to complete Practicum II. Faculty must approve the application before the candidate can enroll in Practicum II.

Level 4: Comprehensive Exam

The candidate must demonstrate adaptive special education knowledge and skills mastery on a Comprehensive Exam completed during his or her final semester of adaptive endorsement coursework.

Please note that candidates must earn a B or above in all endorsement coursework to complete the adaptive endorsement program of study. In some courses (e.g., Practicum II) candidates are offered the opportunity to resubmit a major assignment (e.g., Videotaped Lesson Assignment) to improve their score on that assignment and quite possibly the course. This is at the discretion of each faculty member and is more likely to occur on assignments viewed to be critical to performance on the job as a special educator. In all adaptive endorsement courses, candidates earning a final grade of C or lower must retake the course and earn a B or above to be eligible for Practicum I or II and/or completion of the endorsement program.

- Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships.

ESU Adaptive Special Education program candidates are required to complete two practica (i.e., SD 708 or 709 Adaptive Practicum I, elementary or secondary, respectively and SD 808 or 809 Adaptive Practicum II, elementary or secondary, respectively). All practica occur in approved settings. Practicum I can be completed "on the job” during fall or spring semesters or in a summer practicum placement. Practicum II must be completed "on the job." Candidates are supervised by content and pedagogy supervisors with experience as special educators during each practicum.

To enroll in either practicum, the candidate must have completed all prerequisite course work with a grade of "B or above" and submit a completed practicum application. The application contains detailed information regarding the candidate, the requested practicum setting, and requested practicum supervisor. Program area faculty review the application to ensure that: (a) the candidate has fulfilled the practicum prerequisites, (b) the proposed practicum setting meets program requirements, and (c) the proposed practicum supervisor meets program requirements. Following application review faculty may: (a) approve the application, (b) approve the application pending provision of additional information, (c) request resubmission of a revised application that requirements, or (d) deny the practicum application. Program area faculty must approve the practicum application before the candidate can enroll in the practicum.

Practicum standards are assessed using two methods: (1) the candidate develops a professional portfolio demonstrating competency in knowledge and skills related to specific KSDE Adaptive Special Education standards and (2) candidate performance is evaluated by content and pedagogy supervisors. All portfolio assignments and evaluations must be completed at either the "acceptable” or "target” level. Supervisory evaluations indicating failure of candidate to obtain "acceptable” for a standard will require the
development of a plan for improvement between the supervisor and the candidate. The plan for improvement must be successfully completed at the "acceptable" level. Failure to meet the designated level of proficiency may result in an "Incomplete" or "Failing" grade in the Practicum course.
2. **Chart with Candidate Information:**

**Directions:** Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Please report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, master’s, doctorate) being addressed in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program (initial):</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th># of Candidates Enrolled in the Program</th>
<th># of Program Completers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 -20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 -20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 -20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program (Post-baccalaureate – Added Endorsement):</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th># of Candidates Enrolled in the Program</th>
<th># of Program Completers</th>
<th>Master’s/Ed. Specialist/Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 An enrolled candidate is officially admitted to the program.

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

In this section, list the multiple assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the Kansas standards for this content area. All programs must provide a **minimum of six assessments, maximum of eight assessments**: assessments #1-6 are required for all programs. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is required/administered in the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Assessment⁵</th>
<th>Type or Form of Assessment⁶</th>
<th>When the Assessment Is Required/Administered⁷</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. [Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment]⑧  
   * (Required)  
   a. Praxis II-content test data and sub-score data if utilized  
   b. PLT | Standardized | After SD 808 or 809 Adaptive Practicum II, Elementary or Secondary, respectively |
| 2. [Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction]⑨  
   * (Required)  
   Instructional Planning Project | Project | SD 702 Strategies for Teaching Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities |
| 3. [Assessment of clinical experience]⑩  
   * (Required)  
   Practicum I Portfolio | Portfolio | SD 708 or 709 Adaptive Practicum I, Elementary or Secondary, respectively |
| 4. [Assessment of candidate effect on student learning]⑪  
   * (Required)  
   Videotaped Lesson Assignment | Project | SD 808 or 809 Adaptive Practicum II, Elementary or Secondary, respectively |
| 5. [Content-based assessment (Required)] Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, projects, | Comprehensive Exam | During final semester of course work |

---

⁵ Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.

⁶ Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, portfolio).

⁷ Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and number], or completion of the program).

⁸ Assessment #1a Praxis sub-score data may be used as an assessment for meeting content standards. A data table for Praxis content test and a data table for sub-score data must be submitted but a rubric is not required.

⁹ Clinical experience includes practica, student teaching and internships.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Assessment&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Type or Form of Assessment&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>When the Assessment Is Required/Administered&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comprehensive portfolio tasks and score/s aligned to standards OR course grades-based assessments&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt; related to content knowledge. Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>SD 808 or 809 Adaptive Practicum II, Elementary or Secondary, respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Content-based assessment (Required)] Examples of assessments include comprehensive standard examinations, case studies involving many content standards, projects, comprehensive portfolio tasks and score/s related to content knowledge. Practicum II Portfolio</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>SD 802 Behavior Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards (Optional) ] Functional Behavior Assessment/Behavior Intervention Plan (FBA/BIP) Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>SD 700 Characteristics of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>4</sup>Required Assessments

<sup>10</sup>Course grades-based assessments can only be used for Assessment 5.
For each Kansas standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address each standard. **One assessment may apply to multiple Kansas standards.** In Section IV you will describe these assessments in greater detail and summarize and analyze candidate results to document that a majority of your candidates are meeting Kansas standards. To save space, the knowledge and performance indicators of the Kansas standards are not identified here, but are available on the website — www.ksde.org. The full set of standards provides more specific information about what should be assessed. **Please include information on assessments used for PreK if this is an all-level program.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KANSAS STANDARD</th>
<th>APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The teacher of students with adaptive learning needs demonstrates an understanding of philosophical, historical, and legal foundations of education and special education.</td>
<td>☑️ #1a ☐ #2 ☐ #3 ☐ #4 ☐ #5 ☐ #6 ☐ #7 ☑️ #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The teacher of students with adaptive learning needs demonstrates an understanding of learners’ diversity and provides support for students’ cognitive, physical, social, emotional and career development.</td>
<td>☑️ #1a ☐ #2 ☑️ #3 ☐ #4 ☐ #5 ☐ #6 ☐ #7 ☐ #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The teacher of students with adaptive special education needs demonstrates assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation knowledge and skills.</td>
<td>☑️ #1a ☐ #2 ☐ #3 ☐ #4 ☐ #5 ☐ #6 ☑️ #7 ☐ #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The teacher of students with adaptive learning needs demonstrates knowledge and skill in planning and implementing effective instruction based upon knowledge of the subject matter, student, community, and curriculum goals.</td>
<td>☑️ #1a ☑️ #2 ☐ #3 ☐ #4 ☐ #5 ☐ #6 ☐ #7 ☐ #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The teacher of students with adaptive learning needs promotes learning by providing planned, orderly, supportive environments that encourage participation of individuals with adaptive learning needs.</td>
<td>☑️ #1a ☐ #2 ☐ #3 ☑️ #4 ☐ #5 ☐ #6 ☐ #7 ☐ #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The teacher of students with adaptive learning needs demonstrates knowledge and skill in managing behavior, facilitating problem-solving, developing social skills and promoting self-advocacy of students with adaptive learning needs.</td>
<td>☑️ #1a ☐ #2 ☐ #3 ☑️ #4 ☐ #5 ☐ #6 ☑️ #7 ☐ #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The teacher of students with adaptive learning needs demonstrates effective communication and collaboration skills and knowledge related to individuals with adaptive learning needs.</td>
<td>☐ #1a ☐ #2 ☐ #3 ☑️ #4 ☑️ #5 ☐ #6 ☑️ #7 ☐ #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS STANDARD</td>
<td>APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The teacher of students with adaptive learning needs demonstrates professionalism and ethical</td>
<td>#1a #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge and skills related to students with adaptive learning needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV—EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: Information on the multiple assessments listed in Section II and the data findings must be reported in this section. The assessments must be those that all candidates in the program are required to complete and should be used by the program to determine candidate proficiencies as expected in the program standards.

For each assessment, the evidence for meeting standards should include the following information:

- A brief description of the assessment, project, portfolio and its use in the program. Explain specificity of the assessment to the standard/s. An assessment may assess several standards at the same time;
- The alignment of the assessment with the specific KSDE standards addressed by the assessment, as they are identified in Section III;
- A brief summary of the data findings;
- An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards.

The response to each assessment is limited to the equivalent of two text pages.

For each assessment listed, you will need to attach the following:

- Scoring guides, criteria or rubric (specific to content of standard/s) used to score candidate responses on the assessment;
- A table (include # of candidates) with the aggregated results of the assessment providing, where possible, data for at least the most recent three years. Data should be organized according to the categories used in the scoring guide/criteria. Provide the percentage of candidates achieving at each category.

For each assessment #1a (sub-score data) and assessment #5(course grades-based assessments), you will include the following information:

- Praxis II sub-score data tables must be clearly labeled to indicate alignment with the standard it is assessing. Section IV narrative must clearly show alignment of sub-score data to the standard or elements of the standard.
- Course grades-based assessments have a brief description in the matrix. A more detailed and specific discussion of the alignment of activities, exams, and projects in the course to the standard should be included in the narrative description of assessment 5. The course grades-based assessments data tables will be included in the narrative of assessment 5. Each course grades-based assessments is numbered and lettered as 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E and 5F. Use the same number and letter in the narrative and the data table. If the course grades-based assessments are used as evidence for meeting two standards, the course key assessments’ data (exams, projects, portfolio tasks) must be disaggregated in a data table for each of the two standards. This is necessary to provide evidence of meeting each standard.

One course MAY NOT MEET more than two standards.

In the two columns for attachments, click in the box for each attachment to be included with the report. Each attachment should be no longer than five pages. The two attachments related to each assessment must be included for the program report to be complete. The report will not be reviewed until it is complete.
#1 (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Data from licensure tests for content knowledge. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV. PRAXIS II Content and PLT. Submit overall score data for all candidates. Data tables for standards must be PRAXIS II sub-score data that are aligned to specific standard/s.

DESCRIPTION:

The Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) test is designed for examinees planning to teach in a special education program at any grade level from preschool through grade 12. The 60 multiple-choice questions assess the examinee’s knowledge of the basic principles of special education, focusing on three major content areas: Understanding Exceptionalities (25-30%), Legal and Societal Issues (15-20%), and Delivery of Services to Students with Disabilities (50-60%). Questions may address disabilities of any degree varying from mild to profound, but extensive knowledge of individual specialty areas, such as education of students with low vision or hearing loss, is not required. Score range for this test is 100 to 200.

The Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542) test is designed for examinees planning to teach in a special education program for students with mild to moderate disabilities at any grade level from preschool through grade 12. The five constructed-response questions assess the examinee’s ability to apply the principles of special education to situations that a teacher is likely to encounter in teaching students with mild to moderate disabilities. This test includes three content categories: Assessment (25-42%), Curriculum and Instruction (25-42%), and Structuring and Managing the Learning Environment (25-42%). Score range for this test is 100 to 200.

ALIGNMENT with KSDE STANDARDS:

The Understanding Exceptionalities Subtest of the Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) assesses Standard 2: The teacher of students with adaptive learning needs demonstrates an understanding of learners' diversity and provides support for students' cognitive, physical, social, emotional and career development. The Understanding Exceptionalities Subtest assesses human development and behavior as related to students with disabilities, characteristics of students with disabilities, basic concepts in special education, and the influence of an exceptional condition(s) throughout an individual’s life span.

The Legal and Societal Issues Subtest of the Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) assesses Standard 1: The teacher of students with adaptive learning needs demonstrates an understanding of philosophical, historical, and legal foundations of education and special education. The Legal and Societal Issues Subtest assesses federal laws and legal issues related to special education; the school’s connections with the families, prospective and actual employers, and communities of students with disabilities; and historical movements/trends affecting the connections between special education and the larger society.

The Delivery of Services to Students with Disabilities Subtest of the Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) assesses Standard 5: The teacher of students with adaptive learning needs promotes learning by providing planned, orderly, supportive environments that
encourage participation of individuals with adaptive learning needs. The Delivery of Services to Students with Disabilities Subtest assesses background knowledge, curriculum and instruction and their implementation across the continuum or educational placements, assessment, structuring and managing the learning environment, and professional roles.

The Assessment Subtest of the Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542) assesses Standard 3: The teacher of students with adaptive special education needs demonstrates assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation knowledge and skills. The Assessment Subtest assesses knowledge of specialized policies regarding screening, pre-referral strategies, referral, and placement procedures for individuals with mild to moderate disabilities; knowledge of assessment for eligibility: instruments and methods, formal and informal (e.g., ecological inventories, portfolio, functional, and assistive-technology assessments) used to determine eligibility for special education services; knowledge of assessment for instruction (e.g., how to design and adapt assessment, both formal and informal) and how to utilize assessment information in developing instruction for individuals with mild to moderate disabilities.

The Curriculum and Instruction Subtest of the Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542) assesses Standard 4: The teacher of students with adaptive learning needs demonstrates knowledge and skill in planning and implementing effective instruction based upon knowledge of the subject matter, student, community, and curriculum goals. The Curriculum and Instruction Subtest assesses knowledge of how to evaluate, select, and develop curriculum materials for individuals with mild to moderate disabilities; knowledge of how to use local, community, and state resources in developing programs for individuals who are likely to make progress in the general curriculum; knowledge of how to write appropriate IEP goals and objectives for students with mild to moderate disabilities in academic and behavioral domains; and knowledge in how to plan instruction for individuals and groups based on IEPs.

The Structuring and Managing the Learning Environment Subtest of the Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542) assesses Standard 6: The teacher of students with adaptive learning needs demonstrates knowledge and skill in managing behavior, facilitating problem-solving, developing social skills and promoting self-advocacy of students with adaptive learning needs. The Assessment Subtest assesses knowledge of behavior management (e.g., how to implement systematic behavior management plans and how to select target behaviors to be changed and identify the critical variables affecting the target behavior), knowledge of problem-solving and conflict resolution, knowledge of how to integrate related services into the instructional settings of students with mild to moderate disabilities, and knowledge of how to collaborate with others, including both personnel and families, in planning and providing instruction for students with mild to moderate disabilities.

SUMMARY of the DATA:

In Kansas, all special educators must take the Praxis II (0353, 0542) and achieve a “passing” score to add the adaptive special education endorsement (i.e., either K-6 or 6-12) to their teaching license. Anyone who completes the special education program and applies for the adaptive endorsement after September 1, 2005, must have the following scores:

(a) Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) = 160 or higher
(b) Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542) = 169 or higher
A review of the Praxis II (0353, 0542) data provided in Assessment 1 Data Table indicate that 100% of the program completers in 2007-2009, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010 passed both Praxis II (0353, 0542) assessments. (In fact, all but three 2007-2010 completers passed both Praxis II assessments on their first try.)

Overall: The 2007-2010 mean score for the Core Content (0353) assessment is 179.12 (89.51% of total possible points). More specifically, mean scores for the Core Content assessment were 178.56 (range 160-200 with average of 80% correct), 178.7 (range 163-192 with average of 80% correct), and 180.1 (160-200) for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively.

In addition, the 2007-2010 mean score for the Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542) assessment is 183.6 (91.8% of total possible points). More specifically, mean scores for the Mild to Moderate Disabilities assessment were 184.1 (range 169-200 with average of 67.67% correct), 183.2 (range 169-200 with average of 65% correct), and 183.4 (170-200, average % correct unavailable) for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively.

Standard 2: Mean scores for Subtest I: Understanding Exceptionalities were 12.41 (range 8-16 with average of 80% correct), 12.95 (range 9-15 with average of 78% correct), and 12.94 (range 9-15, average % correct unavailable) for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively.

Standard 1: Mean scores for Subtest II: Legal and Societal Issues were 8.82 (range 6-11 with average of 81% correct), 10.05 (range 7-12 with average 80% correct), and 9.33 (range 6-12 with average % correct unavailable) for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively.

Standard 5: Mean scores for Subtest III: Delivery of Services to Students with Disabilities were 27 (range 22-33 with average of 79% correct), 24.6 (range 19-29 with average 78% correct), and 26.5 (range 21-33 with average % correct unavailable) for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively.

Standard 3: Mean scores for Subtest I: Assessment were 6.87 (range 3-10 with average of 73% correct), 7.61 (range 3-12 with average of 67% correct), and 6.65 (range 3-11, average % correct unavailable) for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively.

Standard 4: Mean scores for Subtest II: Curriculum and Instruction were 9.33 (range 6-13 with average of 65% correct), 9.61 (range 5-15 with average 64% correct), and 9.75 (range 5-14 with average % correct unavailable) for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively.

Standard 6: Mean scores for Subtest III: Structuring and Managing the Learning Environment were 8.6 (range 5-12 with average of 65% correct), 6.33 (range 3-10 with average 64% correct), and 7.3 (range 3-12 with average % correct unavailable) for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively.

INTERPRETATION of the DATA
Candidate performance consistently falls in either the acceptable or target ranges on both Praxis II tests (0353 and 0542). Our candidates continue to present 100% pass rate on these tests, 100% and 94.29% on the first try for the Core Content (0353) and Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542) tests, respectively.

Standard 2: Candidate performance on 0353 Subtest I (Understanding Exceptionalities) indicates that candidates understand major categories and specific disabilities; cognitive, affective, and social-adaptive factors; social and emotional development and behavior; and physical development. Standard 2 is met.

Standard 1: Candidate performance on 0353 Subtest II (Legal and Societal Issues) indicates that candidates understand federal laws and legal issues, school’s connection with families and employers, historical and philosophical movement and trend affecting the connections between special education and the larger society. Standard 1 is met.

Standard 5: Candidate performance on 0353 Subtest III (Delivery of Services to Students) indicates that candidates understand curriculum and instruction and their implementation across the continuum of educational placements. Standard 5 is met.

Standard 3: Candidate performance on 0542 Subtest I (Assessment) indicates that candidates understand specialized policies regarding screening, pre-referral strategies, referral and placement; use instruments and methods to determine eligibility, design and adapt assessments, and utilizing assessment information in developing instruction for individuals with mild to moderate disabilities. Standard 3 is met.

Standard 4: Candidate performance on 0542 Subtest II (Curriculum and Instruction) indicates that candidates understand selecting, evaluating, and developing curriculum materials for individuals with mild to moderate disabilities; being sensitive to cultural and linguistic diversity; using resources in the environment to assist in developing programs; and planning instruction based on IEPs. Standard 4 is met.

Standard 6: Candidate performance on 0542 Subtest III (Structuring and Managing the Learning Environment) indicates that candidates demonstrate behavior management, problem-solving, conflict resolution, collaboration, and integrating services. Standard 6 is met.

Attachments

| Assessment #1 | Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric | Data Table |

11 Licensure test data must reflect the percentage of candidates who have passed the state licensure test for each year since the last accreditation visit. The most recent year of data must include the range of total scores and sub-scores on the licensure test. Data must be presented for all program completers, even if there were fewer than 10 test takers in a given year. Subscore data tables will report the N, the % of candidates’ performance and the average performance range provided in the Praxis report.
#2 (Required) PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan classroom-based instruction. Examples of assessments include the evaluation of candidates’ abilities to develop lesson or unit plans, individualized educational plans, needs assessments, or intervention plans. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

**DESCRIPTION:**

Candidates complete Assessment 2: Instructional Planning Project during SD 702 Strategies for Teaching Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities, before the 1st practicum. For this project, candidates write a professional quality paper following APA style guidelines with the following five sections:

1. **Planning**
   In this section of the paper, candidates discuss how to plan effective instruction for students with adaptive learning needs. This portion of the paper should address: (a) selection of subject matter and curriculum goals that are tied to state curriculum standards and benchmarks; (b) methods to motivate student learning that are based on learning theory, subject matter, curriculum, stages of student development, and individual learning styles; and (c) use of instructional time.

2. **Presentation**
   In this section of the paper, candidates discuss how to design lesson presentations that help students with adaptive learning needs master skills. This portion of the paper should address the: (a) modification of instructional methods and materials to adapt to the demands of various learning environments and (b) provision of a variety of appropriate instructional methods, techniques, strategies, curricula, and sources of specialized or alternative educational materials for students who differ in degree and type of disability.

3. **Independent Practice**
   In this section of the paper, candidates discuss how to provide independent practice that helps students with adaptive learning needs master skills. This portion of the paper should discuss the impact of: (a) language development and listening abilities on academic progress and social
development of students, (b) social skills on the lives of students, and (c) integrating student-initiated learning interests into instruction on the learning of students with adaptive learning needs.

4. Evaluation
In this section of the paper, candidates discuss how to use effective evaluation procedures to develop effective learning activities for students with adaptive learning needs. This portion of the paper should discuss how to: (a) interpret and use assessment data for instructional planning; (b) sequence, implement, and evaluate individual student objectives; and (c) engage in self evaluation that leads to effective instruction and professional growth.

5. Diversity of Learners
In this section of the paper, candidates discuss the influences of student, family, and community on the development of effective instruction for students with adaptive learning needs. This portion of the paper should discuss the: (a) student, family, and community influences to be considered when developing effective instruction; (b) impact of students’ academic and social abilities, attitudes, interests, and values on academic and career development; and (c) cultural perspectives influencing the relationship among families, schools, and communities as related to effective instruction of students with adaptive learning needs.

(Passing scores for this project fall within the “acceptable” or “target” ranges of 80 to 94% or 95 to 100%, respectively.)

ALIGNMENT with KSDE STANDARDS:

This assessment aligns with Standard #4: The candidate will demonstrate knowledge and skill in planning and implementing effective instruction based upon knowledge of the subject matter, student with adaptive learning needs, community, and curriculum goals and its elements.

SUMMARY of the DATA:

The data for the Instructional Planning Project show 100% pass rates with mean scores of 92.5, 98.6, and 98.79% and score ranges of 85 to 100, 87.5 to 100, and 90 to 100% for completers in 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively. In addition, 22 of 27 (81.48%) and 17 of 19 (89.47%) of completers achieved “target” level performance on this assessment in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, respectively. The remaining completers achieved “acceptable” level performance on this assessment. (Please note that the program area did not differentiate between completers performing at target versus acceptable level in 2007-2008. Thus all 2007-2008 completers performed at either the acceptable or target levels.) Refer to Assessment 2 Data Table to see this assessment data.

INTERPRETATION of the DATA:

All completers, i.e., for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively, passed this assessment. In addition, the completers showed an increase in target performance from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010. Unfortunately, at this point in time, it is not possible to determine what caused this improved
performance. While the assessment rubric shows some alignment with the assessment activity (e.g., Teaching unit topic is relevant for the specific child) and Standard 4, the alignment is minimal. [See Assessment 2 Rubric, the old Instructional Planning Project rubric.] Consequently, the weak alignment between the rubric and the assessment description and Standard 4 significantly limit interpretation of this data.

To create greater cohesion between the assessment activity and its scoring rubric, program faculty created a new rubric for this assessment in April 2010. [See Assessment 2 Rubric for Instructional Planning Project (new).] It is a criterion-referenced rubric aligned with both Assessment 2 Instructional Planning Project and KSDE Standard 4 and its elements. Faculty began piloting this rubric during Summer Term 2010. They plan to pilot use of the rubric during Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters. Following this pilot, faculty will meet and discuss the new rubric. Based on their experiences using the rubric, they will make any revisions needed to improve it.

(No more than 2 pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment #2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction] * (Required) Instructional Planning Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#3 (Required) **PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS:** Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge and skills are applied effectively in practice. The assessment instrument used in student teaching should be submitted. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

**DESCRIPTION:**

Candidates complete the Practicum I Portfolio during SD 708 or 709 Adaptive Practicum I (elementary or secondary, respectively) after completing SD 700 Characteristics of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities and SD 702 Strategies for Teaching Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities with a grade of B or better. For this assessment, candidates complete the following three activities:

**Lesson Plans**

In this assessment activity, candidates will create three lesson plans (i.e., one for reading, one for mathematics, and one for behavior) each of which show alignment with the general education curriculum and ties to IEP goals. Candidates will also write a reflection for each lesson plan that includes a discussion of: (a) the method the candidate plans to use to play her or his daily lessons, (b) how the candidate will align each lesson plan
with the general education curriculum, and (c) how the candidate will insure a tie between each lesson plan and the student’s IEP. When completing this activity, candidates should demonstrate an understanding of or the ability to: (a) the differences in students’ approaches to learning and how these approaches relate to their performance; (b) the etiology of disabilities and its implications for learning; (c) how student learning is influenced by individual differences and experiences, including strengths, prior learning, language, culture, family and community; (d) how disabilities may affect life during the educational years and beyond; (e) the effects of various interventions on cognitive, physical, social, emotional, and career development; (f) the effects of various medications; (g) the effects of dysfunctional behavior on learning; (h) identify and describe students’ stages of development, learning abilities, strengths, and needs, and applies this knowledge in determining levels of support needed; (i) access and use appropriate information and resources to understand the cognitive, physical, cultural, social, emotional, and career needs of students; and (j) describe the effect of adaptive learning needs on students’ cognitive, physical, social, emotional, and career development, and on their acquisition, maintenance, and generalization of knowledge and skills.

Behavior Management Analysis Paper

In this assessment activity, candidates will write a professional quality paper that includes a description of of a student’s behavior that interfered with his or her learning or the learning of other students and how the candidate made this determination as well as a description of the positive behavioral supports the candidate implemented with this student. When completing this activity, candidates should demonstrate understanding of or the ability to: (a) the etiology of disabilities and its implications for learning; (b) the effects of various interventions on cognitive, physical, social, emotional, and career development; (c) the effects of various medications; (d) the effects of dysfunctional behavior on learning; (e) identify and describe students’ stages of development, learning abilities, strengths, and needs, and applies this knowledge in determining levels of support needed; (f) access and use appropriate information and resources to understand the cognitive, physical, cultural, social, emotional, and career needs of students; and (g) describe the effect of adaptive learning needs on students’ cognitive, physical, social, emotional, and career development, and on their acquisition, maintenance, and generalization of knowledge and skills.

Parent Conferences Analysis Paper

In this assessment activity, candidates will write a professional quality paper that includes a discussion of the importance of parent teacher conferences and describes an informal parent conference addressing a student’s progress and/or academic or behavioral problem-solving the candidate has conducted. When completing this activity, candidates should demonstrate understanding of or ability to: (a) how student learning is influenced by individual differences and experiences, including strengths, prior learning, language, culture, family and community; (b) how disabilities may affect life during the educational years and beyond; (c) the effects of various medications; and (d) access and use appropriate information and resources to understand the cognitive, physical, cultural, social, emotional, and career needs of students.

(Passing scores for this project fall within the “acceptable” or “target” ranges of 80 to 94% or 95 to 100%, respectively.)

ALIGNMENT with KSDE STANDARDS:
This assessment aligns with Standard #2: The candidate will demonstrate understanding of learners’ diversity and provides support for students’ cognitive, physical, social, emotional, and career development and its elements.

SUMMARY of the DATA:

The data for the Practicum I Portfolio show 100% pass rates with mean scores of 93.14 and 93.89% and score ranges of 83.75 to 100, and 86.25 to 100% for completers in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, respectively. In addition, 9 of 20 (45%) and 6 of 19 (31.58%) of completers achieved “target” level performance on this assessment in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, respectively. All other completers achieved “acceptable” level performance on this assessment. Refer to Assessment 3 Data Table to see this assessment data. (Please note, the program area began tracking final performance percentages rather than final grades in 2008-2009. The 2007-2008 completer data derived from Practicum I Portfolio final grade with 92% or higher earning a letter grade of A and 83 to 91% earning a letter grade of B.)

INTERPRETATION of the DATA:

All completers, i.e., for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively, passed this assessment. However, the percentage of completers achieving “target” on this assessment in both 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 is significantly lower than that achieved on assessments 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7. While the assessment (i.e., including all three activities) shows strong alignment with Standard 2 and its elements, it did not include a scoring rubric to further articulate this alignment. Thus, it is not possible to determine why candidate performance on this assessment is so much lower than that on other assessments. Consequently in depth interpretation of this data within the context of Standard 2 is limited.

Program faculty created a rubric for this assessment in April 2010. It is a criterion-referenced rubric aligned with KSDE Standard 2 and its elements. [See Assessment 2 Practicum I Portfolio Rubric (new).] Faculty began piloting this rubric during Summer Term 2010. They plan to pilot use of the rubric during Fall 2010 and Spring 2011. At that time, they will make any revisions/edits needed to improve the rubric.

(No more than 2 pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>Assessment #3</th>
<th>Scoring Guides/Criteria/Rubric</th>
<th>Data Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment #3</strong></td>
<td>[Assessment of clinical experience]12 * (Required)</td>
<td>Click the box if attached.</td>
<td>Click the box if attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum I Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Clinical experience includes practica, student teaching and internships.
DESCRIPTION:
Candidates complete the Videotaped Lesson Assignment during SD 808 or 909 Adaptive Practicum II (elementary or secondary, respectively) after completing the majority of the adaptive endorsement courses. For this project, candidates complete the following six interrelated activities:

Lesson 1: Lesson Evaluation

In this part of Assessment 4, candidates will identify at least two students with adaptive learning needs, review these students’ IEPs and identify one goal and related research-supported instructional strategies or interventions planned for this goal, develop a lesson plan for each student that addresses the goal using these research-supported instructional strategies or interventions, implement the lesson plan, and videotape its implementation. This part of Assessment 4 should show candidates understanding of or skills related to: (a) the identification, preparation, organization, and presentation of teaching materials to implement lesson plans; (b) creating a safe, equitable, positive, and supportive learning environment that encourages self-advocacy, independence, and educational productivity; is supportive of diversity and alleviates environmental and personal barriers that hinder accessibility and acceptance of students with adaptive learning needs; (c) designing and managing learning environments that enable learners to participate actively in a variety of individual and group learning activities; (d) using local, community, state, and national resources to assist in programming for students who are likely to make progress in the general education curriculum; and (e) using strategies and techniques to facilitate the effective inclusion of students with adaptive learning needs in the least restrictive environments as well as teaches these students in a variety of educational settings.

Lesson 1: Assessment Report

In this part of Assessment 4, candidates will create a professional assessment report for each student that includes the instructional goal, research-supported strategy or intervention, graph with student performance data (a minimum of 3 data points), data summary, data interpretation, and educational recommendation(s). This part of Assessment 4 should show candidates understanding of or skills related to: (a) use evaluation, planning, and management procedures to match learner needs with instructional environments and methods; (b) designing, managing, and evaluating learning environments to assure the use effective teaching procedures and daily routines to support the learning of students with adaptive learning needs; and (c) writing a professional assessment report with the required sections (e.g., instructional goal) using appropriate terminology and appropriate voicing as well as no mechanical or grammatical errors.

13 Effects on student learning include the creation of environments that support student learning.
Lesson 1: Professional Reflection

In this part of Assessment 4, candidates will watch the videotape of the lesson plan implementation and then complete a 2-page paper articulating their professional reflections (e.g., their teaching strengths, their teaching weaknesses, actions they can take for improvement) regarding Lesson 1 activities. This part of Assessment should show candidates understanding of: (a) research concerning best practices to manage the classroom effectively for teaching and learning; (b) theories, methods, techniques, and behavioral rules for managing, teaching, and learning; (c) use of technology to plan and manage teaching and learning environments; (d) ways to create learning environments that allow students to retain and appreciate their own and each other’s respective language and cultural heritage; and (e) common environmental and personal barriers that hinder accessibility and acceptance of students with adaptive learning needs.

Lesson 2: Assessment Report

In this part of Assessment 4, candidates will create a professional assessment report for each student that includes the instructional goal, research-supported strategy or intervention, graph with student performance data (a minimum of 3 data points), data summary, data interpretation, and educational recommendation(s). This part of Assessment 4 should show candidates understanding of or skills related to: (a) use evaluation, planning, and management procedures to match learner needs with instructional environments and methods; (b) designing, managing, and evaluating learning environments to assure the use effective teaching procedures and daily routines to support the learning of students with adaptive learning needs; and (c) writing a professional assessment report with the required sections (e.g., instructional goal) using appropriate terminology and appropriate voicing as well as no mechanical or grammatical errors.

Lesson 2: Lesson Evaluation

In this part of Assessment 4, candidates will develop a second lesson plan addressing the same IEP goal as the first for each student, OR develop a new goal and related lesson plan using research-supported instructional strategies or interventions for this new goal for each student. (Please note, candidates will use the same IEP goal for each student only if the student(s) have not achieved the IEP goal target criterion. In addition, new goals written will be based on data from first lesson.) The candidates will implement the lesson plan, and videotape its implementation. This part of Assessment 4 should show candidates understanding of or skills related to: (a) the identification, preparation, organization, and presentation of teaching materials to implement lesson plans; (b) creating a safe, equitable, positive, and supportive learning environment that encourages self-advocacy, independence, and educational productivity; is supportive of diversity and alleviates environmental and personal barriers that hinder accessibility and acceptance of students with adaptive learning needs; (c) designing and managing learning environments that enable learners to participate actively in a variety of individual and group learning activities; (d) using local, community, state, and national resources to assist in programming for students who are likely to make progress in the general education curriculum; and (e) using strategies and techniques to facilitate the effective inclusion of students with adaptive learning needs in the least restrictive environments as well as teaches these students in a variety of educational settings.

Lesson 2: Professional Reflection
In this part of Assessment 4, candidates will watch the videotape of the lesson plan implementation and then complete a 2-page paper articulating their professional reflections (e.g., their teaching strengths, their teaching weaknesses, actions they can take for improvement) regarding Lesson 1 activities. This part of Assessment should show candidates understanding of: (a) research concerning best practices to manage the classroom effectively for teaching and learning; (b) theories, methods, techniques, and behavioral rules for managing, teaching, and learning; (c) use of technology to plan and manage teaching and learning environments; (d) ways to create learning environments that allow students to retain and appreciate their own and each other’s respective language and cultural heritage; and (e) common environmental and personal barriers that hinder accessibility and acceptance of students with adaptive learning needs.

(Passing scores for this project fall within the “acceptable” or “target” ranges of 80 to 94% or 95 to 100%, respectively.)

ALIGNMENT with KSDE STANDARDS:

This assessment aligns with Standard #5: The candidate will demonstrate knowledge and skill in promoting learning by providing planned, orderly, supportive environments that encourage participation of individuals with adaptive learning needs and its elements.

SUMMARY of the DATA:

The data for the Videotaped Lesson Assignment assessment show 100% pass rates with mean scores of 100, 100, and 95.5% and score ranges of 100 to 100, 100 to 100, and 89 to 100% for completers in 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively. In addition, 100%, 29 of 29 (100%) and 14 of 20 (70%) of completers achieved “target” level performance on this assessment in 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, respectively. The remaining completers in 2009-2010 achieved “acceptable” level performance on this assessment. Refer to Assessment 4 Data Table to see this assessment data.

INTERPRETATION of the DATA:

All completers, i.e., for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively, passed this assessment. However, the percentage of completers performing at the target level decreased from 100% to 70% from 2007-2008 to 2009-2010. Unfortunately, at this point in time, it is not possible to determine what caused this significant decrease in candidate performance from 2007-2008 to 2009-2010. It may well have resulted from an inconsistency between the assessment description and rubric. That is, the rubric shows limited alignment with the assessment activity and Standard 5 and its elements (i.e., lesson plan development, classroom management, use of effective technology and learning strategies, effective communication skills, and personal critique). [See Assessment 4 Rubric, the old Videotaped Lesson Assignment rubric.] So, when completing this assessment, do candidates write reports and reflection papers addressing only the rubric grading criteria or addressing the assessment description or both? And, when evaluating candidate performance on this assessment, do faculty members evaluate candidate performance using only the rubric grading criteria, using only the assessment description, or using both? Regardless, the weak alignment between the rubric and the assessment description and Standard 5 significantly limit interpretation of this data.
To create greater cohesion between the assessment activity and its scoring rubric, program faculty created a new rubric for this assessment in April 2010. [See Assessment 4 Rubric for Videotaped Lesson Assignment (new).] It is a criterion-referenced rubric aligned with both Assessment 4 Videotaped Lesson Assignment and KSDE Standard 5 and its elements. Faculty began piloting this rubric during Fall Semester 2010. They plan to pilot use of the rubric during Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters. Following this pilot, faculty will meet and discuss the new rubric. Based on their experiences using the rubric, they will make any revisions needed to improve it.

(No more than 2 pages)

### Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment #4</th>
<th>Scoring Guides/Criteria/Rubric</th>
<th>Data Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Assessment of candidate effect on student learning] * (Required) Videotaped Lesson Assignment</td>
<td>Click the box if attached.</td>
<td>Click the box if attached.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**#5 (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE:** Assessment of content knowledge. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, projects, comprehensive portfolio tasks and score/s aligned to standards OR the option of submitting course grades-based assessment related to content knowledge evaluation. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV. If submitting course grades-based assessment, the detailed description for Assessment #5 must clearly delineate the alignment of the course description and assessments to the standard that is assessed during the course in order to assure that the course grade reflects candidate knowledge of the standard. Describe course key activities, projects, assessments that show specificity to the standard. If course grades are used, include the program or unit definition of grades in the narrative or as an attachment to assessment 5. If the course grades-based assessments are used as evidence for meeting two standards, the course key assessments’ data (exams, projects, portfolio tasks) must be disaggregated in a data table for each of the two standards. This is necessary to provide evidence of meeting each standard. This narrative must state the proficiency level or grade acceptable by the program. COURSE GRADES-BASED ASSESSMENTS ARE LIMITED TO SIX COURSES.

**DESCRIPTION:**

Candidates complete a written comprehensive exam (i.e., four hours split into two two-hour sessions) during the last semester of endorsement course work. This exam assesses adaptive special education knowledge and skills the candidate has attained while completing endorsement coursework. As such, the comprehensive exam requires candidates to apply the principles, concepts, and methodologies associated with the endorsement coursework to real world situations. Comprehensive exam questions are developed jointly by program faculty. In addition, some are aligned with one or more KSDE adaptive special education standard(s).
Candidates receive a set of 43 study questions to help them prepare for the exam. The exam consists of 12 questions drawn from the set of study questions. These 12 questions are paired with 3 pairs presented during the first 2-hour testing session and 3 pairs presented during the second 2-hour testing session. One pair of questions assesses the candidate’s professional and ethical knowledge and skills as these relate to working with students with adaptive learning needs (e.g., Discuss the basic regulations and policies governing the practice of special education. Include a description of how you demonstrate and train others to follow these professional regulations and policies in your response.). Candidates answer one question from each pair during both testing sessions.

A minimum of two faculty members score each exam. Response assessment is based on the professional judgment of these faculty members. A third faculty member may review responses when scoring conflicts occur. Responses for each question are rated either Acceptable or Unacceptable (re-write). Candidates are informed in writing whether each question is either acceptable or unacceptable. Students may be given specific "homework" requirements to complete with deadlines, etc. before they will be permitted to write new responses to questions where previous responses were not satisfactory. Students are provided one opportunity to respond a second time to questions evaluated as unacceptable in a given semester. Alternate questions may be provided; expectations are explained by the academic advisor. Students may choose to respond in writing or via oral comments to faculty.

Students who are unable to satisfactorily complete comprehensive requirements on the second attempt will discuss options with their faculty advisor concerning a new attempt to pass comprehensives during a future enrollment period (semester). Students will be expected to complete a candidate improvement plan developed by the faculty. This plan is monitored by the student’s faculty advisor. Students may be required to re-enroll or enroll in additional course work before writing the comprehensive exam again. In this situation a student may be required to re-write responses to all questions on the comprehensive exam.

ALIGNMENT with STANDARD:

This assessment aligns with approximately half of the elements (e.g., need to uphold high standards of competence and integrity and a commitment to quality-of-life potential of students with adaptive learning needs, importance of engaging in ongoing activities that develop and advance professional and ethical skills that benefit students with adaptive learning needs, their families, and colleagues) associated with Standard 8: The candidate demonstrates professionalism and ethical knowledge and skills related to students with adaptive learning needs.

SUMMARY of the DATA:

The data for the Comprehensive Exam show 100% pass rates for completers from 2007-2010. Refer to Assessment 5 Data Table to see this assessment data.

INTERPRETATION of the DATA:
It is difficult to interpret this assessment data within the context of Standard 8 for two reasons: (a) the assessment is aligned with only approximately half of the standard elements and (b) there is no scoring rubric for the assessment. Consequently, in depth interpretation of this data within the context of Standard 8 is limited.

While the assessment could be modified to show alignment with a majority of the Standard 8 elements and a rubric could be developed for this assessment, the faculty decided to discontinue it beginning in Summer Term 2010. This decision was based on two issues: (a) Faculty thought that there artifacts in the Practicum II Portfolio that would serve as stronger assessment activities for Standard 8 and (b) This assessment could be replaced with a new assessment to evaluate candidate performance on Standard 3, something the faculty considered to be critical if the program area was to have a comprehensive assessment system to evaluate candidate performance on all eight standards.

Consequently, faculty decided to use Practicum II Portfolio artifacts to evaluate candidate performance within the context of Standard 8 beginning in Summer Term 2010. (See Assessment 6 narrative, Section IV of this report to learn more about this.) They also decided to create a new assessment 5 to evaluate candidate performance within the context of Standard 3 beginning in Summer Term 2010. (See description of the New Assessment 5 below and the Assessment 5 Rubric for Independent Case Study Analyses (new).)

DESCRIPTION (New Assessment 5):

Candidates complete the Independent Case Study Analyses during SD 820 Assessment in Schools. They complete four case studies and write 2-page professional reports for each.

Case Study One

Candidates will analyze data from a case study that involves a second grade student who has received intensive reading intervention involving research-supported instructional strategies and curriculum in a general education classroom. Candidates will: (a) analyze information assessment data, e.g., fluency data, comprehension data; (b) determine whether the intensive reading intervention is effective; (c) identify limitations in the data provided; (d) make educational recommendations; and (e) write a 2-page professional report.

Case Study Two

Candidates will analyze data from a case study that involves a fourth grade student receiving intensive mathematics intervention involving research-supported instructional strategies and curriculum in a general education classroom. Although this student has received four different mathematics interventions over the past year, the data indicate that the student has not made sufficient progress. The student has been referred for a comprehensive evaluation. Candidates will: (a) analyze informal and formal assessment data (e.g., MTSS data, WISC-R, WJ-III); (b) determine whether the student has a disability and, if so, which disability and provide a rationale to support this decision; (c) determine if the student is also gifted and talented and, if so, provide a rationale to support this decision; (d) identify limitations in the data provided; (e) make an educational
recommendation including IEP goals and objectives, assessments to evaluate each, and participation in district and state standards-based assessments; and (f) write a 2-page professional report.

Case Study Three

Candidates will analyze data from a case study involving a middle school student who moved to this country two years ago. As an English language learner (ELL), he has received ELL supports since his arrival at school. He has made notable progress since his arrival. He is now at grade level academically; however, he continues to show difficulty fitting in with peers. His teachers have provided social and behavioral supports for him. They have collected data to evaluate his social and behavioral performance at school. This data indicates that he is not showing sufficient social or behavioral progress at school. Candidates will: (a) analyze the social and behavioral performance data, (b) identify limitations (i.e., including diversity-related and ELL) in the data provided, (c) determine whether this student should be referred for a comprehensive evaluation and provide a rationale to support this recommendation, (d) make an educational recommendation including a measurable objective and planned observational data recording system, and (e) write a 2-page professional report.

Case Study Four

Candidates will analyze a case study involving a secondary student with significant school attendance problems. This student talks regularly about dropping out of school. Candidates will: (a) review data from career/vocational interest assessments and the person-centered planning assessment process, (b) develop transition IEP goals and objectives including assessments needed to evaluate student progress on each and (c) write a 2-page professional report.

(Passing scores for this project fall within the “acceptable” or “target” ranges of 80 to 94% or 95 to 100%, respectively.)

ALIGNMENT with STANDARD

This assessment aligns with Standard 3: The candidate will demonstrate knowledge and skill in assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation as related to provision of educational services for students (K-12) with adaptive learning needs and its elements.

If submitting comprehensive examinations, projects, comprehensive portfolio tasks and scores/s aligned to standards, the program must use the table below and submit the Scoring Guides/Evaluation Criteria/Rubric and a Data Table. DO NOT USE THIS TABLE FOR COURSE GRADES-BASED ASSESSMENTS!!!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment #5</th>
<th>Scoring Guides/Criteria/Rubric</th>
<th>Data Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Content based assessment that addresses Kansas content standards] * Required Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, projects, comprehensive portfolio tasks and score/s aligned to standards. Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>Click the box if attached.</td>
<td>Click the box if attached.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IF COURSE GRADES-BASED ASSESSMENTS are submitted, the following matrix MUST be used in addition to the narrative detailed description of the assessments the program provides in the above #5 Content Knowledge description!**

### Alignment Matrix and Course Description for Course Grades-Based Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments 5.A-F for SIX courses</th>
<th>Program Standard Addressed by Course Assessment</th>
<th>Brief Description of how the Course addresses and assesses the standard from an AUTHENTIC source—such as a syllabus or a course catalog. Cite the most current source. The description should provide evidence of the alignment of the course to the standard indicated on the chart in Section III. Cite your source in each description below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXAMPLE: Calculus I Math 172</td>
<td>Standard 6</td>
<td>Calculus of algebraic functions of one variable: limits differentiation, implicit differentiation, definite and indefinite integrals. Mean value theorem, maxima and minima, area, and volume. Vectors, polar coordinates, parametric equations, and vector valued functions and use of technology. Applications to other fields. Source: Blank University Undergraduate Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alignment Matrix and Course Description for Course Grades-Based Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments 5.A-F for SIX courses</th>
<th>Program Standard Addressed by Course Assessment</th>
<th>Brief Description of how the Course addresses and assesses the standard from an AUTHENTIC source—such as a syllabus or a course catalog. Cite the most current source. The description should provide evidence of the alignment of the course to the standard indicated on the chart in Section III. Cite your source in each description below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**#6 (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Assessment of content knowledge:** Examples of assessments include comprehensive standard examinations, case studies involving many content standards, projects, comprehensive portfolio tasks and score/s aligned to standards and related to content knowledge. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

**DESCRIPTION:**

Candidates complete the Practicum II Portfolio during SD 808 or 809 Adaptive Practicum II (elementary or secondary, respectively) after completing the majority of the adaptive course work with a grade of B or better. For this assessment, candidates complete the following three activities:

**Collaboration/Consultation Analysis Paper**

In this assessment activity, candidates will write a professional quality paper that: (a) describes collaboration or consultation with general education teachers, special education teachers, paraeducators, and family members or legal guardians of students with adaptive learning that includes the roles and responsibilities each play in planning and implementing individual programs for these students; (b) describes problem solving strategies used to facilitate collaboration or consultation; (c) discusses the importance of ethical practice as related to confidential communication with others about students with adaptive learning needs; and (d) discusses culturally responsive factors used to promote effective communication and collaboration. When completing this activity, candidates should demonstrate an understanding of: (a) the conceptual definition
and implementation of the consultant role in the problem-solving process to benefit students with adaptive learning needs; (b) the conceptual definition and implementation practices in collaborative interaction between co-equal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision making regarding the needs of students with adaptive learning needs; and (c) the interpersonal problem-solving strategies used order to address agreed upon problems of students with adaptive learning needs by the application of the following steps: (1) Identification of the problem; (2) Brainstorming solutions; (3) Evaluating potential solutions; (4) Implementing the solutions; and (5) Evaluating the outcomes.

Assistive Technology Plan

In this assessment activity, candidates will write a professional quality plan and share it with parents, teachers, administrators, and other school personnel that shares the results of an assistive technology assessment, recommendations, and implementation and monitoring steps. When completing this activity, candidates should demonstrate understanding of and ability to: (a) follow federal, state, and local guidelines regarding parental rights; (b) the concerns of parents and students from diverse backgrounds; (c) communication effectively with parents, general educators, administrators, and other school personnel throughout the 1) assessment; 2) implementation; 3) progress monitoring; (c) use of appropriate assessment and evaluation tools to plan and implement the assistive technology plan; and (e) match appropriate assistive technology to meet the needs of adaptive students in various educational environments.

Ecological Inventory

In this assessment activity, candidates will complete an ecological inventory using the Classroom Ecological Inventory (CEI) (Fuchs, Fernstrom, Scott, Fuchs, & Vandermeer, 2991), develop a plan to resolve discrepancies between classrooms, and shares this plan with the general educators who teach in these classrooms. When completing this activity, candidates should demonstrate understanding of and ability to: (a) use verbal, nonverbal, and written language effectively, including the selection and use of appropriate technology to communicate with others; (b) communicate individual student’s program needs; (c) use appropriate assessment and evaluation tools to resolve discrepancies between classrooms; and (d) follow ethical practice for confidential communication with others about individuals who have adaptive learning needs.

(Passing scores for this project fall within the “acceptable” or “target” ranges of 80 to 94% or 95 to 100%, respectively.)

ALIGNMENT with KSDE STANDARDS:

This assessment aligns with Standard #7: The candidate will demonstrate knowledge and skill in effective communication and collaboration as related to provision of educational services for students with adaptive learning needs and its elements.

SUMMARY of the DATA:

The data for the Practicum II Portfolio show 100% pass rates with mean scores of 91.44 and 95.79% and score ranges of 85.8 to 100, and 89.25 to 100% for completers in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, respectively. In addition, 15 of 29 (51.72%) and 14 of 20 (70%) of completers achieved
“target” level performance on this assessment in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, respectively. The remaining completers achieved “acceptable” level performance on this assessment. Refer to Assessment 6 Data Table to see this assessment data. (The 2007-2008 completer data derived from Practicum II Portfolio final grade with 92% or higher earning a letter grade of A and 83 to 91% earning a letter grade of B.)

INTERPRETATION of the DATA:

All completers, i.e., for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively, passed this assessment. However, the percentage of completers achieving “target” on this assessment in both 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 is lower than that achieved on assessments 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8. While the assessment (i.e., including all three activities) shows strong alignment with Standard 7 and its elements, it did not include a scoring rubric to further articulate this alignment. Thus, it is not possible to determine why candidate performance on this assessment is so much lower than that on other assessments. Consequently in depth interpretation of this data within the context of Standard 7 is limited.

Program faculty created a rubric for this assessment in April 2010. It is a criterion-referenced rubric aligned with KSDE Standard 7 and its elements. [See Assessment 7 Practicum II Portfolio Rubric (new).] Faculty began piloting this rubric during Fall Semester 2010. They plan to pilot use of the rubric during Fall 2010 and Spring 2011. At that time, they will make any revisions/edits needed to improve the rubric.

Please note that beginning in Summer Term 2010, the program will assess both Standards 7 and 8 with Assessment 6: Practicum II Portfolio. Thus Assessment 6 will use two sets of portfolio artifacts, i.e., one set to assess Standard 7 and another to assess Standard 8. This assessment will continue use of the artifacts described above to assess Standard 7. It will use the set of artifacts described below to assess Standard 8. Finally, the attached Assessment 6 Rubric (New) contains a rubric for each standard assessed.

DESCRIPTION (New Standard 8 Artifacts):

Candidates complete the Practicum II Portfolio during SD 808 or 809 Adaptive Practicum II (elementary or secondary, respectively) after completing the majority of the adaptive course work with a grade of B or better. For this assessment, candidates complete the following three activities:

Personal Philosophy Statement

When completing this assessment activity, candidates will write a professional quality paper that: (a) describes their beliefs related to instruction of students with adaptive learning needs in inclusive classrooms and resource classrooms and how these beliefs are influenced by laws, regulations, and policies that govern the profession; (b) describes their beliefs regarding professionalism and ethics (e.g., rights to privacy, confidentiality, respect for differences) as related to provision of educational services for students with adaptive learning needs; (c) describes their personal attitudes and perceptions, language usage, and cultural biases and differences that may either facilitate or interfere with the professional or ethical practice; and (d) describes the role that consumer and professional organizations, publications, and journals play in their continued professional growth. While completing this activity, candidates should demonstrate understanding of: (a) the manner in which diversity among educators,
families, and students may affect behavior, educational performance, and perceptions and how these factors might facilitate or interfere with professional or ethical practice when working with students with adaptive learning needs; (b) the importance of using instructional evidence-based strategies and best-practice educational methods when working with students with adaptive learning needs; (c) the need to uphold high standards of competence and integrity and a commitment to quality-of-life potential of students with adaptive learning needs; and (d) the importance of engaging in ongoing activities that develop and advance professional and ethical skills that benefit students with adaptive learning needs, their families, and colleagues.

Behavior Management Plan

When completing this assessment activity, candidates will create a professional quality behavior management plan report that describes: (a) the target (i.e., inappropriate) behavior; (b) the replacement behavior; (c) the effective reinforce, appropriate reinforcement schedule, and appropriate data collection process; and (d) how the plan was implemented including data collection, data graphing, and data analysis. Candidates will then share this report with appropriate school personnel in a manner that ensures confidentiality and respect for individual differences. While completing this assessment activity, candidates should demonstrate the ability to: (a) include information about diversity; (b) display awareness of personal attitudes that may interfere with professional or ethical practices; (c) model appropriate professional and ethical behaviors; (d) practice professional activities that foster maximum growth in all students; (e) maintain confidentiality of educational and medical records of students; (f) use practices that maintain positive classroom climate that helps all students grow; (g) demonstrate sensitivity for culture, language, disability and other diversity characteristics of students; (h) uphold high standards of competence and integrity; (i) demonstrate and train others in objective and ethical behavior appropriate for the profession; (j) engage in activities that develop and advance professional and ethical skills; (k) follow laws, regulations, and policies governing the profession; (l) use and understand evidence-based practices to distinguish from unsubstantiated practices; and (m) use appropriate and ethical written and oral communication related to students with adaptive special needs.

Videotaped Lesson Assignment

When completing this assessment activity, candidates will identify two students with adaptive learning needs, review their IEPs to identify goals and the research-supported instructional strategies or interventions identified to work on the goals; development, implement, and evaluate two lesson plans for each student; and write two assessment reports and follow-up professional reflections for each student. While completing this assessment activity, candidates should demonstrate the ability to: (a) include information about diversity; (b) use and understand evidence-based practices to distinguish from unsubstantiated practices; (c) describe theories, methods or techniques for assessment; (d) display awareness of personal attitudes that may interfere with professional or ethical practices; (e) maintain confidentiality of educational and medical records of students; (f) use practices that maintain positive classroom climate that helps all students grow; (g) demonstrate and train others in objective and ethical behavior appropriate for the profession; (h) follow laws, regulations, and policies governing the profession; (i) use appropriate and ethical written and oral communication related to students; and (j) practice systematic self-evaluation and accept criticism from others for professional growth.

(Passing scores for this project fall within the “acceptable” or “target” ranges of 80 to 94% or 95 to 100%, respectively.)
ALIGNMENT with KSDE STANDARDS:

This assessment aligns with Standard 8: The candidate will demonstrate knowledge and skill in professionalism and ethics as related to provision of educational services for students with adaptive learning needs and its elements.

(No more than 2 pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Content based assessment that addresses Kansas content standards] * Required Examples of assessments include comprehensive standard examinations, case studies involving many content standards, projects, comprehensive portfolio tasks and score/s aligned to standards, and related to content knowledge. Practicum II Portfolio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#7 (Optional) Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

DESCRIPTION:

Candidates complete the Functional Behavior Assessment/Behavior Intervention Plan (FBA/BIP) Project during SD 802 Seminar in Behavior Management. For this project, candidates will complete a Functional Behavior Assessment, develop a Behavior Intervention Plan, write a professional quality report, and write a 2-page reflection with the following five sections:

1. Functional Behavior Assessment
In this part of the project, candidates will, in collaboration with a multidisciplinary team, gather anecdotal data, identify a target behavior (i.e., an inappropriate), complete an A-B-C analysis of this data, identify one or more hypotheses regarding the function of the target behavior, test these hypotheses, and identify the function of the behavior. This part of the project should involve the use of: (a) appropriate assessment and evaluation procedures to plan and implement interventions that promote self-awareness, self-management, self-control, self-advocacy, self-reliance, self-esteem, and social skills and (b) others in assessing, planning and implementing programs for students with adaptive learning needs.

2. Behavior Intervention Plan

In this part of the project, candidates will, in collaboration with a multidisciplinary team, create a behavior intervention plan meant to replace the target behavior identified when conducting the Functional Behavior Analysis with an appropriate behavior that serves the same function as the target behavior. This part of the project should involve the: (a) development and implementation of a systematic behavior intervention plan that includes observation, data collection, recording, establishment of timelines, hierarchies of interventions, and schedules of reinforcement; (b) use of a variety of appropriate least invasive and non-aversive techniques; (c) use of appropriate and least invasive techniques and strategies for managing and promoting social-skill development; (d) use of management and social-skill intervention programs based on research; (e) use of individual and group curricula and environmental variables; (f) identification of realistic expectations; (g) demonstration of understanding of the rationale for a variety of techniques and strategies for managing and promoting social skills, developing problem-solving abilities, and self-advocacy skills; and (h) demonstration of understanding of the importance and effects of diversity-related influences on behavior.

3. Evaluation

In this part of the project, candidates will evaluate the effects of the behavior intervention plan on the target behavior. This part of the project should involve the identification of (i.e., based on data analysis): (a) effective strategies and management procedures for crisis prevention; (b) ways to integrate individual and group curricula to promote independent self-enhancement, self-monitoring, self-control, self-esteem, self-advocacy, self-direction, and personal social skills; (c) ways to facilitate the development and implementation of rules and appropriate consequences; and (d) theories supporting reinforcement techniques.

4. Reflection

In this part of the project, candidates will engage in reflection about the project. In this part of the project, candidates should show understanding of or the ability to: (a) legislation and policies related to behavior management; (b) the importance of multidisciplinary and collaborative decision-making; (c) attitudes that influence behavior; (d) organize, develop, and sustain learning safe environments; and (e) mediate controversial issues.

5. Professional Report

In this part of the project, candidates will write a professional report describing the project activities. This part of the project should involve: (a) writing a professional report that describes the purpose of the report, a description of the assessment process (i.e., FBA), data resulting from the
assessment process, description of the intervention plan (i.e., BIP) and its implementation, graph with data resulting from intervention plan, data summary, data interpretation, and educational recommendations; (b) writing with professional voicing and clarity, (c) writing with effective organization; and (d) writing with no grammatical, mechanical, or spelling errors.

(Passing scores for this project fall within the “acceptable” or “target” ranges of 80 to 94% or 95 to 100%, respectively.)

ALIGNMENT with KSDE STANDARDS:

This assessment aligns with Standard #6: The candidate will demonstrate knowledge and skill in managing behavior, facilitating problem-solving, developing social skills and promoting self-advocacy of students with adaptive learning needs and its elements.

This assessment aligns with three elements [i.e., (a) assesses, documents, and reports both appropriate and problematic social behaviors; (b) reports assessment results to all stakeholders using effective communication; and (c) uses assessment and evaluation results to select and evaluate instructional activities, monitor progress, and modify interventions and learning environments] associated with Standard #3: The candidate will demonstrate knowledge and skill in assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation as related to provision of educational services for students (K-12) with adaptive learning needs.

SUMMARY of the DATA:

The data for the FBA/BIP Project show 100% pass rates with mean scores of 92, 98.52, and 99.37% and score ranges of 84 to 100, 83.75 to 100, and 92 to 100% for completers in 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively. In addition, 24 of 27 (88.89%) and 18 of 19 (94.74%) of completers achieved “target” level performance on this project in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, respectively. The remaining completers achieved “acceptable” level performance on this project in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, respectively. (Please note that the program area did not differentiate between completers performing at target versus acceptable level in 2007-2008. Thus all 2007-2008 completers performed at either the acceptable or target levels.) Refer to Assessment 7 Data Table to see this assessment data.

INTERPRETATION of the DATA:

1. Interpretation for Standard 6

All completers, i.e., for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively, passed this assessment. In addition, the completers showed an increase in target performance from 2007-2010. Unfortunately, at this point in time, it is not possible to determine what caused this improved performance. The assessment rubric shows minimal alignment with the assessment activity (e.g., Graphs are neat, accurate and add to the reader's understanding of the topic.) and Standard 6. [See attached Assessment 7 Rubric for the old Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavior Intervention Project rubric, which precedes the new rubric in Assessment 7 Rubric.] Consequently, the weak alignment between the rubric and the assessment description and Standard 6 significantly limit interpretation of this data.
To create greater alignment between the assessment activity and its scoring rubric, program faculty created a new rubric for this assessment in April 2010. (See attached Assessment 7 Rubric for Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavior Intervention Plan Project (new).) It is a criterion-referenced rubric aligned with both Assessment 7 Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavior Intervention Plan Project and KSDE Standard 6 and its elements. Faculty began piloting this rubric during Summer Term 2010. They plan to pilot use of the rubric during Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters. Following this pilot, faculty will meet and discuss the new rubric. Based on their experiences using the rubric, they will make any revisions needed to improve it.

2. Interpretation for Standard 3

All completers, i.e., for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively, passed this assessment. In addition, the completers showed an increase in target performance from 2007-2010. Unfortunately, at this point in time, it is not possible to determine what caused this improved performance. In addition, this assessment aligns with only three elements from Standard 3. Thus, it is probable that this assessment does not have sufficient alignment with Standard 3 to evaluate candidate performance as relates to that standard.

Consequently, program faculty discussed the likelihood of this assessment activity ever addressing the majority of elements in Standard 3. They decided that this assessment activity could never legitimately address these elements and so would not be workable to evaluate candidate performance as relates to Standard 3. Thus they decided to create a new assessment to evaluate Standard 3. [See Assessment 5 (new) for information about this new assessment earlier in Section IV of this report.]

(No more than 2 pages)

| Attachments |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Assessment #7** | **Scoring Guides/Criteria/ Rubric** | **Data Table** |
| [Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards ] * Optional Functional Behavior Assessment/Behavior Intervention Plan (FBA/BIP) Project | Click the box if attached. | Click the box if attached. |

**#8 (Optional) Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards.** Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.
DESCRIPTION:

Candidates complete Assessment 8: History and Foundations Project during SD 700 Characteristics of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities. For this project, candidates write a professional quality research paper following APA style guidelines that addresses the following three topics:

1. Special Education History and Foundations
In this section of the paper, candidates discuss the philosophical, historical, and legal foundations of special education. This portion of the paper should include a discussion of the: (a) ongoing effects major contributors and classic studies have on current practice; (b) philosophies, theories, and resulting models (i.e., including those from medicine, psychology, and education) that form the foundation of current practice; and (c) role cultural beliefs, values, and traditions have played in the evolution of special education.

2. Special Education Services
In this section of the paper, candidates discuss the implications of special education services derived from categorical labeling (e.g., LD, BD, MR) versus those derived from non-categorical labeling (e.g., adaptive special education). This portion of the paper should also include a discussion of: (a) definitions and identification criteria for students with adaptive learning needs, including those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds; (b) information related to the rights and responsibilities of parents, students, teachers, and schools, as they relate to students with adaptive learning needs; and (c) the candidate’s personal philosophy of education, i.e., including knowledge of current issues and trends as related to instruction of students with adaptive learning needs.

3. Cultural Competence and Special Education
In this section of the paper, candidates discuss the impact of the dominant culture on the shaping of schools and the persons who study and work in them. This portion of the paper should also include a discussion of the: (a) potential impact of differences in values, languages, and customs that can exist between the home and school on the individuals who study and work in schools and (b) strategies used by diverse populations to cope with continuing racism and stereotyping.

(Passing scores for this project fall within the “acceptable” or “target” ranges of 80 to 94% or 95 to 100%, respectively.)

ALIGNMENT with KSDE STANDARDS:

This assessment aligns with KSDE Standard #1: The candidate will demonstrate an understanding of philosophical, historical, and legal foundations of education and special education and its elements.

SUMMARY of the DATA:

The data for Assessment 8: History and Foundations Project show 100% pass rates with mean scores of 100, 95.52, and 97.5% and score ranges of 100 to 100, 87.5 to 100, and 87.5 to 100% for completers in 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively. In addition, 100%, 17 of 24
(70.83%) and 15 of 19 (78.95%) completers achieved “target” level performance on this project in 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, respectively. The remaining completers achieved “acceptable” level performance on this project in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, respectively. Refer to Assessment 8 Data Table to see this assessment data.

INTERPRETATION of the DATA:

All completers, i.e., for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010, respectively, passed this assessment. More specifically, 100% of the 2007-2008 completers met target performance criteria in 2007-2008. The percent of completers achieving target performance in 2008-2009 dropped significantly. It improved some in 2009-2010. Unfortunately, at this point in time, it is not possible to determine what caused the decrease in candidate performance from 2007-2008 to 2009-2010. It may well have resulted from an inconsistency between the assessment description and rubric. That is, the rubric shows limited alignment with the assessment activity and Standard 1 and its elements (e.g., discuss the historical events that seem to indicate that litigation may have paved the way for legislation providing services for students with disabilities). [See Assessment 9 Rubric for the old History and Foundations Project rubric.] So, when completing this assessment, do candidates write papers addressing only the rubric grading criteria or addressing the assessment description or both? And, when evaluating candidate performance on this assessment, do faculty members evaluate candidate performance using only the rubric grading criteria, using only the assessment description, or using both? Regardless, the weak alignment between the rubric and the assessment description and Standard 1 significantly limit interpretation of this data.

To create greater cohesion between the assessment activity and its scoring rubric, program faculty created a new rubric for this assessment in April 2010. (See Assessment 8 Rubric for History and Foundations Project (new).) It is a criterion-referenced rubric aligned with both Assessment 8 History and Foundations Project and KSDE Standard 1 and its elements. Faculty began piloting this rubric during Summer Term 2010. They plan to pilot use of the rubric during Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters. Following this pilot, faculty will meet and discuss the new rubric. Based on their experiences using the rubric, they will make any revisions needed to improve it.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Additional assessment that addresses Kansas content standards ] * Optional History and Foundations Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments, but rather, it should summarize major findings from the evidence, the faculty’s interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty have taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program.

Since the last KSDE review, the Adaptive Special Education Program area has experienced several significant changes:

1. A shift to online delivery for all adaptive endorsement courses.
2. A shift from a categorical (e.g., learning disabilities, behavior disorders) to a cross-categorical (i.e., adaptive special education) endorsement program.
3. Loss of all but one faculty member. (Please note that this resulted primarily from the retirements of several distinguished, senior special education faculty members.)

Moving courses online requires course revision. The revision focuses on two issues: (1) development of effective online learning activities and (2) establishing effective online pedagogy. While some activities used in in-person courses, e.g., case studies, work equally well online, others, e.g., hands-on small group learning activities, often do not. Thus, to have a quality online program, faculty members spend much time researching, identifying, and developing effective online learning activities. Similarly, research-supported online pedagogy must be identified, practiced, and implemented in each course. Without attention to such details, online courses are all too often nothing more than “high tech independent studies” for the candidates who take them.

Shifting from a categorical to a cross-categorical endorsement program requires new program development. This often involves new course development and old course revision. For the ESU Adaptive Special Education Program, this meant development of a graduate adaptive special education endorsement program. Two graduate courses from our preceding categorical endorsement programs could be used, with revision, in the adaptive endorsement program. However, the program required development of six new courses, the last of which was piloted in Spring Semester 2009.

And finally, how does a program area measure the effect of losing all but one faculty member? It is so much more than just the loss of all but one faculty member. It’s the loss of distinguished, senior faculty, each of whom has devoted his or her life’s work to The Teachers College. It’s the loss of their wisdom. It’s the loss of their leadership. It’s the loss of their mentoring of preservice special educators and junior faculty members. It’s the loss of their connections to schools throughout Kansas. In short, it’s the loss of their service to the field of special education. While we filled the final faculty vacancy in fall of 2009, it will take some time to fill the void left by our predecessors.
In December of 2009, the adaptive special education program faculty reviewed data from the 2008-2009 annual program report. In that meeting we highlighted four areas in need of immediate attention: (1) creating a new data storage system, (2) aligning program assessments with KSDE standards, (3) creating rubrics aligned to KSDE standards for Assessments 2-8, and (4) revising Practicum I and II.

CREATING a DATA STORAGE SYSTEM

Our original data storage system failed sometime before 2008-2009. (This is evident by the low percentage of completers for whom we have data in the current report.) Consequently, we lost much of the data stored via that system. We decided to create a spreadsheet containing completer assessment data for Assessments #2-8. (Data for Assessment #1: Praxis II, 0353 and 0543 is stored in the Dean's office.) In addition, during Fall Semester 2010 we began to enter data from the spreadsheet into the AMS system used by many other programs in The Teachers College. At this point, we have entered data for all candidates enrolled in courses from January 2008 to date into our spreadsheet. We have also harvested all remaining data from the original storage system and begun to enter it into the spreadsheet. We will have all harvested data entered into the spreadsheet by December 2010 and AMS by May 2011.

ALIGNING PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS with KSDE STANDARDS

In our December 2009 meeting, program faculty discussed Assessments 1-8 and their alignment with one or more KSDE Standards. We agreed to the following assessment to standard(s) alignments:

- Assessment 1 - Praxis II Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) and Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542) align with KSDE Standards 1-6
- Assessment 2 – Instructional Planning Project aligns with KSDE Standard 4
- Assessment 3 – Practicum I Portfolio aligns with KSDE Standard 2
- Assessment 4 – Videotaped Lesson Assignment aligns with KSDE Standard 5
- Assessment 6 – Practicum II Portfolio aligns with KSDE Standard 7
- Assessment 7 – Functional Behavior Assessment/Behavior Intervention Plan Project aligns with KSDE Standard 6
- Assessment 8 – History and Foundations Project aligns with KSDE Standard 1

We did NOT agree with the following assessment to standard(s) alignments:
- Assessment 5 – Comprehensive Examination aligns with KSDE Standard 8
- Assessment 7 – Functional Behavior Assessment/Behavior Intervention Plan Project aligns with KSDE Standard 3

To resolve the assessment to KSDE rubric alignment problems, program faculty agreed to the following:
The program faculty met and completed the aforementioned changes between February and April 2010.

CREATING RUBRICS ALIGNED with KSDE STANDARDS for ASSESSMENTS #2-8

Program faculty worked in teams to create the new assessment rubrics between February and April 2010. [Please find Assessment 2-8 Rubrics (New) attached in Section IV of this document.] Each rubric contains the majority of standard elements for the standard(s) the assessment evaluates. The rubrics will provide much more in depth information regarding completer performance on the assessment. This detailed information should help program faculty guide completers from “acceptable” to “target” performance levels on each assessment.

The faculty began piloting use of the rubrics for Assessments #2, 3, 5 (new), 7, and 8 during Summer Term 2010. (Please refer to the data resulting from two of the new rubrics, i.e., the new Assessment #5 and Assessment #8, provided below.

- Assessment #5 (New) Independent Case Study Analyses
  Mean = 97.71 (97.71%)
  Range 90 to 100 (90 to 100%)
  Pass = 100% (78.57% Target, 21.43% Acceptable, 0% Unacceptable)
  Detailed analysis:
  i. Three of 14 candidates presented some difficulties using terminology accurately in the assessment reports they created for 2 or more of the case studies.
  ii. The highest number of candidates lost one or more points when analyzing the case study involving assessment of an English language learner.

- Assessment #8 History and Foundations Project
  Mean = 47.36 (94.72%)
  Range 34 to 50 (68 to 100%)
  Pass = 92.86% (71.43% Target, 21.43% Acceptable, 7.14% Unacceptable)
  Detailed analysis:
  i. Candidate scoring in unacceptable range lost points in Sections I and III of the paper as well as for professional quality and documentation. S/he discussed one court case only and it was not specific to special education in Section I. And the candidate’s discussion of the historical foundations of special education and resulting legislation contained inaccuracies and was limited in scope.
  ii. The majority of points lost on this assessment for candidates occurred in Section III: Cultural Competence and Special Education and
Professional Quality Documentation. The discussions related to Section III were often limited in depth and showed little connection between cultural competence and the field of special education. Also, most candidates who lost points in the Professional Quality and Documentation section of the rubric needed additional references or did not follow APA style guidelines when citing references in the body of the paper and/or the reference list at the end of the paper.

Clearly these new rubrics provide candidates with additional detail regarding the assessment requirements, i.e., the rubrics shape the learning behaviors of the candidates by guiding their preparation for the assessment as well as their performance during the assessment. In addition, the rubrics guide faculty members’ teaching during the semester as well as help faculty reflect back on the course as they prepare to teach it again in subsequent semesters. Faculty will discuss the data resulting from the rubrics as well as their “user-friendliness” along with the data from this report in the December 2010 program area meeting.

REVISING PRACTICUM I and II

Six of 24 credits in the adaptive endorsement program at ESU result from practica. The practica allow completers to become experiential learners with ongoing supervision and mentoring from experienced special educators and university faculty. The importance of both practica to our completers cannot be overstated. And yet the Practicum I and II Portfolio assessment data indicate that far too few completers (i.e., fewer than 90% of all completers) achieved target level performance in either practicum.

Based on input from current and former candidates and school district administrators, program faculty think the completers’ performance is likely due to one or more of the following: (1) ineffective practicum evaluation forms, (2) ineffective field supervision process for an online endorsement program, and (3) outdated practica activities. Consequently, the faculty will work with special education administrators, building principals, teachers, and recent completers to revise the supervisor evaluation forms, distance supervisor evaluation process, and some of the practicum activities. We plan to complete these revisions during Spring Semester 2011 and pilot them in Practicum I and II during Fall Semester 2011.

In conclusion, the adaptive endorsement program assessment process and the data it provides have served as a catalyst for continuous improvement in the adaptive special education program at ESU. The ongoing assessment helps us make data-based decisions regarding program changes. In addition, this process ensures ongoing assessment to evaluate the effects of program changes for both our candidates and our program. And finally, the assessment process helps us stay focused on those program elements likely to be most critical to the preparation of adaptive special educators who work effectively with children with adaptive learning needs, their families, and other professionals who serve these children in the schools and communities where they work and play.